



*Dr Peter Greenwood.*

## TRENDS AND DEVELOPMENTS IN CORRECTIONS

by **Dr. PETER W. GREENWOOD**

Ladies, gentlemen, distinguished fellow speakers and organisers of this conference, I feel thrice blessed, or honoured to be here — to be here in Australia, land of sunny blue skies and warm waters, at least up on the Queensland coast where my family is. I only hope that I can find them again when I go back. I feel blessed to be addressing this audience and particularly I feel honoured to be talking about corrections, because I find that it is often hard to draw a very large group together to talk very seriously about this sometimes distressing topic.

I consider myself a newcomer to this field of corrections in that I feel that I have, somewhat, come in through the back door, being concerned with juvenile corrections. My earliest work was in policing, detectives, probability factors, co-ordination between detectives and patrol officers, and work on prosecutors, plea-bargaining and filing policies. I did some work with the New York City detectives and finally got on to the issue of what prisons do in serving the public. I authored a piece on selective incapacitation, trying to estimate the effects of imprisonment and then, finally, I got into the juvenile justice system in a study for California. There I discovered serious questions in the area of corrections, particularly in the decline of efforts devoted to rehabilitation and the great debate that still rages in the United States

between the issue of “public” v. “private” and what the “private” role might be in the area of corrections. So, now, here I am by default, although when I began in this field all the greats were in corrections: there wasn’t much work going on in police or prosecution. You were a huge success if you went out and rode in a patrol car for five days in order to report about what policemen do. It seems now that if you go inside a prison for five days and write a paper, you are a success and I think that the police and prosecutors have moved much further along in studying how to improve their work than has been true in corrections in the last ten years.

So, that might give you a hint about what I see. Basically, using the old colloquialism, I see corrections going to hell in a handbasket. Bankruptcy may be too good a word. Back in the United States, at least 40 of the States are operating under court orders because their corrections systems do not meet basic minimum standards. We see facilities that are decrepit and overcrowded. We see correctional policy in the hands of politicians, rather than in the hands of correctional professionals. We see a general lack of leadership within the field, or the profession, with the basic thought of keeping a low profile as a way of keeping one’s head in this business, rather than by standing up for what one believes. We see a general decline in the amount of

**D**r. Peter Greenwood was the first overseas speaker to address the conference. He was a colourful and dynamic speaker. He did not present a printed paper and so it should be remembered, when reading this article, that it is a report of a speech and not a paper prepared for publication. Dr. Greenwood is a key figure in the Criminal Justice Programme of the Rand Corporation. The Rand Corporation of Santa Monica in California is a research institute. Dr. Greenwood has been involved in that organisation's research into mandatory

prison sentences and the effects on crime and prison populations that they have. He has been involved in research on criminal careers, and in particular the notion of habitual and persistent offenders. His publications include "The Criminal Investigation Process", "Controlling the Crime Rate Through Imprisonment" and "Youth Crime and Juvenile Justice in California — a Report to the Legislature". He was, in short, a most significant contributor to the Adelaide conference in both its formal and informal discussions.

attention and effort devoted to rehabilitation, so that most offenders pass through correctional facilities without any but the most minimal attempts being made to remedy their serious defects in the area of drug and alcohol abuse and lack of educational and vocational training. I would venture to say that most ranchers know a lot more about the background and developmental progress of the cattle that move across their feedlots than most correctional administrators do about the inmates that come within their prisons. I also see a decline in the effort devoted to community corrections and a retreat to the "fortress prison" as the only politically acceptable means of inflicting punishment in order to protect the public.

So that is it. Should I sit down now, or should I go on? Try and figure it out, because my talk is entitled "Trends and Developments". Is that a trend? I don't believe it is, because I have never been able to find out when it wasn't so. I believe that shortly after Cain slew Abel, a blue ribbon committee was formed to look into the conditions under which Cain was held and they probably issued a blistering report about the conditions of the prison and how he was being treated.

