

**Youth mentoring as a viable crime prevention strategy:
Evidence and Ontario policy, with reflections from some mentors**

Jeffrey Bradley

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
Masters of Arts (MA) degree in Criminology

Department of Criminology
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ottawa

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Crime Trends in Canada	1
Costs of Criminal Justice	3
Crime Prevention through Social Development as a Solution.....	4
Youth Mentoring as a Social Development Program	5
Main Objectives of the Thesis	7
Outline of Chapters	8
Chapter 2: Methodology.....	10
Introduction.....	10
Conceptual Issues.....	10
Types of Literature.....	16
Qualitative Research	18
Strengths and Limitations	22
Conclusion	24
Chapter 3: Contributions of Risk Factors and Social Bonding to Crime Prevention	25
Introduction.....	25
Risk Factors for Youth Crime.....	25
Social Bonding Theory	30
Empirical Support.....	33
Criticisms to advance the theory.....	35
Conclusion	37
Chapter 4: Effectiveness of Youth Mentoring Programs to Prevent Crime	39
Introduction.....	39
Selected Youth Mentoring Programs and Evaluation Results	40
Big Brothers Big Sisters of American (Community-Based).....	40
Youth Inclusion Program (UK).....	45
Mentoring Plus	49
Quantum Opportunities Program	52
Mentoring Relationships	54
Best Practices of an Effective Youth Mentoring Program.....	57
Relevance of Social Bond theory to the success of Mentoring Programs	63
Conclusion	64
Chapter 5: Review of Ontario policy frameworks and reports on Crime Prevention through Social Development	66
Introduction.....	66
History of Canadian Crime Prevention Policy.....	66
Ontario Crime Prevention Policy Frameworks.....	71
Availability of Funding for Crime Prevention in Ontario	79
Public Opinion	81
Ontario Community Safety and Well-Being Planning Framework.....	82
Conclusion	85

Chapter 6: Methods of Youth Mentors from Big Brothers Big Sisters Community-Based Mentoring Program	87
Introduction.....	87
Organizational Procedures of the BBBS Community-Based Mentoring Program.....	87
Youth and Risk Factors.....	93
Process of Relationship Bonding between Mentors and Mentees.....	97
Challenges of Mentoring High-Risk Youth.....	103
Prevention of Crime and Violence.....	105
Conclusion	108
Chapter 7: Conclusions and Recommendations	110
Conclusions.....	110
Recommendations.....	114
Future Research	117
References.....	119
Appendices:	140
Appendix A: Interview Guide.....	140
Appendix B: Ethics Approval.....	142
Appendix C: Recruitment Poster	143
Appendix D: Recruitment Script	144
Appendix E: Letter from the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services	145

Abstract

This thesis explored whether youth mentoring could be used as a crime prevention strategy for Ontario. It examined risk factors for youth crime and social bonding theory, the effectiveness of selected programs to prevent crime and best practices, and Ontario government reports on effective crime prevention. It also explored youth mentoring in practice with some mentors from Big Brothers Big Sisters of Ottawa and Sudbury Ontario.

The analysis of the literature on risk factors for youth crime identified a number of individual, relationship, community, and societal level factors that correlate with the likelihood of a young person engaging in crime. Travis Hirschi's social bonding theory provided a lens to understand the contribution mentoring can have on preventing crime through attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief with parents and schools.

The evidence-based research on the effectiveness of selected programs that had a mentoring component showed that the likelihood of offending could be reduced with other well-being indicators. Research on mentoring relationships showed that when mentors focused on the assets of the youth and were committed to the relationship, they could foster a lasting emotional bond. Best practices of an effective youth mentoring program included outreaching to vulnerable youth, involving parents, screening and training mentors, matching mentors and mentees based on background, having mentoring connected to a larger strategy, following a developmental approach, and developing standards for implementation.

The recent reports from the Province of Ontario on crime prevention and community safety use much of the same evidence on risk factors and social development programs to confirm that prevention is an effective way to reduce crime. These reports also point to strong public support for government investment in prevention and education over punishment.

The semi-structured interviews with mentoring practitioners in Sudbury and Ottawa, Ontario analyzed the methods used by mentors volunteering with high-risk youth in the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based program. Results showed the organizational procedure, youth and risk factors, the bonding process between mentors and mentees, and challenges of mentoring at-risk youth were important. Mentors had positive beliefs on the impacts mentoring had on preventing crime and violence.

Therefore, youth mentoring is a crime prevention strategy consistent with evidence and government reports and so is viable, but will require political support and investment upstream to make a difference across the province.

Key words: Crime prevention, social development, social bonding, youth mentoring.

Acknowledgements

I would first like to thank my parents Paul and Shelley-Ann Bradley and my sister Carly Bradley for their endless support, care, and love throughout the thesis process. My family helped me to remain focused and motivated by encouraging me to follow my passion through hard work and perseverance. Even when writing became challenging, my family always helped me refocus and plan for success.

I would also like to thank my supervisor, mentor, and close friend Dr. Irvin Waller for his expertise, guidance, support, and criticism throughout mastering the research process. His knowledge and experience working in the field of crime prevention, public policy, and victim's rights assisted this thesis to remain practical, policy driven, and focused on actions for the government to respond to crime and violence proactively. His passion for a safe, just, and peaceful world through prevention has driven me to a career in the Federal Public Service.

