



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

_____ **Research Report** _____

**Use of Programs and Interventions
with Canada's Federally Sentenced
Radicalized Offenders**

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.

**Use of Programs and Interventions with Canada's Federally
Sentenced Radicalized Offenders**

Steve Michel

&

Yvonne Stys

Correctional Service of Canada

March 2014

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank partners at the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP), Public Safety Canada, Canadian Security Intelligence Service (CSIS), and the Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) for their input and expertise in relation to this report. The authors would also acknowledge the support received by staff in CSC's Correctional Operations and Programs Sector, specifically the Preventive Security Intelligence (PSI) Division, and the Policy Sector's Research Branch, specifically Stephanie Clarke, Collette Cousineau, Trina Forrester, Justin Gileno, Renée Gobeil, Andrew Harris, Leslie Helmus, Sara Johnson, Andrea Moser, and Kelly Taylor. Special thanks are extended to DRDC for providing the funds which made this research possible, and specifically to Sean Norton, DRDC, for his continued subject matter expertise and guidance.

Executive Summary

Key words: *terrorism, radicalized offender, counter-terrorism, risk-factors, rehabilitation*

Since 1989, CSC has applied the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) principle (Andrews, Bonta & Hoge, 1990) in order to identify and address the risks and criminogenic needs of the federally sentenced offender population. The effectiveness of this approach has been empirically assessed and validated on offender populations in general, however, there has been no examination to date of the extent to which the correctional management approach employed with radicalized offenders adheres to the RNR principle. This paper identifies the interventions in which radicalized offenders participated in relation to their identified criminogenic and violent extremist needs.

The sample consisted of those radicalized offenders who were released from a federal institution in 1997 or later, or were still incarcerated as of December 1, 2013 (66.7% of all identified radicalized offenders). Using information from the Offender Management System (OMS) as well as data coded from various sources, the interventions in which the sample of radicalized offenders participated were identified and summarized. Next, congruence between these interventions and the offenders' identified needs (criminogenic needs as identified by the DFIA, DFIA-R, and file coding for other violent extremist needs) was assessed.

The three most commonly attended interventions were identified as institutional employment, education, and psychological services. When examining core correctional programming specifically, radicalized offenders were most likely to participate in living skills, violent offender, personal development, and substance abuse programming, however this involvement was much less frequently identified than participation in other institutional interventions such as social programs or chaplaincy.

Those with an identified need in the education and employment domain were the most likely to also participate in at least one intervention that addressed the education and employment domain. The next most common need domain addressed was community functioning (for those assessed by the DFIA) and personal/emotional needs (for those assessed by both the DFIA and DFIA-R). Least likely to be addressed were needs related to the marital/family domain; however this was a need area that was not frequently identified as problematic for radicalized offenders.

By examining the institutional and community-based interventions which CSC has utilized with radicalized offenders and the congruence of these interventions with identified needs, CSC achieves a more comprehensive understanding of how past and current intervention options address the needs of radicalized offenders. This knowledge can be used to inform any future intervention referrals for radicalized offenders, identify limitations in current intervention options, and highlight opportunities for new interventions for this group.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary.....	iii
List of Tables.....	v
List of Appendices.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Method.....	4
Participants.....	4
Procedure.....	4
Measures.....	5
Needs.....	5
Type of Motivation.....	5
Interventions/Activities.....	5
Results.....	8
Participation in institutional and community-based interventions.....	8
Congruence between offender needs and participation in interventions.....	11
Discussion.....	14
Conclusions.....	17
References.....	19

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Radicalized Offender Participation In/Completion of Interventions</i>	9
Table 2 <i>Participation in Interventions by Source of Motivation</i>	11
Table 3 <i>Comparison of Criminogenic or Other Violent Extremist Needs vs. Interventions Received</i>	13

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Coding Manual.....	23
Appendix B: Mapping Needs Addressed to Program Type.....	26

Introduction

Offenders under the supervision of the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) are entitled to receive programs and services that will assist in reducing the risk of recidivism and aid in their successful transition to the community (CSC, 2009a). Since 1989, CSC has applied the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) principle in order to identify and address the risks and criminogenic needs of the federally sentenced offender population (Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990; Motiuk & Porporino, 1989). The effectiveness of this approach has been empirically assessed and validated on offender populations, and some sub-populations in particular (see Bonta & Andrews, 2010; Gendreau, 1996; Jolley & Kerbs, 2010; Ogloff & Davis, 2004; and Polaschek, 2012). To date, however, there has been no examination of the extent to which the correctional management approach employed with radicalized offenders adheres to the RNR principle. This paper examines the institutional and community-based interventions utilized with radicalized offenders and compares them to their assessed needs, in an effort to gauge the extent of adherence to the RNR principle for this group.

The RNR principle, generally, posits that criminal behaviour can be predicted and often prevented through the accurate assessment and effective treatment of criminogenic risk and needs (Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990). In the correctional context, this amounts to the accurate assessment of criminal risk and need upon admission to an institution, and the delivery of treatment in a way that is consistent with the needs, abilities, and learning style of the offender. Many studies have illustrated the positive treatment effects associated with conforming to the RNR principle (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, & Cullen, 1990; Lipsey, 1989), as well as highlighting the negative effects of straying from the principle and administering treatment that was either unnecessary or insufficient (Bonta, Wallace-Capretta, & Rooney, 2000; Lowenkamp & Latessa, 2005; Lowenkamp, Pealer, Smith, & Latessa, 2006; Lowenkamp, Smith, & Bechtel, 2007).