Yes, we all were aware of brief interludes when hopes ran high: when there were new ideas and new institutions and somehow it appeared that a true renaissance was at hand in the area of corrections. We all have our favourite periods, or our favourite stories. I am a particular fan of the English Borstal system during the 1920's and the 1930's. I was enlightened by one of your countrymen, Gordon Hawkins, who did a paper for me in a report we recently did on international trends in juvenile justice.

But it doesn't last. It never seems to hang on. Sooner or later, the extra funding, the special type of staff, the uniquely charismatic leaders that bring us such movements or such programmes burn out and disappear. A prisoner escapes and commits some heinous crime. Or the evaluators come in and prove that nothing works and we are back to business as normal. Lock them up. Get tough. Nothing works.

I would love to show you a video that I brought with me of some programmes that we are in the midst of evaluating back in the United States on juvenile programmes. One of the control programmes is the California Youth Authority, as it exists today. Some of you who are interested in corrections may remember the famous California Community Treatment Project in which they were going to try and treat the youths in their homes. You may remember the Probation Subsidy Programmes that was designed to try and get juvenile courts to treat juveniles in their local communities rather than sending them away to State facilities. For a while, that was successful, but I would like to show you now what the California Youth Authority considers its "flagship". It is an institution built for 1,200, but which now holds 1,700, most of the time locked down in double cells.

It is hard to believe that it can get any worse, but I don't doubt that it can. In California, our prisons now hold about 50,000. That is a doubling in the last ten years. The projection is 100,000 by 1992 and I believe that we have a Governor that would be proud to see it go that way. He has no chagrin, or no apology, for pursuing that kind of a correctional policy.

However, I have some reason to believe that the situation is turning around. Hopefully, this is the dark before the dawn and we may be entering into a new era. I have no idea how long it will take, but at least I see the seeds of it. I base this observation on two major trends that I see developing in American correctional systems, and I think that I sense it in other places that I visit. One is in the juvenile system and one is in the adult. They both start with a despair over the effectiveness and the intelligence of complete reliance on traditional institutional programmes. The fortress prisons for adults; the training schools for juveniles. In the juvenile area, this has given way to a strong movement amongst private agencies to develop effectual programmes — effectual ways of dealing with the problems that bring juveniles into the system. In the adult system, it has given way to a movement that we call "alternative sanctions", because it is now pretty much accepted that the reason people are put into prison is to protect the public and sanction the punishment.

Really, what we need to tackle is educating the public that other forms of sanctions can be just as effective, and probably a lot more cross-effective, than simply locking people up. Both those movements are developing a rather strong head of steam and I will be addressing them in my talk today, primarily in the juvenile area, because that is where I have been working, but also just to give you some feel for what is going on in the adult alternative sanction or intermediate sanction movement.

I would like to begin by reminding you, without going into any depth, of the context in which one talks about corrections today. We have a continued high rate of crime. In many countries, it had levelled off over the last few years. While there is a good deal of debate between the victimization surveys and the police reports, the rate seems to have turned up again over the last few years. Certainly, we have no sense that crime is going away. We still have plenty of crime and the public is still concerned. We have a tremendous growth in the prison population and a related growth in courts. The courts go up even more than the population because the courts are imposing more stringent conditions. We are getting more prisoners with AIDS which make them more difficult and expensive for the administrators to deal with. If we do see a general decline in rehabilitative efforts, it is when we go into correctional facilities today and see custody which involves keeping the offenders apart and keeping them busy. Moving the bodies around is generally the principal concern, rather than

rehabilitation. There is very little effort devoted to experimentation, to analysis, to careful evaluation. We have got a high recidivism rate for correctional programmes. In the United States, it is very hard to find out what the recidivism rate is, but we have begun to do some studies and they seem to show that well over 50% of released offenders are arrested again within one year. Typically, 50% are re-imprisoned within two years of their getting out of custody.

There has been some recent research aimed at showing the contribution of chronic juvenile offenders to the overall crime problem. The notion is that crime starts at a fairly young age. These offenders continue to go through the system. There is the suggestion that family background has some strong causal relationship with these chronic offenders.