Additionally, my colleagues in the Department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa provided endless support and feedback throughout my masters' degree, particularly Deborah Landry, Vajmeh Tabibi, Kate Fletcher, Claire Delisle, and Lori Stinson. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to discuss complex social problems with them and have their expertise in the field of critical criminology and social justice. Additionally, thank you to my committee members Michael Kempa and Rick Linden for your helpful comments and my friends everywhere for your support and encouragement through debate and dialogue.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my research participants for their perspective on youth mentoring and helping to shape the lives of young people in our communities through their voluntary commitment with the Big Brothers Big Sisters Organization. Their voices brought an interesting exploration to the front-line experiences, processes, and challenges of mentoring vulnerable youth. I hope my analysis has brought together the best available knowledge on youth mentoring in relation to crime prevention and the opinions of mentors were effectively interpreted.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Crime Trends in Canada

In Canada, police recorded crime rates have steadily declined from their peaks in the mid-1990s (Farrell, Tilley, & Tseloni, 2014; Farrell & Brantingham, 2013). According to police-reported crime statistics in Canada for 2016, there were 1.9 million incidents recorded by the police, which is about 5, 224 incidents per 100,000 population (Keighley, 2017). Statistics Canada General Social Survey (GSS) on victimization in 2014 found that 1 in 5 adults over the age of 15 (about 5.6 million people) reported that they or their household experienced victimization in the past year. The GSS on victimization includes eight types of offences such as assault, theft, break-ins, and vandalism (Perreault, 2015). A total of 6.4 million criminal incidents were reported in 2014 with 65% of those incidents being non-violent (Perreault, 2015). An estimated 1 in 7 adults reported being a victim of property crime, while 1 in 15 adults reported being a victim of a violent crime (Perreault, 2015; Waller, Bradley, & Murrizi, 2016).

According to police-reported data, the youth crime rate has been steadily declining since the early 2000s and “the rate of youth accused of [a] crime has fallen 40% since 2005” (Allen, 2016, p. 26). This decline in youth crime recorded by police may be in part due to the policy changes enacted in 2004 through the Youth Criminal Justice Act (YCJA). The implementation of the YCJA reduced the criminalization of young people through an increased use of police warnings and diversion programs (Department of Justice Canada, 2013; Public Safety Canada, 2016b). This legislative reform provides proof that shifts in public policy can impact crime rates.

The costs of harm to victims from crime against adults is estimated at \$55 billion annually for 2014, with \$10 billion accounting for tangible costs like medical bills, loss of wages, and stolen or damaged property; While, \$45 billion accounts for intangible losses such as pain and suffering, loss of quality of life, and other collateral consequences within the family and

community (Waller et al., 2016; Zhang, 2011; Perreault, 2015). Statistics show that youth have a higher likelihood of becoming victims of violence in their home and on the street (Smandych & Winterdyk, 2012; Public Safety Canada, 2012; Easton, Furness, & Brantingham, 2014). Mainly females, Indigenous people, and visible minorities experience significantly higher rates of violent victimization perpetrated against them (Monchalin, 2016; Scott, 2016). Research shows that individuals between the ages of 15 and 24 are at the highest risk for violent victimization and are at the peak age for criminal involvement (Scott, 2016; Allen, 2016). However, self-reported rates of victimization for youth under the age of 15 are unknown, since there is no victimization survey for this age category to measure incidents not captured or reported to the police (Wemmers, 2017).

Youth deemed to be involved in criminal behaviour typically commit many non-violent offences, such as property crime, theft under \$5 000, and mischief; they also commit some violent crimes, such as assaults (Boyce, 2015; Alam, 2015). According to the Correctional and Conditional Release Statistical Overview, the most common crimes committed by youth in 2015 were theft and administration of justice offences, with the majority being committed by males (Public Safety Canada, 2016b).

When a crime is reported to the police and a charge is laid against an accused, a lengthy criminal justice process begins. This process, from beginning to end, is often traumatic for victims because it does not provide them with deserved rights, supports, or services (Waller, 2011). Victims are used as mere witnesses to the offence and feel failed by the system, which relies mostly on accountability through criminal courts and incarceration (Perrin, 2017). Moreover, while the system assumes the role of prosecuting offences perpetrated against victims,

it tends to neglect the tremendous amount of physical, psychological, and monetary costs that impact the victim long after the crime has occurred (Johnston-Way & O'Sullivan, 2016).

Costs of Criminal Justice

Overall the budget for the Canadian criminal justice system has increased by 66% from 2003 to 2013, with an estimated total of \$20.3 billion being spent annually in 2012 on reactive measures to crime, such as policing, instead of preventative measures (Story & Yalkin, 2013).

Policing costs almost doubled during this period. In a yearly account produced during 2015/2016, operating expenditures for all policing services in Canada totaled \$14.2 billion in current dollars for wages, benefits, and other operating costs (Greenland & Alam, 2017).

Between 2002 and 2012, police expenditures increased by about 43% with the majority of these expenses being paid by municipalities (Story & Yalkin, 2013; Easton, Furness, & Brantingham, 2014). With these rising costs of policing, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities (2015) states “the increasingly complex set of local responsibility has led to unsustainable growth in policing and public safety costs for municipalities, often crowding out other essential services such as early intervention and crime prevention programs” (par. 2). This quote emphasizes the need to increase funding for social programs and focus on community-based solutions, as a proactive means to address crime and community safety.

In provincial and territorial prisons in Canada, the use of pre-trial detention continues to increase with over 57% of people awaiting trial, because of court delays and a problematic bail system (Deshman & Myers, 2014). In total, there was a 39% increase in the use of remand in a yearly account produced during 2004/2005 to 2014/2015 (Correctional Services Program, 2016). According to an Independent Review of Ontario Corrections (2017), “pre-trial detainees constitute a majority (67%) of the people incarcerated in provincial institutions” (p. 41). Provincial and territorial prisons also face issues of inhumane conditions with triple bunking in

cells, overuse of solitary confinement, poor food quality, limited access to rehabilitation programming, instances of violence, and lack of access to medical care (Piché, Kleuskens, & Walby, 2017; Ombudsman Ontario, 2017). In 2015/2016, “adult correctional services operating expenditures in Canada totaled over \$4.6 million” (Reitano, 2017, p. 6) with the average federal prisoner costing \$238 a day and about \$203 a day for provincial and territorial prisoners.

Youth correctional statistics in Canada show that in a yearly account in 2015/2016, a total of 8,455 youth between the ages of 12 and 17 were either in custody or being supervised in the community, which is down 33% from five years prior (Malakieh, 2017). According to Jeffrey, Therien, & Bali (2015), “the average cost of a youth offender throughout adolescence is estimated at \$823,099” (p. 1), this includes the costs of corrections, police, courts, prosecution, legal aid, and victim costs in Canada. Many researchers believe that crime prevention through social development is a better alternative to standard criminal justice measures because they perceive youth offending behaviours to be influenced by poverty, lack of education and jobs, mental health, family breakdown, histories of abuse and violence, homelessness, and social exclusion, all of which can be alleviated through appropriate intervention (Currie, 2016; Minaker & Hogeveen, 2008; Farrington, 2017).