While substantiation of the RNR principle has occurred with several sub-populations of offenders, including sex offenders and those with substance-abuse needs, no such examination has occurred for radicalized offenders. Radicalized offenders, defined as “an ideologically motivated offender, who commits, aspires or conspires to commit, or promotes violent acts in

order to achieve ideological objectives” (Correctional Service Canada, 2012b)¹, have been found to be different from the general offender population in several ways. In a comparison of radicalized and non-radicalized federal offenders in Canada, radicalized offenders were less likely than non-radicalized offenders to have witnessed family violence during childhood, to have been abused during childhood, or to have negative relations with a parental figure during childhood. Radicalized offenders were also found to be much more likely to be employed at the time of arrest and to have completed grade 10. With respect to attitudes, more radicalized offenders held negative attitudes towards the criminal justice system and held attitudes that were intolerant of other religions, while with respect to associates, radicalized offenders were more likely to be assessed as having many criminal acquaintances. Finally, radicalized offenders were generally less likely to have substance abuse items indicated than non-radicalized offenders (Stys, Gobeil, Harris, & Michel; in press).

Offender risk level, needs, and reintegration potential are assessed initially by CSC as part of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process (Motiuk 1997, 1998). Offenders are rated as either high, medium, or low risk, and are rated on the extent of their need in seven domain areas: employment/education, marital/family, associates, substance abuse, community functioning, personal/emotional, and attitudes. With the OIA as the basis for assessment, CSC then aims to tailor its correctional plans according to the risk principle, that is, to match the required degree of correctional treatment to the needs of the offender (Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990; CSC, 2012a). While these need domains are evidence-based risk factors related to criminal behaviour, the individuals who engage in violent extremism may have different needs (Silke, 2008) that may not be systematically and empirically measured through the OIA, but which may nevertheless benefit from targeted programming.

Currently, CSC does not offer any specific or unique programming for radicalized offenders, opting instead to address their criminogenic needs with the current roster of correctional programming and interventions. CSC has four main programming areas: correctional programs, educational programs, social programs and vocational programs. Correctional programs focus on risk factors that contribute to criminal behaviour and aim to reduce reoffending by helping offenders make positive changes. Educational programs provide

¹ See Stys, Gobeil, Harris, & Michel (in press) for a summary of definitional challenges related to violent extremism and radicalization.

offenders with the basic literacy, academic and personal development skills that are needed to succeed in the community. Social programs promote positive social, personal and recreational activities, and vocational programs provide offenders with relevant job training to increase employment opportunities (CSC, 2009a).

Other jurisdictions, however, have implemented specific programming for their violent extremist offenders. In a recent review of prison and community-based disengagement and de-radicalization programs, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Malaysia, Jordan, the United States, Egypt, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Qatar, Netherlands, and the UK (among others) were noted as having begun to consider prison programs to address and remediate the spread of militant jihadist activities within prisons (Speckhard, 2011). Programs often included elements of re-education regarding a particular ideology by trusted clerics, attempts to rectify or eliminate non-ideological motivations for participation in the violent extremist group (i.e., providing opportunities for financial independence and marriage), and close monitoring of the offender after release. In his review of radicalization and de-radicalization in the prisons of 15 nations, Neumann (2010) summarizes that the programs implemented in several countries' correctional systems can be effective in disengaging radicalized offenders and preventing the radicalization of other offenders, but notes that the focus on security in prison environments often overshadows the potential for positive influence and reform.

Before considering the adaptation or integration of one or more internationally piloted violent extremist interventions and programs in the Canadian correctional context, it is important, as a first step, to examine the institutional and community-based interventions which CSC has traditionally utilized with radicalized offenders. By identifying the interventions used with radicalized offenders and the congruence of these interventions with identified needs, CSC can gain a more comprehensive understanding of how the current intervention options address the needs of radicalized offenders. This knowledge can then inform any future intervention referrals for radicalized offenders, identify limitations in current intervention options, and highlight opportunities for new interventions for this group. To this end, this report aims to answer the following research questions:

1. Which institutional and community-based interventions did radicalized offenders participate in and/or complete?
2. Are these interventions congruent with the needs identified for radicalized offenders?

Method

Participants

The initial sample included all past and present federally incarcerated offenders who were identified as meeting the CSC definition of “radicalized offender” (CSC, 2012b). Updating and replicating an approach utilized for a previous study of this group², this study combined several sources of offender information (the Offender Management System, or OMS; security intelligence information; and public domain information) to identify offenders who would qualify as meeting the radicalized offender definition. Any federal offender for which an electronic record existed on or before December 1, 2013 was considered for inclusion in the study³. A sub-sample of this group was selected, for reasons discussed below, resulting in 66.7% of the radicalized offender group being included in the present study. To be considered for inclusion in this study, the offender had to have a release date after January 1, 1997, or be incarcerated as of December 1, 2013.

Procedure

A comprehensive list of variables related to violent extremism, including motivation and need, was developed and integrated into a coding manual (see Appendix A). Based upon an extensive review of the literature, the coding manual was distributed to partner portfolio agencies with expertise in violent extremism for their review and feedback to ensure that the identified classifications were comprehensive, relevant, and accurate. Detailed information for each of the identified radicalized offenders was then gathered from a variety of sources, including electronic OMS reports, hard-copy federal offender files, Canadian Police Information Centre (CPIC) records, and open source information. An intensive file review of each radicalized offender file was conducted in order to code for all variables of interest which could not be pulled directly from the OMS database. As information surrounding institutional and community-based interventions are routinely collected as part of the intake assessment process at CSC, these data, along with a number of other relevant variables, were extracted from the OMS and combined with the coding manual data to form a comprehensive database on radicalized offender motivations, needs, and interventions.

² See Stys, Gobeil, Harris, & Michel (in press) for a detailed summary of how this sample was derived.

³ For security reasons, the exact number of offenders identified as being radicalized could not be included in this report. It is possible to report that this number is less than 100.