I do not know what your recidivism rates are here, but some recent research that we have done in California upon a sample of prison inmates, showed that 72% were re-arrested within two years of release. Another group of offenders from the same counties, Los Angeles and Alameda, but this time probationers who thus seemed a better class of offender, were also surveyed. The result was 63% were found to have been re-arrested within two years. Another California Youth Authority sample followed up offenders after ten years — this was a group imprisoned in the early 1950's. 93% were re-arrested over the ten year period. The best data that we now have on the California Youth Authority is that about 70-75% are re-arrested within one year of release. We studied a group of juveniles as a control group — the San Diego Juvenile Probation Camp. Of this group, 71% were re-arrested within one year of their release. So, in no sense can it be said that those programmes are making a dramatic impact on the future criminality of young offenders.

To reinforce just what this relationship is between juvenile and adult criminality, I have some statistics from a typical city in the United States which compares the juvenile record with the adult record. Firstly, the chances of adult offending where there has been no juvenile arrest is only 2%. Secondly, if there has been a single arrest as a juvenile, the probability of at least one adult arrest is 18%. The likelihood is that this group will have four or more adult arrests. Thirdly, looking at offenders who have five or more arrests as a juvenile, there is a 95% chance that those offenders will be arrested as an adult. That comes as no surprise. There is a strong continuity in the peak ages of criminality right around that boundary between juvenile and adult. It would obviously help to focus in on these contributors to the crime problem because it would seem that those juveniles account for about 50% of adult crime.

We have been doing some work, my colleagues and I, on trying to estimate the cost and what the future career patterns of juvenile offenders will be. We did it with incapacitation work and now we are trying to do it to estimate the impact of rehabilitation programmes. We have produced some figures that have been designed to estimate what the future cost of a juvenile offender will be. The typical pattern we see is that the age of onset, with the first arrest, is at age somewhere between 14 and 15. Typically, the first arrest is at a somewhat younger age than that for status offences, but by the time they start showing up for theft, burglary, assault and the like they are normally somewhere between 14 and 15 years of age. The typical arrest rate we found for the San Diego probation sample that we analysed was, for chronic offenders, and these are juveniles who have 4 to 5 arrests, about one and a half arrests per year. That is, one and a half arrests per year after they get out of the programmes. The probability of arrest for each crime was somewhere between 5% and 10%, depending on what studies you look at. Either based on their self report, or looking at all of the arrests and all of the crimes — and that allows us to convert them for each offender when we see arrests — we can ask, "*How many crimes did he really do?*" Well, crimes per arrest, an offender is found to be doing between 10 and 20 crimes for each arrest that shows up on his record. What is the probability of incarceration given arrest? Again, from Californian data, the proportion is about 40% and the average term is about one year.

Using those kinds of figures, using a probability model, we can look at what the future behaviour of the offender is likely to be. The expected career length for such an offender is about 13.3 years. That

is how long, on the average, he will be in the system. Some will be much less and some much longer, but 13.3 years is the average for somebody who has got five prior arrests. About 62% represents the proportion of his time that he will be out on the street. The rest of the time he will be locked up or in some kind of correctional programme. This assumes an 80% recidivism rate, which is about the rate that we are now seeing from the Californian Youth Authority and from probation teams.

So that is the basic starting point for my model. If we look at the expected career of total crimes, the offender can be expected to commit somewhere between 125 and 250 offences. Assuming an amount of \$1,000 per crime as the societal cost of the crime to the victim and what the police will spend on it, the crime cost can be said to be \$125,000 to \$250,000. In addition there will be \$100,000 in correctional costs. So this is the life-time criminal career cost. The cost of corrections and the cost of the crimes is \$225,000 to \$350,000 per offender.

Now, the reason we did this work was because people talk about the cost of corrections. How, they say, can we stand to spend an average of about \$22,000 to \$25,000 a year for a juvenile in a training school? So, when we begin to talk about a programme that might spend \$28,000 a year, they throw up their hands and say, "*How can we spend so much money? We know what it costs to send somebody to Harvard and that's cheaper.*" Well, the way we have begun to think about it is to respond that this is an individual who is otherwise going to cost us \$225,000 or more as the cost of his offending.