Crime Prevention through Social Development as a Solution

A proactive way to impact youth crime and violence is by improving the quality of life of young people through social development. Crime prevention through social development (CPSD) can provide assistance to youth by addressing their needs and the causes of their anti-social behaviour and attitudes by using an individualized and social approach (Waller, 2014; Waller & Weiler, 1985). Most of the evidence for CPSD is based on the life course and developmental criminology studies that tested key indicators of crime longitudinally on large birth-cohorts of children to determine the underlying causes of persistent offending (Farrington,

2003; 2015). The identified risk factors were determined to be a proactive way to tackle the underlying causes of criminal behaviour by providing individuals with social programs that could address problems before a crime occurs (Tanner-Smith, Wilson, & Lipsey, 2012; Welsh & Farrington, 2012).

CPSD (also referred to as social crime prevention) seeks to reduce the likelihood of individuals committing a crime in the future by investing time and money into social programming to address their amenable risks and needs (Farrington & Welsh, 2007; Waller, 2014). It also seeks to improve the general well-being of people by creating jobs, reducing poverty, and ensuring sustainable housing, education, and mental health supports. CPSD sees the “intersection of multiple, complex social, economic, health and environmental factors [contributing] to criminalization” (Ontario & OACP, 2012, p. 11). CPSD is distinctive because it takes into consideration the individual, family, environmental, and the systemic issues that facilitate crime and advocates for practical public policy solutions through a problem-oriented framework (Schneider, 2015; Sutton, Cherney, & White, 2014).

Mainly the issues of poverty, racism, discrimination, gender inequality, and classism are believed to influence the conditions for crime because they exclude people from equal and fair opportunities. Social crime prevention can help solve problems by avoiding expensive police and emergency rooms, incarceration, and removing youth from their families, peers, and communities. By investing in programming built upon the 50 years of research, Canada can become a leader in reducing its responses to social problems and crime in general (Winterdyk, 2017; Linden, 2011).

Youth Mentoring as a Social Development Program

One of the initiatives to prevent crime is youth mentoring, which provides a relationship for at-risk youth who are living in disadvantage and attempts to help guide them through life

challenges (DuBois, 2002). However, the methods to mentor youth need to be further explored to understand how they can prevent crime and which strategies are used to garner an impactful relationship between mentors and mentees effectively. The process of mentoring involves an adult role model establishing a pro-social relationship with a young person to help guide them into making positive decisions during their transition into adulthood (DuBois, Portillo, Rhodes, Naida, & Valentine, 2011). Some of these decisions include learning how to behave respectfully, listening to others, having agency and voice, attending and participating in school, connecting with parents, volunteering in the community, engaging in teamwork, and having a good work ethic.

Youth mentoring is considered a secondary crime prevention program because it seeks to address the most vulnerable young people who are deemed to have a higher likelihood of committing a crime in the future (Smandych, 2001; Lab, 2010; Brantingham & Faust, 1976). Longitudinal studies have shown that certain individual, family, and social risk factors can put people at a higher probability to commit a crime in the future and engage in other problematic behaviours (Murray & Farrington, 2010). Youth mentoring also encompasses interventions in the prevention of problematic drug and alcohol use, improving academic abilities, and improving self-worth and relationships (National Institute of Justice, 2016).

Most youth mentoring programs seek to increase positive relationships between adults and young people in order to improve self-worth and social skills, while taking into consideration the social circumstances surrounding the youth's upbringing and social environment. Although some mentoring programs are promising to impact crime and cost-effective, Canada continues to spend over \$20 billion annually on police, courts, and prisons, which primarily focuses on reacting to the crime through punishment as a deterrent (Story &

Yalkin, 2013; Easton, Furness, & Brantingham, 2014). Canada has an opportunity to be considered a world leader in preventing harm, victimization, and fear of crime through evidence-based prevention and yet it continues to feed into the status quo by hiring more judges and prosecutors and building new prisons to expand the industry (Gallant, 2016; Piché, Kleuskens, & Walby, 2016). These outdated approaches leave many people behind and fail to invest in proven social prevention and community supports, which has the potential to reduce crime and improve the well-being of everyone.

Investing public and private resources into youth mentoring programs has cost-benefits which can improve the lives of young people, while reducing criminal justice expenditures (Washington State Institute, 2017; Public Safety Canada, 2016a). Some estimates reveal a cost benefit of over four dollars for every dollar invested into mentoring (Waller, 2014; Waller et al., 2016; Aos, Lieb, Mayfield, Miller, & Pennucci, 2004). In an era of escalating police and correctional costs, mentoring should be considered a smart investment that could reduce the probability of crime by helping solve problems holistically, which in time, will help resolve the issues that are considered to be the roots of crime, including poverty, addiction, family breakdown, mental health, lack of education, and job opportunities (Sherman, Gottfredson, MacKenzie, Eck, Reuter, & Brushway, 1998; Savoie, 2008; Charron, 2011). Mentoring programs can provide social mechanisms that foster responses to youth crime that can help address socio-emotional issues in the short-term, while long-term social policies can simultaneously improve the overall physical and emotional welfare of youth.

Main Objectives of the Thesis

This thesis seeks to answer the research question: Is youth mentoring a viable crime prevention strategy for Ontario? The question is broken down into sub-questions, which are answered through a review of existing evidence-based literature such as academic and

government reports. There is also a qualitative component from five semi-structured interviews with Big Brothers Big Sisters youth mentors in Ottawa and Sudbury Ontario, Canada.

Throughout the thesis, I seek to expand the information on the topic of youth mentoring and its connection to crime prevention through selected programs. The study aims to review the risk factors for youth crime and social bonding theory in relation to youth mentoring, the effectiveness of youth mentoring programs in preventing crime, government policy frameworks and reports on crime prevention through social development for Ontario, and the practical methods used by youth mentors.