Measures

Needs

Criminogenic needs for the sample of offenders were obtained from the OMS database. These needs are assessed for each offender at intake to the federal correctional system through the Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis (DFIA) or Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis – Revised (DFIA-R; Brown & Motiuk, 2005; CSC, 2012a). These tools identify and prioritize criminogenic needs according to seven dynamic risk areas: employment and education, marital/family, associates, substance abuse, community functioning, personal/emotional and attitudes, and allow for targeted intervention on factors that reduce the likelihood of re-offending. Criminogenic needs for this sample were derived either from the original DFIA (1994 to mid-2009) or the DFIA-R (mid-2009 to present), depending on date of admission.

Based on a review of the literature and consultation with subject-matter experts, a list of other, violent-extremist specific needs was created. The primary sources used to identify possible needs came from existing risk assessment instruments including the Extremism Risk Guidelines (ERG 22+; Home Office, 2012), the Multi-Level Guidelines (MLG; Cook, Hart, & Kropp, 2013), and the Violent Extremist Risk Assessment (VERA; Pressman, 2009; Pressman & Flockton, 2012). For ease of interpretation, these additional needs were then classified under the criminogenic need categorizations outlined above, as appropriate⁴.

Type of Motivation

Type of motivation was determined from a review of file materials. Possible motivations were derived from multiple sources, including a review of the violent extremist literature (Helmus, 2009), a rapid evidence assessment of prison de-radicalization and disengagement programs (Munton et al., 2011) and motivations identified in other prison systems (Lloyd, 2012). These possible motivations were confirmed via consultation with Canadian experts in the area of violent extremism. Based on the motivations identified for each offender, each offender was categorized as ideologically motivated, non-ideologically motivated, or as having both types of motivations. For more information, see report by Stys and Michel (in press).

Interventions/Activities

Institutional and community-based interventions and activities were defined as any

⁴ The determination, classification, and examination of needs and motivations of radicalized offenders were examined for a complementary report. See Stys & Michel (in press), for additional detail.

activity, in which an offender could participate or partake, that could address an offender need. These were examined under the following categorizations: Nationally Recognized Correctional Programs (NRCPs), education, employment, and other⁵. Data on the first three types of interventions were available for the radicalized offender group as of January 1, 1997, thus only those who were released on or after this date (or incarcerated on December 1, 2013) were included in the sample for this study. Initial independent examinations of the proportion of offenders who participated in interventions in the institution and in the community yielded community intervention values that were too small to be meaningful, thus the two intervention locations were combined.

NRCPs are comprised of a variety of programs including those for general crime prevention, violence prevention, family violence prevention, substance abuse, sex offenders, community maintenance, social development, and women offenders. It also includes the integrated correctional program model (ICPM), which offers a holistic approach to interventions by targeting multiple criminogenic needs. First piloted in the Pacific and Atlantic regions, ICPM was approved to be offered nationally in June of 2013. Also included in this report as a NRCP, but not currently listed in the National Programs Descriptions (see CSC, 2009a for more information), are programs to enhance living skills and personal development.

Educational interventions include programs such as Adult Basic Education, General Educational Development Program, and English as a Second Language. Offenders who have less than a grade 12 education level (or equivalent) are encouraged to participate in an educational program.

Employment interventions include employment within the institution, or community. If deemed appropriate, offenders can participate in employment within the institution (e.g., cleaning, cooking, working in snack shop, etc.) or CORCAN employment (e.g., manufacturing, textiles, construction, services) to provide them with the skills needed to safely reintegrate into the community.

Activities and interventions included within the ‘other’ category include information on psychology, chaplaincy, and other social or extra-curricular activities. As information on these types of interventions are not systematically recorded within OMS, offender files were reviewed

⁵ Programs have changed over time. While some programs related to education and employment have been considered to be Nationally Recognized Correctional Programs, all education and employment programs were considered in a separate category for the purposes of the report.

to identify which offenders had participated in these three activities. Through reviewing psychology and case management files, those who had information on at least one session with a psychologist were considered to have participated in a psychological intervention. Those who had information that suggested they attended a religious event were considered to have participated in chaplaincy⁶. Finally, those who had information that suggested they had participated in hobby craft, family gathering events, social time with volunteers, or recreational activities, were considered to have participated in a social or extracurricular activities.

Data on NRCPs are considered to be reliable, however the reliability of data on enrollments and completions for other types of interventions and activities that are not nationally recognized are considered to be less reliable. This may result in an underestimate of some of the interventions and activities reported in the dataset (e.g., education, employment). In addition, data on completions are less reliable for some interventions and activities such as employment since employment is often ongoing and does not always have a defined completion date. Similarly, information on education completions are also less reliable.

Offenders were considered to have enrolled and participated in an intervention or activity if they had attended at least one session. Those offenders who had participated in an intervention or activity were considered to have completed this intervention/activity if their status in OMS was either 'successful complete', 'attended all sessions', and 'unsuccessful completion'. To map the needs addressed to the interventions received, information from OMS and from the Correctional Operations and Programs sector were used.

⁶ As there are no specific files that consistently contain information on participation in chaplaincy or other social or extracurricular programs, data on these variables are also less reliable.

Results

Intervention information from OMS regarding NRCPs, Education, and Employment was available for the entire radicalized offender sample. Information on those interventions and activities that needed to be captured through file coding (chaplaincy, psychology, social and extra-curricular activities) was available for 93.8%, 87.5%, and 93.8% of the sample respectively.

It is important to highlight that the average amount of time spent incarcerated to the date of data extraction (or first release, whichever came first) was 2,271 days (or approximately 6.2 years) and ranged from 122 to 8,521 days. In the sample, the earliest year that an offender was admitted was 1986 and the most recent admission occurred in 2012. Of those that have been released (66.6%; on day parole, full parole, statutory release, or warrant expiry), the year that the first offender in the sample was released was 1998, and the most recent release occurred in 2013.