What is the level of rehabilitation? The model that I have given you assumes an 80% recidivism rate. If we can just drop the recidivism rate from 80% to 70% — I am not asking that a programme be totally successful, that everybody who comes out of it does not go back to crime — just that the recidivism rate drops from 80% to 70%. That will save \$75,000. I have heard of the costs for locking somebody up in Australia. They are even higher than they are in the United States, so you will save even more. There has not, however, been an evaluation in 20 years that could detect a drop in recidivism rates from 80% to 70%. Nobody has got a sample size big enough. It would take at least 200 people to be able to detect that. Nobody has done a recidivism study: an evaluation of any programme that is designed to detect that kind of an improvement.

Of course, if you could drop the rate of recidivism further, if you could drop it to 60%, you would be down to a saving of \$112,000. That is a point where we can begin to see the dollar becoming significant in selling rehabilitation as an effective crime control technique. We can sell it not just as a good thing to do for offenders — because people may not want to do something good for these young men who have chosen a life of crime — but we can sell it as a good thing that we are doing for ourselves.

Before I move on to the various programmes, I just want to refresh your memory as to what the characteristics of a chronic juvenile offender are. There is a high likelihood that a juvenile offender will have come from a family background where the father and mother have criminal records, where there is alcohol and drug abuse and where the parents are psychotic. Not all come from that background, but a much higher percentage do than in the general population. Of course, those are problems which interfere with effective parenting. There is also a high probability that the chronic juvenile offender will come either from a single parent or from a large family. Again, those are factors that interfere in the amount of attention any one individual child is going to get. I speak of inadequate parenting; not just lack of discipline, but inadequate love, affection and all the things that build self-esteem in juveniles. Other factors include a high probability of physical or sexual abuse, poor school performance and so on — the classical list of characteristics that make this individual just a '*delight*' when he comes into your programme. You are now supposed to turn him around in the six months or a year that you have to overcome all these characteristics or deficits that they have built up.

Now the question is, how did we get where we are with rehabilitation? How did we end up believing that nothing works? Well, those of you who have studied the field, know the studies. I happen to think that a mistake was made in the way that much of the past work was done. The basic model that was used in those evaluation studies,

the so-called 'mode analysis', was a simple model. There is a treatment modality and that is what you do to the individual. Maybe it is a group counselling programme, maybe it is a vocational programme, maybe it is a psycho-therapy programme, that is the way that most of the studies classify the treatment. And then there are the outcomes. Was there future crime? Did attitudes change? The basic test that was used was, "Does a particular technique, like vocational counselling, consistently change behaviour?" No, none of them consistently did change behaviour and so the basis answer is, "Nothing works". No particular form of treatment is guaranteed to change criminality and, basically, that view is the one that has predominated over the past 10 or 15 years. It is the excuse for why most training schools now concentrate on keeping the offenders busy, keeping them safe, and trying to hold down the cost.

I think a more realistic model of what is involved in treatment realizes that there are inputs which are the money, the staff, the things that the correctional system is given to work with. There are then, if it is a residential programme, a bunch of processes that follow on and I will get into what those are. They come to bear on the individual and have some particular kind of effect when the individual is released from a residential programme. Then there is some form of after-care. There are things that are done, or the opportunity at least to do things. Then there is the outcome. The important thing is not just the selection of the treatment modality. Each one of those things can affect the final outcome and none of them have been consistently measured. In the evaluation studies, we have been left with the conclusion that nothing works.

I would like to develop that model. I would like to leave you with a picture that, hopefully, some day will be in colour, suitable for framing, over every probation officer's desk! This is the basic model. The programme consists of inputs and processes that operate on the individual. There are intermediate outcomes that you can measure as the offender, or whoever it is that you are working on, goes out through the door, and then there is the final outcome a year or two years later. Of course, this makes the evaluation somewhat difficult. For a residential programme, we are talking about a minimum of 4 or 5 years in order to know what the final outcomes are from the day we started accepting individuals into the programme.