In order to do this, I will answer the following questions:

1. Does evidence on risk factors for youth crime and social bonding theory help explain the contribution of youth mentoring in relation to crime prevention?
2. What is the evidence that mentoring youth is effective in preventing crime?
3. Is Ontario committed to investing in evidence-based crime prevention through social development and would this embrace mentoring?
4. What are the methods used by youth mentors' in the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based mentoring program to prevent crime?

Outline of Chapters

Chapter two discusses the conceptual issues, methodological approaches to analyzing the evidence and collecting data, and the strengths and limitations of the thesis.

Chapter three discusses the evidence on risk factors and social bonding theory for understanding the contribution of youth mentoring in relation to crime prevention.

Chapter four is an analysis of the evidence on the effectiveness in preventing crime of selected programs that have a mentoring component, relationship types, and best practices for an effective youth mentoring program.

Chapter five looks at the history of Canadian crime prevention policy, government reports on crime prevention through social development in Ontario, availability of funding, public opinion, and the Ontario community safety and well-being planning framework.

Chapter six uses data from qualitative interviews to address the methods employed by mentors in the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based youth mentoring program in Sudbury and Ottawa Ontario. The perspectives of mentors are analyzed to determine which practices they follow to create social bonds and whether these are oriented to preventing crime and violence.

Chapter seven concludes with the main findings of the thesis and tentative recommendations for the viability of mentoring to prevent youth crime.

Chapter 2: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodological approaches for the thesis. Conceptual issues define the terms used throughout the thesis. The types of literature explains the sources of the evidence-based research on the effectiveness of youth mentoring programs and existing studies that tested its impact on indicators of crime. It discusses the interview process with Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based youth mentors in the municipalities of Sudbury and Ottawa Ontario. Qualitative research methods include the data collection technique using semi-structured interviews with mentors and a thematic analysis to generate themes for findings. Finally, the strengths and limitations of the study will be examined.

Conceptual Issues

The literature on the following terms was accessed to define their meaning. These terms include crime, youth, youth mentoring, crime prevention, crime prevention through social development, at-risk youth, municipal strategy, viable, and evidence-based.

Crime

A crime is defined as any willful act that is against the law in the *Criminal Code of Canada*, which includes the act (actus reus) and the intent (mens rea) to cause harm (Justice Education Society, 2017). This thesis considers a crime as incidents that are reported in a victimization survey through self-reports and official police recorded data that result in a criminal justice response. Crime rates in Canada are determined by Statistics Canada, using the General Social Survey (GSS) on victimization. The GSS victimization survey determines an estimated amount of crime that victims self-report, but do not necessarily report to the police (Allen, 2016; Perreault, 2015). They are also reported through the police recorded data, using the Uniform Crime Reporting (UCR) survey.

Youth crime, in particular, can occur in many forms including violent crime, sex crime, property crime, organized crime, theft, selling or using illegal drugs and other acts which fall under the criminal code of Canada (Minaker & Hogeveen, 2008). Even criminal acts that are diverted from the traditional justice system through diversion or community programs are considered in the GSS and the official crime statistics (Allen, 2016). Other forms of crime, such as fraud and piracy, do exist but are less relevant to youth in conflict with the law.

Youth

Under the law in Canada, any person between the ages of 12 and 17 is considered to be a youth or young person. Due to their age, these individuals have limited criminal responsibility in the criminal code and they fall under the *Youth Criminal Justice Act*, a separate piece of criminal legislation, which deems their behaviour less blameworthy (Government of Canada, 2016).

Youth are tried and sentenced in youth courts, but some youth who commit violent offences will be tried as adults in the traditional court system at a judge's discretion. The youth development stage is described as a period of transition from a child to becoming an adult with full rights as citizens (UNESCO, 2016).

Youth Mentoring

Youth mentoring is defined as “a relationship over a prolonged period of time between two or more people, where an older, caring, more experienced individual provides help to the younger person as he/she goes through life” (Development Services Group Inc., 2011, p. 1). This definition was adopted by the US Department of Justice through its crimesolutions.gov database on effective prevention and is coherent with the model programs discussed throughout the thesis. Crimesolutions.gov is a database that analyzes the evidence-based research on prevention and

intervention programs that are proven effective, promising, or not effective in improving human well-being.

Mentoring is the creation of a relationship that is fostered informally or formally by a non-parental adult through a natural process or a planned match through a program (Dolan & Brady, 2012). Both types of relationships serve as a mechanism to help teach and guide youth how to manage their emotions and behaviour, become socially aware and engaged, making healthy choices, being able to cope with stressful life situations, and having social ties to improve social capital (National Institute of Justice, 2016; Dolan & Brady, 2012).

There are many different types of formal mentoring including one-to-one, e-mentoring, peer mentoring, team mentoring, and group mentoring, which take place in various locations in the community, faith groups, online, agencies, school, and workplaces (Bania & Chase, 2016). My focus is on programs that establish a formal one-to-one mentoring relationship between youth and adults, as they have shown to have promising effects on indicators of crime in communities.

Crime Prevention

By definition, crime prevention uses programs and practices to intervene proactively to stop criminal acts from occurring in an effort to reduce crime rates, victimization, and public fear of victimization (Lab, 2010; Schneider, 2015). Conceptually, crime prevention is often divided into three levels adopted from the public health typology including primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention. The word prevention means pre-intervention to reduce the likelihood of later issues that have a higher probability of occurring (Gilling, 1997). Crime prevention involves various techniques through social development, situational tools, environmental design, surveillance technologies, and diversion programs (Hastings & Melchers, 1990). Each type has

its own set of assumptions mostly based on rational choice, deterrence, routine activity, and social control theory (Gilling, 1997; Linden & Koenig, 2012; Akers, 1990).