Participation in institutional and community-based interventions

Table 1 details the interventions in which the sample of radicalized offenders (released after January 1, 1997 or still incarcerated as of December 1, 2013) participated, and subsequently completed, while in federal custody. Of those radicalized offenders, 97.9% had participated in some sort of intervention or activity during their supervision in a federal institution or in the community, with the most common interventions including employment in the institution (87.5%), psychological services⁷ (83.3%), and education (72.9%). Among those who had participated in at least one NRCP (47.9%), offenders participated in a mean of 3.17 NRCPs and a median of 2.0 NRCPs. It should be noted that this may include offenders who had participated more than once in each type of program. In addition, of those who participated in at least one NRCP, 43.5% participated in one type of NRCP, 26.1% participated in two types of NRCPs, 13.0% participated in three types of NRCPs, 13.0% participated in four types of NRCPs, and 4.3% participated in five types of NRCPs⁸.

Of those programs that at least 10% of the sample participated in, the most frequently completed programs (among those who had participated) included violent offender (100.0%),

⁷ Offenders who had one or more sessions with a psychologist were considered to have received psychological services.

⁸ Types of NRCPs refers to the list of nine categories under NRCP in Table 1.

substance abuse (83.3%), ICPM (75.0%) programs, and living skills (69.2%). As expected, while over a quarter of the offenders for which there was information participated in violent offender programs, very few participated in family violence programs, suggesting that their violence is not being directed towards family members.

Table 1

Radicalized Offender Participation In/Completion of Interventions

Intervention	Participated (%)	Completed interventions Of those who participated (%) ^a
NRCP		
Living Skills / Social Programs	27.1	69.2
Violent Offenders	22.9	100.0
ICPM	16.7	75.0
Substance Abuse	12.5	83.3
Community	8.3	75.0
Personal Development	6.3	66.7
Family Violence	4.2	50.0
Sex Offender	2.1	100.0
Education	72.9	N/A
Employment		
Institutional Employment	87.5	N/A
CORCAN	50.0	N/A
Community Employment	6.3	N/A
Vocational Training	27.1	53.8
Other Intervention/Activities		
Psychology	83.3	N/A
Social Activities	64.4	N/A
Chaplaincy	44.4	N/A

Note. Intervention participation proportions will not sum to 100% as offenders could participate in more than one intervention. The proportion of completed interventions is reflective of only those offenders who participated in the intervention, and not of the entire sample. An N/A is indicative of an intervention which cannot, by its nature, be “completed”.

^aThis represents the proportion of those offenders who participated and subsequently completed the program.

Table 2 provides a breakdown of participation in interventions by the type of motivation the offender had for their offence(s). As mentioned previously, almost everyone in the sample participated in at least one intervention, with 92.3% of those with ideological motivations participating, and everyone with either non-ideological or both type of motivations participating. Similarly, a large proportion of offenders with only non-ideological motivations participated in at least one NRCP (91.7%) compared to those with only ideological motivations (23.1%) and both types of motivations (40.9%).

Some considerable differences in participation were found for the programs on substance abuse, violent offenders, and living skills. Employment in CORCAN and employment in the community was more common among ideologically motivated offenders, and slightly more ideologically motivated offenders participated in chaplaincy activities. Interestingly all of the non-ideologically motivated offenders received some psychological services while two-thirds of ideologically motivated offenders received psychological services. Anecdotally, a number of ideologically motivated offenders refused to engage with the psychology team despite a request from the case management team.

Table 2

Participation in Interventions by Source of Motivation

Intervention	Motivation Type (%)		
	Ideological	Non-ideological	Both
NRCP			
Living Skills / Social Programs	23.1	50.0	18.2
Violent Offenders	15.4	41.7	18.2
Substance Abuse	7.7	33.3	4.5
ICPM	15.4	25.0	13.6
Community	7.7	25.0	0.0
Personal Development	7.7	0.0	9.1
Sex Offender	0.0	8.3	0.0
Family Violence	0.0	8.3	4.5
Education	61.5	100.0	68.2
Employment			
Institutional Employment	84.6	83.3	90.9
CORCAN	61.5	41.7	50.0
Community Employment	23.1	0.0	0.0
Vocational Training	46.2	25.0	13.6
Other Intervention/Activities			
Psychology	63.6	100.0	84.2
Social Programs	61.5	66.7	65.0
Chaplaincy	50.0	33.3	47.6

Congruence between offender needs and participation in interventions

Congruence between needs identified via a DFIA or DFIA-R assessment and interventions received was determined by mapping interventions, as determined by OMS data and offender file review, to various information sources identifying the needs which are addressed by each correctional program or intervention⁹. See Appendix B for an overview of

⁹ Of the sample of radicalized offenders in this study, 95.8% had criminogenic needs as assessed by the DFIA or DFIA-R.

which needs were addressed by interventions in this sample. Table 3 outlines the findings of Stys and Michel (in press) regarding the criminogenic and other violent extremist needs identified for the sample of radicalized offenders, and identifies the proportion of those with an identified need in a domain who received interventions to address that need. Stys and Michel (in press) found that radicalized offenders most commonly were assessed using the DFIA and DFIA-R as having needs in the attitudes, associates, and personal/emotional domains, and rarely had needs in the domains of substance abuse, marital/family, and community functioning. Results of this study indicate that of those with some or considerable need in personal/emotional domains as rated by the DFIA, 88.9% received an intervention to address this need. Over half (60.0%) of those with a DFIA identified need in associates received an intervention to address their need, and over three quarters (86.2%) of those with a DFIA identified attitudes need received an intervention for that need. Needs assessed by the DFIA-R were less congruent with interventions received, with between 0% and 50.0% of those with the highest rated need domains (attitudes, associates, and personal/emotional) receiving interventions that addressed their needs. Those with employment and education needs were most likely to receive an intervention addressing that need, regardless of the tool used to assess need.