Let me begin at the back end, because this is the simplest. You have all thought about it before. What are the outcomes you choose to measure to find out whether a programme is any good? The intermediate outcomes are things that you can measure as the juvenile is going out through the door: his behaviour; did he complete the programmes; absent-without-leave incidents; behavioural incidents within the programme. They are some measure at least of success. Added to this, there is a variety of standardized tests that can measure attitudes towards the future of family crime, although it is still unclear whether they are related to future crime generally: how the individual did in education test scores; in vocational preparation; in physical fitness. Those are all things that you can begin to measure for a quick assessment about how well a programme is doing. But, ultimately, to know what the better programmes are, if you are trying to choose, if you are in a State where there are 3 or 4 choices, this is what you care about — future criminality. The rate of future criminality, the frequency of arrests, or self-reports if you want to rely on those as better, and, secondly, employment duration, income — because the juvenile who is at high risk because of future criminality is also at high risk of unemployment — drug and alcohol abuse and a variety of other unhappy circumstances are all things that should be measured. Hopefully, a programme that changes one, will change all and some might be easier to measure than others.

I want to talk about the front end now. The things that go in to a programme such as programme characteristics, money (if you spend more money you ought to get a better programme — that has not been proven yet), should be compared. We should be able to compare, for instance, vocational programmes that differ by an order of magnitude of two, three or four in the amount of time that is devoted or the resources that are available for training (which seem to me to be falling). But it is clear that if you go and look at programmes where

the amount of time devoted, say, to group counselling is only five hours a week in a full-time residential programme, there can be great differences across programmes in the amount of effort that is devoted to any particular form of treatment. Management, staffing and planning comprise, we consider, the basic treatment modality. What are you going to do with the offenders, how are you going to work on them — that was the basic thing that was measured in the past. Never before was the emphasis on money, facilities, management and those kind of things, which can have a very serious effect on the quality of the programme. We are now in the midst of evaluating some programmes where we are getting to measure those things. We are having the opportunity of giving questionnaires to the staff to find out what their attitudes are, what their training is, what their attitudes towards the management are in order to try and compare across the programmes, the quality of these inputs as they go in.

So, those are the things that go in and now this is the checklist of processes that we believe offer some thought of trying to apply comparisons. You may go in and find that these are not all going on. For me, that would be a negative mark against any particular programme. Just to start with screening: how do they select who gets into the programme and who does not? I have never heard of a good programme that takes anybody. It is very difficult to design programming that way. Generally, you want to exclude certain categories of offenders. Next the diagnosis: to what degree do you sit down and figure out what this particular individual's problems are and how you are going to work on them and what you are going to do? Security: how do you keep the offenders safe from each other and from escaping the system? Discipline: one of the things not done typically in many programmes. Family counselling: what is done to deal with the family issues that are frequently dreadful? When you talk about chronic juvenile offenders, to what degree are they brought into the institutions to be involved in the programme? To what extent do you work with the family while the juvenile is in the programme?

We are developing ways to try and measure those things in a variety of programmes. From people that we have seen that seem to be running effective programmes, here are the things that they see going on, in roughly the kind of order they see them as going on in the individuals that they are trying to deal with. It begins with an attempt to establish some remorse in the individual: to take some accountability for his crime. The language we frequently hear amongst juveniles is, "The guy got shot". We are talking to the shooter and he has said that as if he didn't do the shooting. So they are trying to get the offender to understand what it would be like if his mother got knocked down and her purse got stolen or whatever the victim's situation might be. It is a long struggle, but most people believe that that is the first step in dealing with these offenders. Trying to develop some self-esteem, because many of them do not have much at all to work with, and self-discipline with experience and understanding.

Think about experience. What does that mean? It means a variety of experiences when we start talking about socialization; how to deal with other people; how to deal in a work-place; how to make choices. When I start describing differences amongst programmes, a typical training school provides a very limited background or format to experience the kinds of things, to have experience of making the kinds of choices, that somebody does out in real life. When I talk about some of the programmes that we think are doing interesting things, they are not going on in training schools because they provide a much too limited an opportunity to do the things that you need to do. Understanding, trust, bonding and, finally, planning what the individual is going to do when he gets out of the institution. So that is the model, the inputs, the processes that go on and, unfortunately, to test such a model as to whether or not it really works, we need hundreds of programmes to validate it, given all of those variables. The best that we have are two or three or four at the given moment, but at least we can use the model as a way to try and understand what might explain the differences we now see between programmes.