According to the PST model developed by Brantingham and Faust (1976), primary prevention focuses on the general population by “identification of the physical and social environment that provide opportunities for or precipitate criminal behaviour and alteration of those conditions” (p. 292). These preventative methods seek to change the underlying social, cultural, economic, physical, and environmental conditions (Currie, 1996). Secondary crime prevention focuses on people and places that are at-risk for criminal involvement, and which factors that deem those at-risk to have a higher likelihood of committing a crime in the future (Smandych, 2001; Lab, 2010; Blyth & Solomon, 2009). Secondary crime prevention attempts to identify factors early on by intervening before youth get further involved in activities such as gangs, violence, and mischief (Brantingham & Faust, 1976; Dijk & deWaard, 1991). Tertiary prevention efforts aim to reform and rehabilitate offenders after they have come into contact with the criminal justice system. At this level, prevention programs focus on reducing the likelihood of reoffending or getting the individual the help they need through treatment and rehabilitation (Brantingham & Faust, 1976; Dijk & deWaard, 1991).

Crime Prevention through Social Development

This project is focusing on secondary crime prevention through youth mentoring programs that target at-risk youth and it will be considered an analysis of Crime Prevention through Social Development (CPSD). CPSD focuses on improving the lives of young people emotionally, economically, and socially before they come into contact with the criminal justice system (Waller & Weiler, 1985). CPSD offers positive social programming to vulnerable youth to help address the various social structural problems, while dealing with the individual and

environmental factors in their lives, which may be indicators of later criminal involvement (Schneider, 2015).

Upstream prevention is a term used increasingly by prevention experts to describe techniques that can be applied to repair the problems which cause people to fall into detrimental life circumstances and involvement in perpetual cycles of crime (Cohen, Chavez, & Chehimi, 2010). It is adopted from an analogy used in the health sector and it implies that it is more efficient to help people who have fallen into the water upstream, rather than help individuals who are too far downstream, closer to the waterfall; a drop that will ultimately lead to the involvement of the justice system (upstream, 2017). This term tends to be used in the health field and is starting to be adapted by crime prevention practitioners.

At-risk youth

The term 'at-risk' youth is considered to be individuals between the ages of 12 and 17 who show identifiable risk factors that may lead to criminal behaviour in the future if their needs are not addressed (Smanyach, 2001; Ontario & OACP, 2012). Some youth are deemed to have a higher likelihood of engaging in crime in the future based on the levels of deprivation they face, which in turn increases their probabilities of offending with multiple social and individual factors. Moore (2006) states, that "it does not imply certainty. Risk factors raise the chance of poor outcomes, while protective factors raise the chance of good outcomes" (p. 3). At-risk youth are individuals who are identified by their family, school, social workers, health sector, and agents of social control, who are in need of guidance and help to address their underlying problems. To move away from stigmatizing certain youth and the possibilities of false positives and false negatives, any person who is in high need of support, will be considered a candidate within this categorization (Knepper, 2007; Goddard, 2012; Williamson, 2009).

Municipal Strategy

A municipal strategy is a plan that is widely used throughout large groups of people or a large area of inhabitants. Developing a plan is determined through the diagnosis of problems in communities to determine what efforts could be used to solve them (Linden, 2000). These plans must include some sort of logic model to highlight the short, medium, and long-term goals to meet target dates to monitor those objectives (Institute for the Prevention of Crime, 2007). This ensures the ability to meet set goals and objectives, while being open to possible delays and setbacks. The process requires a coordination committee to agree on what the focus of the strategy will be and the feasibility of their actions. The committee also needs a budget with the funding allocations determined before implementation. Typically, a centre of responsibility can assist in this process by implementing the policy and coordination of administration (Institute for the Prevention of Crime, 2009). After implementation of the strategy, there must be a process and outcome evaluation to ensure its effectiveness and that objectives are being met. It is also important for members to report back on progress to the larger group for changes to be made, if necessary. For the implementation to be effective, according to Shaw (2001), it must go through a process that diagnosis the problems within communities, has a plan to tackle the underlying problems, must be done strategically through outreach, and evaluations must be collected to know if performance measures were satisfied (Institute for the Prevention of Crime, 2007).

Viability

Viability is defined as something that is “capable of working, functioning, or developing adequately” (Merriam-Webster, 2016). In the context of this thesis, it means that there is compelling evidence that youth mentoring programs can have some impact on crime and

improve the lives of young people and that governments are interested in this evidence but they have not yet moved to invest in it.

Evidence-based

Evidence-based is defined as a program, or strategy, that has proven to show positive results, through quantitative studies that prove its effectiveness and scientific use through sound methodology, usually with the finding of random control trials and experimental studies (Welsh, 2007). It is also important that methodological flaws, including internal and external validity, are addressed throughout the study so that generalizations are not improperly determined, which affect government policies and public perceptions (Roberts & Hastings, 2007). It should also have consistency in showing positive results in various social contexts with a variety of populations (Welsh, 2007).

Types of Literature

The literature review was completed using the University of Ottawa online library catalogue and key databases including the Criminal Justice Abstracts, Academic Search Complex, and ProQuest Social Sciences to find peer-reviewed journal articles and books. The keywords that were searched included: youth, youth justice, mentoring, crime prevention, crime reduction, juvenile delinquency, evidence-based, and social development. Additionally, a general web search was done through Google (scholar) to find government research papers, systematic literature reviews, information guides, and newspaper articles on youth mentoring programs and crime prevention through social development.

Principal sources included the textbook on Smarter Crime Control (Waller, 2014), which reviewed all of the evidence on effective crime prevention programs up to 2013 and offered practical solutions to governments to spare victims and save tax dollars. One of the chapters is

particularly devoted to Preventing Youth from Becoming Repeat Offenders, which inspired the focus on youth mentoring through Big Brother Big Sisters.

In 2017, there are many online resources that have analyzed the effectiveness of crime prevention programs and practices. The selected evidence-based youth mentoring programs were chosen from online sources of knowledge including the United States Department of Justice website crimesolutions.gov, the World Health Organization reports, Blueprints for healthy youth development, and the Campbell Collaborative which identified mentoring as an effective or promising program. The United States Department of Justice runs a website through the Office of Justice Programs under the National Institute of Justice, which summarizes the research findings on programs and practices that are effective, promising, and have no effect. The database originated from a report submitted to the US Congress in 1997 titled *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*, which was a meta-analysis of government-sponsored programs by criminologists Lawrence Sherman and others from the University of Maryland (Schneider, 2015; Sherman et al., 1998). The World Health Organization (WHO) brought together the evidence on effective violence prevention initiatives through its *World report on violence and health* (Krug, Dahlberg, Mercy, Zwi, & Lozano, 2002) and the *Preventing youth violence: an overview of the evidence* (Kieselbach & Butchart, 2015). Blueprints for healthy youth development is “a registry of evidence-based positive youth development programs design to promote the health and well-being of children and teens” (Blueprints, 2017, par. 1) run by the University of Colorado Boulder. The Campbell Collaborative does systematic literature reviews on effective interventions.