These findings need to be contextualized in relation to the differential in the period of time that offenders assessed by the DFIA-R (versus the DFIA) would have available to have needs addressed given that the DFIA-R has only been in existence since mid-2009. It is also important to note that the current program referral criteria for NRCPs also take into account risk level, meaning that offenders who had an identified need, but not the appropriate level of risk for the program, may not have met the referral criteria.

With respect to violent extremist needs, similar to the DFIA and DFIA-R, the information available suggests that those few offenders identified as having a marital/family violent extremist need did not receive an intervention to address that need. Otherwise, the majority (with the exception of the associates domain) of those offenders with violent extremist needs received at least one intervention to address the corresponding need.

Table 3

Comparison of Criminogenic or Other Violent Extremist Needs vs. Interventions Received

Need Type	Identified Need (%)	Received Intervention (%)
Criminogenic Needs: DFIA		
Associates	75.8	60.0
Attitudes	87.9	86.2
Community Functioning	27.3	88.9
Employment/Education	57.6	100.0
Marital/Family	39.4	23.1
Personal/Emotional	81.8	88.9
Substance Abuse	36.4	58.3
Criminogenic Needs: DFIA-R		
Associates	92.3	0.0
Attitudes	92.3	33.3
Community Functioning	7.7	0.0
Employment/Education	53.8	100.0
Marital/Family	7.7	0.0
Personal/Emotional	76.9	50.0
Substance Abuse	15.4	50.0
Other Violent Extremist Needs		
Associates	91.5	39.5
Attitudes	95.7	71.1
Employment/Education	89.4	100.0
Marital/Family	36.2	11.8
Personal/Emotional	93.6	77.3

Note. Total proportion will be greater than 100% as offenders could have multiple criminogenic needs. For DFIA, those with some or considerable need were considered to have an identified need. For DFIA-R, those with moderate or high need were considered to have an identified need. For other violent extremist needs, any domain that had at least one item scored as being present was considered to have a need in that domain.

Discussion

This report highlights the various interventions received by those offenders who are identified as radicalized and under the custody or community supervision of CSC. While not offering a formal de-radicalization program for these offenders and opting instead to address their needs with the current cadre of correctional programs, the programs and interventions that CSC provides do appear to be broadly consistent with interventions offered in other countries for radicalized offenders. A review of de-radicalization and disengagement programs for Islamist extremists that is offered in a number of countries identified three components de-radicalization programs should address: affective, pragmatic, and ideological. The affective component of a program targets the emotional attachment that the offender has to the radical group (and individuals within it). Singapore, deemed to offer one of the most comprehensive de-radicalization programs (Rabasa, Pettyjohn, Ghez, & Boucek, 2010), provides psychological counseling for offenders and their families to address this component. In the present study, psychological services were found to be one of the most common interventions received by the radicalized offenders. Targeting the criminogenic needs of associates and attitudes (identified as most common among radicalized offenders in a previous study; Stys & Michel, in press) with various interventions offered by CSC may also address this affective component.

Programs addressing pragmatic issues focus on barriers that may prevent the offender from successfully reintegrating into society, such as employment opportunities. A review of programs offered in 15 countries identified education and vocational training as a common element included in this component (Neumann, 2010). The most common programs received by the radicalized offender sample in this study were predominately targeting these reintegration issues, with institutional employment, education, and vocational training, which all prepare the offender to enter the workforce once released, found to be common. The results suggest that CSC places a strong emphasis on addressing the pragmatic issues a radicalized offender may face once released, as almost all offenders in the sample who had an identified need in the education/employment domain received at least one intervention to address that need.

The final component Rabasa and colleagues (2010) identify as central to a successful program for radicalized offenders is addressing the offender's ideological motivations. This is the most common component addressed by most Islamist extremist de-radicalization programs

offered (Morris, Eberhard, Rivera, & Watsula, 2010; Speckhard, 2011), although does not appear to be as central to de-radicalization or disengagement programs for other types of violent extremists (see Bjørge & Horgan, 2009). To encourage offenders to disengage from violent extremism, the National Offender Management Service in England and Wales focuses on the attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions that drive the motivation (Lloyd & Dean, 2012). Similarly, CSC offers programs to target the beliefs and attitudes of the offender. Attitudes were found to be among the most common needs identified by the DFIA, DFIA-R, and other possible violent extremist needs identified through file review. Promisingly, a large proportion of those who had an identified attitudes need also received programming to address it. Almost half of the sample was identified as receiving some form of religious service at least once, although due to the lack of reporting of chaplaincy interactions in the offender files, it is not clear whether these services were specifically addressing the offenders' radical ideology. Further, psychological services may also address the attitudes and beliefs that drive the motivation to engage in violent extremism. Though the attitude need domain was found to be frequently addressed by the interventions that radicalized offenders participated in, it is unclear the degree to which these interventions would address attitudes that are linked to violent extremist offending. For example, CSC programs typically focus on addressing pro-criminal attitudes, which, based upon the findings of Stys and colleagues (in press) are frequently problematic for radicalized offenders; however, there may be other violent extremist attitudes (e.g., negative attitudes towards out-group, perception that conventional activity does not work) that may not be addressed by existing CSC correctional programs or interventions. Though it is unclear with the current analysis, psychological services may have addressed these other violent extremist attitude needs.