Those are wonderful ideas. Given the pessimistic background, is there any hope, is there any reason to believe, that the field is going to act on any of those ideas? I would say a resounding "Yes". I do not

know what the international scene on this is, or whether studies that we commissioned a few years ago suggested that the European experience was a parody of the U.S. experience. Frequently, the grist for the mill at conferences was to have a speaker from the U.S. come over and bemoan the U.S. experience and that was pretty much what European countries were doing. I do not think that that is the case now. If we can turn to look at some interesting experiences in a number of States. Massachusetts, of course, was the leader in de-institutionalizing juveniles back in the mid-1970's. They have now been through five commissioners in that State. They cannot imagine going back to any other way. I remind you that in Massachusetts about 85% of the juvenile correctional dollar is spent with private providers. There are 170 juveniles locked up in the State of Massachusetts which has but 170 secure beds. There are 1,000 in California where there is a very different approach to the problem. Yes, California is larger — five times larger, not 100 times larger. Utah and Colorado are both in the process of implementing the Massachusetts model. Utah has already gone that way. Colorado is well on the way to moving towards the removal of juveniles from training schools and to commitment to community programmes frequently operated by private vendors, which means, typically, small programmes of under 40 beds.

I have listed a number of the programmes that we have looked at, that I would gladly send anybody to and say, "*You will see a terrific programme. You will get good ideas. I am impressed by what is going on.*" Vision Quest is one we have finished evaluating. Unfortunately, we didn't have a random assignment design. We compared it against the probation camp in San Diego County. It is a time series design. They didn't operate at the same time. We found that Vision Quest reduced the recidivism rate for juveniles from 71% to 39%. Now, we looked at the same data that San Diego Probation looked at and they concluded that there was no effect. They failed to control on time at risk in the community and they failed to control on differences in the characteristics of offenders. So we have seen about 45% reduction. San Diego Probation did not like the Vision Quest programme because it cost \$29,000 compared to their \$22,000 per individual. They thought it was too expensive. I think that a 45% reduction in recidivist rate is one hell of a good deal in terms of what happens to the kids.

Paint Creek Youth Centre is a new experimental programme that we are evaluating in Ohio. It is a private programme. They took over an old sports camp that is about 60 miles outside Cincinnati. The juveniles are programmed there for about a year with guided group interaction and positive peer culture. You would happily have your children spend time at that camp or reside there overnight. It is the safest place I have ever seen. When the kids come out of there, they go to work in businesses that are run by the programme: a lumber mill, a pallet factory, a variety of wood products programmes. It is a very good programme that is really turning the State of Ohio around. The judges are very thrilled about it.

The last one I want to mention is a programme called Key Tracking. It is one of the ones in Massachusetts that Jerome Miller encouraged. It is a private programme. They also appear to have a very low recidivism rate. Key Tracking follows individuals in the community. There is often a debate about what intensive probation means. Usually, probation is three phone calls a week, while intensive probation may be three visits a week. Key Tracking sees the kids two or three times a day. It gets them up, gets them to school, gets them home from school, gets them to the doctor, puts them to bed and takes them out on the weekends. \$10 a day is what they get paid for key tracking. Very dynamic management runs the programme. The people who are the case workers are young, generally sociology or psychology graduates. It is 14 months and then up and out. There is no hanging around in the programme, so there is nobody who has been a case worker in that programme for longer than 14 months. When they come in they are told that they will work for 71 hours a week, and that is the kind of service that they give. They have all the jobs they can want when they leave the programme. I think part of that is the people who run that programme.

There are some other programmes that I do not have time to go into, but which I will be happy to talk about at a later stage.