The articles and online sources were collected in English from November 2015 until February 2017. All of the research on youth mentoring is from the last 20 years with a particular

focus on community-based approaches to mentoring and crime prevention. The majority of the articles on the effectiveness of youth mentoring are based on the discipline of psychology, and only a small number of them have analyzed delinquency, crime, and violence prevention.

The articles and books are from scholars in Canada, the United Kingdom, Australia and the United States. The review did not look at literature in other languages or countries outside of the commonwealth as they pose different circumstances and different mentalities towards youth and social justice. The review of the literature allowed the researcher to gather evidence-based information on what works in regards to mentoring youth and its connection to crime prevention through social development.

Qualitative Research

My interviews were qualitative because I explored the perceptions and beliefs of practitioners who administer youth mentoring programs in two Ontario municipalities. The interviews were conducted to understand the implementation methods of mentoring in the community by seeing practitioners as the front-line experts. According to Neuman & Robson (2015), qualitative research allows researchers “to study smaller groups and...properly interpret the meanings behind researchers’ subjects” (p. 18). By using qualitative research, I was able to understand the perspectives of people and their personal experiences during the process of mentoring youth, and how it works during implementation in particular contexts (Stake, 2010).

For the qualitative approach, I was reflexive in my research by challenging the motives behind how I collected and interpreted the data. Through conscious reflection, I was aware that my beliefs and experiences influenced how I applied knowledge since all knowledge is based on individual status and privilege (Van den Hoonaard, 2014). Hence why I collected data through interviews with people who work directly with youth in the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based mentoring program, so that I could understand the process and practices of their

implementation methods and how social bonds could lead to the prevention of crime. By meeting face-to-face with research participants, I obtained a grasp of the implementation process through their voices and narratives. Similarly, it helped me to reflect on the discourses that influenced my worldview and perceptions of others when interpreting the data (Grbich, 2004). During this reflection, I tried to make sure my interpretations were accurate through careful analysis and description.

Data Collection Technique

I conducted semi-structured interviews with mentoring practitioners who administer the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based youth mentoring program in Ottawa and Sudbury, Ontario. The semi-structured interviews allowed me to prepare questions in advance, while having the ability to probe follow-up questions when certain explanations were unclear (Hagan, 2014). Moreover, it gave my participants less structure and permitted them to discuss certain topics in greater detail that were more relevant and important for the study (Harrell & Bradley, 2009). My research needed to have front-line workers, because I wanted to gain access to practical problems that typically get missed in wider program assessments. Furthermore, I believe my research participants should be able to discuss aspects of their programs more generally, while talking about their role in helping to prevent youth from engaging in crime through their implementation process.

Sampling Technique

The purposive sampling technique was used to choose my research participants based on set criteria. According to Palys (2008), purposive sampling is “a series of strategic choices about with whom, where, and how one does one’s research” (p. 679). To meet my objectives, I decided to choose practitioners over the age of 18, who work with high-risk youth between the ages of 12

and 17 years old, and are mentors in the one-to-one Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based youth mentoring program. The definition of high-risk was left open so that mentors could justify why they believed the youth was labeled as such. The youth mentors also had to have at least three years of experience to ensure awareness of the program structure and working with high-risk youth who have multiple needs. This research project took place in two locations. The first location was in the City of Ottawa, Ontario, because it is a large area in Ontario and has a crime prevention board under the City Council known as Crime Prevention Ottawa. Many cities in Ontario do not have a crime prevention board under the municipal government who will fund community initiatives and support youth programs, so it is appropriate to perform the study in the capital city. Ottawa is a major urban centre in Canada with a population of approximately 1 million people; as such, it serves a diverse population of youth. Additionally, to gain perspectives from mentors working in a smaller Northern Ontario community, I recruited mentors from Big Brothers Big Sisters in Sudbury, Ontario. Sudbury was one of the municipalities consulted and discussed in the Ontario Community Safety and well-being report (2015) because of cities promising initiatives to prevent crime.

The study was exploratory so that practitioner's perspectives were investigated, to gain an understanding how people discuss and enact the program objectives and methods to assist youth with high needs. For the five interviews, I talked with two male mentors, two female mentors, and one staff member. Individuals were over the age of 18, and of different workplace statuses such as employees and volunteers. The interviews took place at the University of Ottawa and Laurentian University in a booked room to ensure comfort and privacy when audio recording. Participants were recruited through the use of a poster attached to an email, which was distributed to the main youth mentoring organization in Ottawa and Sudbury including Big

Brothers Big Sisters Ottawa and Big Brothers Big Sisters of Greater Sudbury. All participants were chosen based on a first come first serve basis by responding to the poster.

Analytical Technique

My analytical technique was a thematic analysis, which is “a method to identifying, analyzing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 79). I interpreted the data I gathered through semi-structured interviews. This type of analysis allowed me to collect data and code the themes and patterns that emerge from the transcribed interviews. This technique helps to “minimally organize and describe your data set in rich detail...and interprets various aspects of the research topic” (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 6). I followed Ezzy’s (2002) description of the process by reading the transcribed data and connecting evident themes and jotting down notes in the margins. After a second read, I coded the categories that emerge to determine the key issues and grouped relevant concepts for the analysis and eliminate others (Ezzy, 2002, p. 88). Through open coding, I was able to see the similarities and differences between rich descriptions and was able to describe the main patterns for accurate results and interpretations. This also allowed for my theory to be developed and enabled me to understand the modes of thought used by youth mentors when connected their work to crime prevention. The benefits of doing a thematic analysis is that openness in making themes based on my research questions and not focusing only on a certain aspect of the youth mentoring topic. It allowed me to get a diverse perspective from a multitude of voices and be able to focus on relevant issues that mentors felt were vital for the prevention of youth crime and violence (Ezzy, 2002).