The results of this study are interesting, from an operational perspective. Radicalized offenders were found to actively participate in correctional interventions, but less so in structured correctional programs and more in institutional employment, education, psychological services, and social programs. This is expected however as any offender who has below a grade 12 education level is encouraged to participate in education programs. In addition, since organized correctional programs as they exist today were not offered until the late 1990s, it is expected that many of the radicalized offenders incarcerated prior to 2000 would have received interventions focused on employment, education, and vocational programs. Interestingly, the rate of program

completion among radicalized offenders was similar to what has been typically found in the offender population in general. Data from Performance Direct (CSC, 2014) indicates program completion for NRCs ranged from 76.4% during fiscal year 2008/09 to 82.8% during fiscal year 2013/14 (up to January 2014). Radicalized offenders consistently completed their programming at similar rates to these indicating that radicalized offenders are just as likely to complete correctional programming as their non-radicalized counterparts.

Not surprisingly, a large proportion of those offenders for whom only non-ideological motivations were identified had participated in interventions compared to those with only ideological motivations. One explanation for this is that those with non-ideological motivations are more likely to have higher levels of criminogenic needs. Previous research (see Stys & Michel, in press) suggests that this may be the case, as those with only non-ideological motivations were found to be more likely (proportionally) to be classified as having some or considerable need on all of the DFIA domains.

In many ways, the RNR principle of addressing criminogenic need was found to be utilized with the sample of radicalized offenders. Those with employment and education needs as assessed by the DFIA and DFIA-R participated in relevant and congruent interventions. Interestingly, offenders who were assessed by the DFIA more frequently received interventions that addressed their needs than did those offenders who were assessed by the DFIA-R. This may be a function of sample size, as only a quarter of the sample were assessed with the revised version of this assessment, or it may be a function of the types of radicalized offenders which have been admitted to federal institutions since 2009. In addition, given the recent date in which the DFIA-R came into effect, those offenders assessed by the DFIA-R may have had less time to be afforded the opportunity to participate in interventions. Further investigation into this result is merited, as all future radicalized offenders will be assessed with the DFIA-R upon admission to the federal correctional system.

While it appears that many of the other violent extremist need areas were addressed by correctional programming, the lack of empirical assessment of these items at intake leaves these results hypothetical at best. Identifying if these violent extremist needs are actually being measured by items in the DFIA-R and if the current cadre of programs can actually address these unique needs remain areas to be investigated in future research.

Any lack of congruence between radicalized offender needs and program participation is

not necessarily indicative of an intentional deviation from the RNR principle, and is, in fact, reflective of the pattern of adherence for the general offender population (CSC, 2009b). Several operational reasons exist for why an offender may not participate in a program, including the absence of a particular program in an offender's institution, the unavailability of a space for an offender within an available program (i.e., there is a waiting list for the program), or the inability to attend a program due to current accommodations (i.e., the offender is in administrative or voluntary segregation). Depending on the length of a program and the frequency with which it is offered, offenders with shorter sentences or those that have been transferred may not have the opportunity to participate in certain programs, especially those that are longer in duration. In addition, the current program referral criteria for all NRCPs (e.g., Family Violence Prevention Program, National Substance Abuse Program, ICPM, Women's Violence Prevention Program), also takes into account risk level. Some offenders who do have a need but not the appropriate risk level for the program may not meet the referral criteria. Offenders could also have been referred to a program and refused to participate (CSC, 2009b).

Especially relevant for radicalized offenders is the suitability of attending programming in a group setting and the ability of a particular program to meet their unique needs. The latter rationale was cited several times in offender records, where an initial referral to a program was made based on overall assessed need in a particular domain, but upon further investigation of these needs, the program was deemed to be inappropriate or unsuitable for the specific needs of the radicalized offender. This finding suggests that while currently available programs may be able to address the global needs of radicalized offenders to some degree, further consideration should be given either to the adaptation of current program offerings to the unique needs of radicalized offenders, or to the development and/or adaptation of specific programming for these offenders.

Conclusions

This study made considerable headway in examining the institutional and community-based interventions which CSC has traditionally utilized with radicalized offenders and determining whether or not these interventions were congruent with their identified needs. In general, radicalized offenders were found to be active participants in the institution, however less in formal correctional programming than in employment, education, psychology, and social programming. They were also relatively successful at completing their programming, a

reflection, perhaps, of their capacity as high-functioning offenders.

This study was limited by the information available regarding program and intervention referral, participation, and completion. Certain files were not made available to the research team, impacting the availability of information sources from which to complete the coding. This was especially true for any files that were held in the Quebec region. While multiple data sources were consulted in order to maximize the amount and quality of information regarding institutional and community programs and interventions, there were surely gaps in this data. Future work should consider conducting interviews with offenders' case management teams in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding of which programs and interventions were utilized, and why. For instance, it would be informative to understand more concretely the nature of the psychological interventions received in order to determine if the sessions in which the offender participated were meaningful interventions or simply a routine interaction or consultation. This is especially important considering that, in this study, one meeting with a psychologist was considered as participating in a psychological intervention. Also, due to the number of radicalized offenders in the sample, results were presented at the aggregate level. However, the sample of radicalized offenders is, in itself, quite heterogeneous, and so important group distinctions may have been missed.

Considering the body of evidence supporting the relevancy of correctional programs in contributing to offender's motivation to change, successful institutional adjustment and community reintegration (Cleland, Pearson, & Lipton, 2006; French & Gendreau, 2006; Kennedy, 2001; Lipsey & Cullen, 2007; Tellier & Serin, 2001), ensuring that the programming needs of radicalized offenders are effectively met should be considered an important aspect of this population's management strategy. Additional work measuring the impact of and outcomes related to, radicalized offenders' program participation would be operationally beneficial. Examining how other correctional jurisdictions, both nationally and internationally address the needs of their radicalized offenders would also inform programming and intervention options for these offenders, allowing CSC to maximize its opportunities to successfully rehabilitate and reintegrate its federally incarcerated radicalized offenders. Fortunately, work in this area is expected to occur in the next year. Ultimately, using a variety of sources, a multi-year research project aims to provide the CSC with empirically supported approaches to assessment, management, and interventions for radicalized offenders.