There is one last thing I want to mention that gives me some optimism about what is going on in the system. Skillman is a Foundation back in the United States that has given us money to develop some experiments in the after-care area. We are going to be doing one with Vision Quest and one with some other Michigan programme, because that is where the Foundation is. But I think people are now prepared to spend money on after-care. To take juveniles who are now spending 12 to 14 months in an institution and say, instead of 12 months, let's keep him 10 months in the institution and 4 months of intensive programming back in the community, because, after 10 months of a juvenile's being in a programme, his family is the problem. 70%, 80% or 90% of the time. It is mum who is the problem. It may be mum, dad, the grandmother or whoever. It is some kind of situation at home that is the difficulty and keeping a juvenile in the programme for a longer time isn't going to help solve that. You have to get somebody who is the kind of communicator, the negotiator or advocate and maybe you have to separate the family after you have tried all those things. But it is the family for the chronic offenders, who have had serious kinds of family problems, that have to be dealt with. Traditionally, in our over-crowded training schools, nobody looks at the family. It is unlikely that the offender will make a home visit and unlikely that the parole officer will come to the institution to visit the offender before he goes home. It is unlikely because they are too busy. They are busy keeping the kids for two years in the juvenile institutions.

(Dr. Greenwood showed a number of slides which illustrated the differences between various States in the U.S. in terms of percentages of juvenile offenders in custody, money spent upon juvenile offenders, the number of juvenile offenders in private programmes, the ratio of staff to offenders, etc. and proceeded.)

I want to reinforce the basic argument. What are we talking about when we talk about why there is this interest in looking at corrections in this way? Effective treatment programmes are more cost-effective than simple incapacitation as a means of reducing crime. By the way, they are also much more humane. One of the problems is that while a lot of the correctional reform has taken place on the basis of what is more humane, there is a good proportion of the public which says that it is not our duty to be humane to these folks because they are offenders. The point is that it produces less crime to be more humane.

The basic problem is that the treatment programmes are difficult to run. They are not impossible, because there are some, but it is not easy. It is not as easy as running a gaol. To be effective in running a gaol, you just lock up to produce incapacitation, you do a head-count two or three times a day, you try and keep people from hanging themselves and you have done it. To treat offenders in the community, with all the deficits I have talked about, is a very very tricky, difficult situation — what with staff burnout and kids who are trying to screw up in every way possible. But it can be done and we have got evidence now of programmes that have survived for ten to fifteen years and are still very popular in the areas where they are.

So what needs to be done in this area of juvenile corrections? And I think the same thing applies when you get to adults, but I see a requirement of more money when I talk about what the adult situation is. There needs to be more evaluation of exemplary programmes. The problem is that many of the programmes that were evaluated in the past were only evaluated because they got Federal Government money, which does not have anything to do with whether or not they were good programmes. Frequently, the whole idea was to get the Federal money and not to run good programmes! Once we have done evaluations, we have got to identify and support the effective programmes. Right now, there are very few incentives to run an effective programme. There is lots of political heat, but very little political incentive because nobody is measuring; nobody is keeping book. There have to be reasonable licensing requirements and reimbursement rates. One of the problems that we are running up against in the United States is that a juvenile programme is expected to look like a group home or a training school. If you show me kids in a tepee, kids living out in the wilderness, which is a lot cheaper and which seems to be a lot more effective, you will find that it doesn't meet

the State's standards. Where are the fire escapes? Where is your basic schoolroom four inches above the ground and all those things that are customarily required? Los Angeles County by itself is 1,000 group home beds short and that is by their own probation officer's admission. Why? Because they have not raised the rate of pay for group homes in about ten years and now nobody wants to go into that business, given all the liability and the licensing requirements and what have you that are involved. But there has got to be some networking among interested parties who think there have to be short term internships for senior staff. People just have to get around. At present, it is amazing how insular some programmes are. We see one in Ohio, we see one in Michigan, we see one in Kentucky, but they don't know about each other. There is not a network. There is not the money to travel around. They are staying at home doing the best job they can. It is very difficult for these folks to communicate amongst themselves. Finally, there has to be education and training which focuses on effective programmes. Not the kind of public administration baloney that for some years has gone into trying to deal with the basic custodial problems, which may be a good thing, but which does not solve the greatest issue: how do you reduce crime?