Ethical Considerations

Through the ethical codes of conduct set out by the University of Ottawa, I followed all protocols to ensure my research participants were not unintentionally harmed and I was aware of the potential risks that could arise (Ferdinand, Pearson, Rowe, & Worthington, 2007). Firstly, I was aware of the confidentiality and anonymity of my participant's information and the need to protect the data. Informed consent was necessary to make sure my participants knew what the research study was about and how I was collecting my data through their descriptions (Whittaker, 2005). To mitigate this risk, I had an official information sheet with the University of Ottawa letterhead to show the authenticity of my project and the purpose of my study of youth mentoring programs and their connection to crime prevention through social development (Polonsky & Waller, 2015). Additionally, a confidentiality agreement was signed to make sure participants were aware that this information was used to produce knowledge and audio recorded to ensure accuracy. My interviews were recorded on a digital recorder, uploaded to my laptop, transcribed and kept under a locked file folder encrypted with a password. Upon transcribing the data, real names were switched with pseudo names so there was no link to their identity (Waldrop, 2004).

Strengths and Limitations

This research project discusses the existing literature on risk factors for youth crime and social bonding theory, evidence-based youth mentoring programs, and government reports on crime prevention through social development for Ontario. It addresses the gaps in the existing literature on the implementation processes used by youth mentors to prevent crime in the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based program. I offer an understanding of the how youth mentoring relationships develop and the perceived impact on criminal involvement. The youth mentors hold the practical knowledge on what they do when implementing the structured program and the challenges they face with high-risk youth.

There is also a limitation to the study due to the location, time, and feasibility. The interviews were conducted in two municipalities in Ontario (Sudbury and Ottawa) with the Big Brothers Big Sisters organization and only discussed the experiences of mentors in those two communities, which could be similar to other municipalities. At no point is this study attempting to infer results from the interviews to all Ontario municipalities, and is only an investigation to help enhance knowledge on evidence-based youth mentoring programs in relation to crime prevention. When it comes to external validity, I contextualize my findings within the Ontario Community Safety and Well-being policy framework. In regards to internal validity, the number of participants is small since I am only doing five interviews due to time and the feasibility of this project.

The selected criminological theories of risk factors and social bonding were chosen based on etiological theories of crime prevention through social development that helped explain one of the main purposes of youth mentoring, which is an emotional and social relationship. However, this thesis did not look on other theories that could provide a broader lens to mentoring processes. The analysis of the literature also focused on youth mentoring that is happening in western democratic countries that are similar to Canada including the United Kingdom and the United States. Canada has limited evaluations and literature on the effectiveness of youth mentoring, so some of the conclusions from the U.S. or the United Kingdom may not be reflective of the social circumstances in Canada. Information was collected systematically, yet may not hold all of the available literature on the topic. Also, government reports and developments in CPSD were focused on implications for the Province of Ontario and no other locations in Canada.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the conceptual issues of the thesis to ensure the accuracy of terminology. It also talked about the literature collected and used throughout the thesis to compare previous studies. The literature review was useful since it looked at evidence-based youth mentoring research to analyze tested indicators on crime. My methodological tools using qualitative research were discussed to justify why I have chosen this process to gain an understanding of the experiences and implementation strategies of people working with Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based mentoring program. Lastly, the strengths/limitations of the study showed some of the justifications for why this study was performed.

Chapter 3: Contributions of Risk Factors and Social Bonding to Crime Prevention

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the empirical research and theories arising from life course and developmental criminology and the seminal work by Travis Hirschi on social bonding, which was first introduced in Hirschi's book *Causes of Delinquency* in 1969. It aims to answer the first research sub-question: Does evidence on risk factors for youth crime and social bonding theory help explain the contribution of youth mentoring in relation to crime prevention?

Mentoring programs focusing on crime reduction are often directed towards at-risk youth who are paired with an adult mentor to assist them in dealing with life challenges by receiving guidance and support to achieve their goals and desires (Spencer & Basualdo-Delmonico, 2014, p. 75). First in this chapter, the evidence on risk factors for youth crime is discussed to situate what youth mentoring programs might aim to address and how social bonds are an important protective factor to improve young people's well-being. Then, it will explain the four components of social bonding theory and outline some of the empirical support provided by Hirschi and other scholars about youth crime. Lastly, it will review the criticisms to advance the theory.

Risk Factors for Youth Crime

Risk factors are calculated as a scientific means to address youth who are identified as experiencing negative behavioural, psychological, and environmental factors, which increase their likelihood of engaging in criminal activity in the future (Schneider, 2015; Lab, 2010).

These vulnerabilities do not necessarily lead to criminality, but the more risk factors that occur in the life of a youth, the greater the chances of being involved in crime (Tanner-Smith et al., 2012; Weiler, Haddock, Zimmerman, Henry, Krafchick, & Youngblade 2015; Lab, 2010). These negative life experiences should be addressed through social support and not be used to further

stigmatize or manage disadvantaged individuals through punitive control (O'Malley, 2010). Protective factors, on the other hand, identify the assets within a youth's life that can positively impact their exposure to risk (Anderson, Beinart, Farrington, Langman, Sturgis, & Utting, 2005). Young people in high need are typically referred to social development programs, like mentoring, that can help reduce or rectify issues through enhancing their access to supports for their overall well-being (Farrington & Welsh, 2010; WHO, 2015).

Life-course and developmental criminology have proven correlations with later criminal behaviour through longitudinal studies, which followed same-age birth cohorts of children for over 50 years showing the multiple factors or life circumstances in early childhood that had impacts on later persistent offending (Farrington, 2003; 2015). Data was empirically collected at various points in the individual's life to understand the differences between offenders and non-offenders. Sampson & Laub (2005) stated that "the general organizing principle was that crime is more likely to occur when an individual's bond to society is attenuated" (p. 15). Some of the life experiences during development that correlated with increased tendencies towards criminal behaviour include negative family conditions, living in poverty, lack of education, behavioural problems in school, lack of social cohesion, substance misuse, and abuse (Wolfgang, Figlio & Thorsten, 1972; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Loeber & Farrington, 1998). A recent review of the Canadian longitudinal studies shows that young people who experience broken homes, poor peer relations, alternative forms of care, lack of jobs, drug and alcohol misuse, lack of education, and anti-social behaviour have a higher likelihood of later criminal behaviour in adulthood (Farrington, 2017). These individual risk factors are linked with crime indicators like arrests and self-reported data to determine probabilities, which have become the justification for targeted youth crime prevention and intervention programs.