References

- Andrews, D. & Bonta, J. (2010). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (5th ed.). New Providence, NJ: Matthew Bender and Company.
- Andrews, D., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R. D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, *17*, 19-52. doi:10.1177/0093854890017001004
- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, *3*, 369-404. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9125.1990.tb01330.x
- Bjørger, T. & Horgan, J. (2009). *Leaving terrorism behind: Individuals and collective disengagement*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Bonta, J. & Andrews, D. (2010). Viewing offender assessment and rehabilitation through the lens of the risk-need-responsivity model. *Offender supervision: New directions in theory, research and practice*, 19-40.
- Bonta, J., Wallace-Capretta, S., & Rooney, J. (2000). A quasi-experimental evaluation of an intensive rehabilitation supervision program. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, *27*, 312-329. doi:10.1177/0093854800027003003
- Brown, S. L. & Motiuk, L. L. (2005). *The Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) component of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process: A meta-analytic, psychometric and consultative review*. (Research Report R-164). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Cleland, C. M., Pearson, F., & Lipton, D. S. (1996, November). *A meta-analytic approach to the link between needs-targeted treatment and reductions in criminal offending*. Paper presented at the American Society of Criminology annual meeting. Chicago, IL.
- Cook, A. N., Hart, S. D., & Kropp, R. (2013). *Multi-level Guidelines (MLG) for the Assessment & Management of Group-Based Violence*. Burnaby, BC: Mental Health, Law, and Policy Institute.
- Correctional Service of Canada (2009a). *Correctional Program Descriptions*. Retrieved from Correctional Service of Canada website: http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/correctional-programs/002001-1000-eng.shtml#_Toc231830432
- Correctional Service of Canada (2009b). *Evaluation Report: Correctional Service Canada's Correctional Programs*. Retrieved from Correctional Service of Canada website: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/pa/cop-prog/cp-eval-eng.shtml>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2012a). *Commissioner's Directive: Correctional Planning and*

- Criminal Profile* (CD 705-6). Retrieved from: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca>.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2012b). *Radicalization Strategy Working Group Definition*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2014). *Performance direct: Correctional interventions Efficiency*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- French, S. A., & Gendreau, P. (2006). Reducing prison misconducts: What works! *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33, 185-218. doi:10.1177/0093854805284406
- Gendreau, P. (1996). Offender rehabilitation what we know and what needs to be done. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 23(1), 144-161. doi:10.1177/0093854896023001010
- Helmus, T. C. (2009). Why and how some people become terrorists. In P. K. Davis, & K. Cragin (Eds.), *Social science for counterterrorism: putting the pieces together* (MG-849-OSD) (pp. 71-112). Retrieved from RAND Corporation website: http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG849.pdf
- Home Office. (2012). *Channel: Vulnerability assessment framework*. Retrieved from Home Office website: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/counter-terrorism/prevent/vul-assessment?view=Binary>
- Jolley, J. & Kerbs, J. (2010). Risk, need, and responsivity: Unrealized potential for the international delivery of substance abuse treatment in prison. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 20(3), 280-301. doi:10.1177/1057567710373115
- Kennedy, S. M. (2001). Treatment responsivity: Reducing recidivism by enhancing treatment effectiveness. In L. L. Motiuk & R. C. Serin (Eds.), *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming* (pp. 30-36). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Lipsey, M. W. (1989, November). *The efficacy of intervention for juvenile delinquency: Results from 400 studies*. Paper presented at the 41st annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Reno, NV.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Cullen, F. T. (2007). The effectiveness of correctional rehabilitation: A review of systematic reviews. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 3, 297-320. doi:10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.3.081806.112833
- Lloyd, M. & Dean, C. (2012). Intervening with extremist offenders. *Forensic Update*, 105, 35-38.
- Lowenkamp, C. T. & Latessa, E. J. (2005). Increasing the effectiveness of correctional programming through the risk principle: Identifying offenders for residential placement. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 4, 263-290. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2005.00021.x
- Lowenkamp, C. T., Pealer, J., Smith, P., & Latessa, E. J., (2006). Adhering to the risk and need principles: Does it matter for supervision-based programs? *Federal Probation*. 70, 3-8.