I just want to touch on what is going on in the adult system. It is very funny, but it is the same basic issue that arises. Prisons are seen not to be doing such a good job. They are overcrowded and expensive, so what are we to do? There is no talk about rehabilitation. All the words have to do with sanctions and with punishment. These are the buzz words that you will hear if you go and visit the United States. Intensive probation is much discussed. The State of Georgia is one of the most heavy users of incarceration and, I guess, they have used up so much space now that they just have to do something else. They have turned to intensive probation, which means many more frequent visits and stringent conditions about when the individual can leave his home. Many of these programmes require the individual to pay for the right to be on intensive probation, so basically they pay for the costs. All these can be used together. House arrest, of course, requires

the individual to stay in his house, except when he goes out to work; so he can still continue to support his family. We are beginning to see very frequent use of electronic surveillance to ensure either intensive probation or house arrest. Under intensive probation, it may be said that you can't go to a bar or to a particular neighbourhood and a beeper on your wrist will indicate whether or not you conform to that. House arrest says that you can't leave the house and the electronic bracelet that you wear will show if you get more than 200 feet from the phone, or whatever the particular distance it is set at. Gerry Miller's organisation, the National Centre for Institutions and Alternatives carries on business by coming into court and offering presentence reports. The way you do that, when you are dealing with an offender who the judge wants to send to prison, is to say, "This guy is going to do 2,000 hours of community service, one year of house arrest and will wear the electronic bracelet and so on." So one has a punitive restrictive sanction that begins to be comparable to lock up in prison at a quarter to a third of the cost and that is where we are going. Shock parole or probation is the name that is given to a system of locking up offenders for just two weeks or a month and then releasing them into the community. They get a taste of prison, but they don't get involved.

At least 50 programmes now are going on in the States, started over the past year with Federal intervention. One of my colleagues is involved in evaluating those. A report should be published shortly.

In closing, I would like to thank you all for being an attentive audience. I would certainly like to thank the Australian Crime Prevention Council and the other host agencies for putting on this conference. It is certainly a delight to be here. I look forward to the rest of what promises to be a very interesting conference and participating in that. If you want to write to me, the address is:—

**Dr. Peter W. Greenwood,**  
**The Rand Corporation,**  
**1700 Main Street,**  
**SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA 90406.**

*Proud to be Associated with the Australian Crime  
 Prevention Council . . .*

## BRIGHTON CITY COUNCIL

IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF CRIME  
 PREVENTION

## The **BOOKSHELF** PTY. LTD.

Professional Book Supplies

LAW	BUSINESS
TAX	COMPUTER
ACCOUNTING	COMMERCIAL

170 PULTENEY STREET, ADELAIDE  
**TELEPHONE 223 3899**

SA Agents for Law Books Co

ADELAIDE'S LEADING LAW BOOK SHOP

## QUALITY SECURITY EQUIPMENT



*Manufacturers and Suppliers of*

- DIGITALARM CONTROLS
- RADIO CONTDROL EQUIPMENT
- INDUSTRIAL ELECTRONICS

## ELECTRONICS DESIGN AND MANUFACTURING

3-18 STODDART ROAD, PROSPECT, NSW 2149  
 Phone: (02) 631 0555 AGENTS IN ALL STATES

## ALCAN ALUMINIUM CENTRES

A Division of Alcan Limited

### EVERYTHING IN ALUMINIUM FOR HANDYMEN — BUILDERS AND INDUSTRY

- Rolled Products • Extruded Sections • Garden Furniture
- Alum Cast Lace • Caravan Sheet • Suppliers of
- Amplimesh and Security Sections to the Handyman and Security Industries • Bullit Resistant Plate

*For Technical Information Contact*



40 COMPTON RD WOODRIDGE — (07) 209 1222  
 CNR HOLT ST & CURTIN AVE, EAGLE FARM — (07) 260 1011