- Lowenkamp, C. T., Smith, P., Bechtel, K. (2007). Reducing the harm: Identifying appropriate programming for low-risk offenders. *Corrections Today*, 69, 50-52.
- Morris, M., Eberhard, F., Rivera, J., & Watsula, M. (2010). Deradicalization: A review of the literature with comparison to findings in the literatures on deganging and deprogramming (research brief). Retrieved from the National Institute of Corrections website: http://nicic.gov/assets/ExternalLink.aspx?url=http%3a%2f%2fsites.duke.edu%2fihss%2ffiles%2f2011%2f12%2fMorris_Research_Brief_Final.pdf
- Motiuk, L. L. (1997). Classification for correctional programming: The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 9, 18-22.
- Motiuk, L. L. (1998). The Offender Intake Assessment Process. In R.A. Wilkinson (Ed.) *Best Practices: Excellence in Corrections*. Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association Press.
- Motiuk, L. L. & Porporino, F.J. (1989). *Offender Risk/Needs Assessment: A Study Of Conditional Releases*. (Research Report R-1). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Munton, T., Martin, A., Lorenc, T., Marrero-Guillamon, I., Jamal, F., Lehmann, A., & Sexton, M. (2011). *Understanding vulnerability and resilience in individuals to the influence of Al Qa'ida violent extremism: A rapid evidence assessment to inform policy and practice in preventing violent extremism*. Retrieved from Home Office website: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/science-research-statistics/research-statistics/counter-terrorism-statistics/occ98?view=Binary>
- Neumann, P. R. (2010). *Prisons and terrorism: Radicalisation and de-radicalisation in 15 Countries*. Retrieved from The International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation website: <http://icsr.info/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/1277699166PrisonsandTerrorismRadicalisationandDeradicalisationin15Countries.pdf>
- Ogloff, J. R., & Davis, M. R. (2004). Advances in offender assessment and rehabilitation: contributions of the risk–needs–responsivity approach. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 10, 229-242. doi:10.1080/10683160410001662735
- Polaschek, D. (2012). An appraisal of the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model of offender rehabilitation and its application in correctional treatment. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 17, 1-17. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8333.2011.02038.x
- Pressman, D. E. (2009). Risk assessment decisions for violent political extremism. Retrieved from Public Safety Canada website: http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/_fl/2009-02-rdv-eng.pdf
- Pressman, D. E. & Flockton, J. (2012). Calibrating risk for violent political extremists and terrorists: the VERA 2 structured assessment. *The British Journal of Forensic Practice*, 14, 237-251. doi:10.1108/14636641211283057
- Rabasa, A., Pettyjohn, S. L., Ghez, J. J., & Boucek, C. (2010). *Deradicalizing Islamist extremists*

(MG-1053-SRF). Retrieved from RAND Corporation website:
http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2010/RAND_MG1053.pdf

Silke, A. (2008). Holy warriors: Exploring the psychological processes of Jihadi radicalization. *European Journal of Criminology*, 5, 99-123. doi:10.1177/1477370807084226

Speckhard, A. (2011). *Prison and community-based disengagement and de-radicalization programs for extremist involved in militant jihadi terrorism ideologies and activities*. NATO Research and Technology Organization. Retrieved from National Institute of Corrections website:
<http://nicic.gov/assets/ExternalLink.aspx?url=http%3a%2f%2fftp.rta.nato.int%2fpublic%2f%2fPubFullText%2fRTO%2fTR%2fRTO-TR-HFM-140%2f%2f%2fTR-HFM-140-11.pdf>

Stys, Y., Gobeil, R., Harris, A. J. R., & Michel, S. (in press). *Violent Extremists in Federal Institutions: Estimating Radicalization and Susceptibility to Radicalization in the Federal Offender Population*. (Research Report R-313). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Stys, Y. & Michel, S. (in press). *Examining the Needs and Motivations of Canada's Federally Incarcerated Radicalized Offenders*. (Research Report R-344). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Tellier, C., & Serin, R. C. (2001). The role of staff in effective program delivery. In L.L. Motiuk & R.C. Serin (Eds.), *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming* (pp. 174-184). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Appendix A: Coding Manual

Explanation/Label	Variable Content	Coding Notes
Religious services		
	0 = No 1 = Yes	
Ever attended religious education or worship service while incarcerated?	77 = Not applicable 88 = Unknown (lack of evidence) 99 = Missing	
Psychological Services		
	0 = None 1 = At least 1 2 = At least 10 3 = At least 20 4 = At least 30 5 = At least 40 6 = At least 50 7 = At least 100	Converted to a dichotomous variable with 0 = 0 and 1 and greater = 1
Total number of sessions with psychological assessment/services (while incarcerated or during release)		
Social Programs		
	0 = No (clear evidence) 1 = Yes (clear evidence)	
Participated in any social programs during incarceration	77 = Not applicable 88 = Unknown (lack of evidence) 99 = Missing	
Possible Violent Extremist Needs		
Associates		
Lack of pro-social integration (associates aspect) - Friends	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present	
Associates support extremist offending – Friends	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present	
Personal contact with violent extremists – Friends	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present	
Associates involved in violent action - Friends	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present	

Violent role or status in group	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Attitudes	
Attitudes justifying offending	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Identification of target in response to perceived injustice	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Commitment to using violent to achieve objectives	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Negative attitudes toward outgroup	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Commitment to group	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Perception that conventional activity does not work	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Them vs. us thinking	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Victim of injustice and grievances	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Over-identification with group	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Catastrophizing	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Dehumanization of the enemy	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Glorification of the past	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Employment/Education	
Lack of pro-social integration (employment/education aspect)	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Marital/Family	

Associates support extremist offending – Family	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Lack of pro-social integration (associates aspect) - Family	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Associates involved in violent action – Family	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Personal contact with violent extremists – Family	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Personal/Emotional	
Feelings of hate, frustration, persecution, or alienation	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Lack of empathy	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Susceptible to influence or authority	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Problems resulting from victimization	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Mental health problems leading to problems with behaviour	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Mental health problems leading to thought processes	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present
Mental health problems leading to problems with mood	0 = No information indicates the factor was present 1 = Information indicates the factor was possibly or partially present 2 = information indicates the factor was present

Appendix B: Mapping Needs Addressed to Program Type

	Associates	Attitude	Community Functioning	Education/ Employment	Marital/ Family	Personal/ Emotional	Substance Abuse
Correctional Programming							
Living Skills	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Violent Offenders	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	
Personal Development	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Substance Abuse					✓		✓
ICPM	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
Community	✓	✓				✓	
Family Violence					✓		
Sex Offender	✓	✓	✓			✓	
Women Offender		✓	✓		✓		✓
Education				✓		✓	
Employment							
Institutional Employment	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
CORCAN		✓		✓		✓	
Community Employment	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	
Vocational Training		✓	✓	✓		✓	