Yessine's (2011) systematic literature review analyzed studies that looked at risk factors for delinquency of youth in Canada showing the individual, family, peer and school related issues that put individuals at a higher risk for problematic behaviours. Yessine (2011) looked at the "developmental trajectories of offending and risk identification, assessment and prediction" (par. 1) to determine which policies and practices could adequately respond to youth crime. Some of the individual factors include: hyperactivity leading to issues of concentration, symptoms of antisocial behaviour, risk taking, and substance use; family factors such as housing issues, poverty, lack of parenting, abuse in the home, relationship problems and incarcerated family members; peer related such as involvement in gangs, pressure to be involved in illegal activities; school related such as poor grades, behavioural problems in school, lack of focus, and dropping out; and community related such as social deprivation, lack of collective efficacy, disorganization, high-crime areas (Yessine, 2011; Hawkins, 1998; Shader, 2004; Foster, 2001). Although most of these factors are individualized, studies have shown these conclusions provide a useful tool to prevent further offending and stop negative life trajectories of vulnerable youth who face many layers of inequality (Lab, 2010).

It is important to see that these factors stem from a variety of systemic problems that are deeply entrenched in social, economic, political, and cultural contexts that continue to impact certain segments of the population disproportionately such as the poor and racialized (O'Mahony, 2009; Case, 2006; Case & Haines, 2007). Many of these young people are structurally disadvantaged by a system that has failed to help them reach their full potential and find meaningful opportunities in their lives (DuBois, 2002). Many of the risk factors above can be understood in a social-ecological model, which describes how societal systems play a role at various levels in the development of youth and how multiple factors can affect their socialization

process (Krug & Dahlberg, 2002; Cavell & Elledge, 2014; Centre for Disease Control and Prevention, 2015).

Risk factors have been the focus of crime prevention techniques because they are the “characteristics, variables, or hazards that, if present for a given individual, make it more likely that this individual, rather than someone selected from the general population, will develop a disorder” (Shader, 2004, p. 2). To be admitted into a youth mentoring program, individuals are likely to be experiencing some known risk factor that another agency has identified or diagnosed, such as having low socio-economic status, experiencing behavioural problems in the home or school, anti-social behaviour, living in single parent families or foster care, struggling with academics, lack of parental guidance, parental incarceration, mental health issues, and facing instances of abuse (National Institute of Justice, 2016; DuBois et al., 2011; Higley et al., 2014). According to Dolan & Brady (2012), “studies have shown that young people with less social support are at increased risk of problems and that social support contributes to better adjustment generally” (p. 13). The World Health Organization Ecological Framework has brought together the best available international knowledge outlining the identified risk factors at four levels that contribute to either becoming a victim or perpetrator of violence and some possible interventions as protective factors, which include:

1. Individual level factors are things that characterize an individual’s upbringing and biology, which contribute to their behaviour. Some examples of risk factors include psychological characteristics, substance misuse, and histories of violence. Possible interventions would aim to improve social skills and self-esteem (WHO, 2017; Krug & Dahlberg, 2002; Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

2. Relationship level is an individual's bond to family, friends, and loved ones. Some examples of risk factors include poor parenting, violence occurring in the home, low income, and delinquent peers. A preventative response would include parenting training through home visits, school mentoring, and violence prevention courses (WHO, 2017; Krug & Dahlberg, 2002; Bronfenbrenner, 1994).
3. Community level is the contexts in which our social relationships occur in such as schools, neighbourhoods, and workplaces. Some examples of risk factors in these circumstances include concentrated poverty, unemployment, high-crime area, high mobility, high density, lack of attachment to community and minimal social supports. Possible interventions would look to peer mediation, teacher management practices, and community empowerment (WHO, 2017; Krug & Dahlberg, 2002; Bronfenbrenner, 1994).
4. Societal level is the factors that either foster or reduce violence in a larger structural context. These are the "economic and social policies that maintain socioeconomic inequalities between people, the availability of weapons, and social and cultural norms such as those around male dominance over women, parental dominance over children and cultural norms that endorse violence as an acceptable method to resolve conflicts" (WHO, 2017, par. 2). Some ways of intervening include education on gender and economic inequality, altering norms supportive of violence, reducing the availability of firearms, and impunity (WHO, 2017; Krug & Dahlberg, 2002; Bronfenbrenner, 1994).

Youth also have assets in their life to mitigate the risk of engaging in crime, known as protective factors such as resiliency, self-efficacy, positive disposition, and intelligence. Social bonding is a protective factor because youth are highly influenced by the people and institutions in their milieu. Anderson et al. (2005) state that social bonding is a "stable, warm, affectionate

relationship with one or both parents; link with teachers and with other adults and peers who hold positive attitudes, and ‘model’ positive social behaviour” (p. 12). Therefore, mentors have the ability to establish social bonds with mentees in order to help address their needs (Welsh, 2007).

Mentoring can tackle some of these risk factors, particularly individual factors and school related, as youth will be paired with an older adult who can be a role model for behavioural and psychological change (Lerner, Napolitano, Boyd, Mueller, & Callina, 2014). It can also help young people increase their self-esteem and confidence through social support, which can lower their negative coping strategies. It has also been proven that parental relationships can be improved through community-based youth mentoring (Grossman & Resch, 2000). Howell (1995), states that “mentors behave in a supportive, nonjudgmental manner while acting as role models” (in Welsh, 2007, p. 172). Overall mentoring has the potential to lower the risk factors experienced by youth and can reduce the negative life experiences faced by disenfranchised youth by enhancing life skills, connecting them with an adult role model, and providing community supports (Farrington & Welsh, 2010; Weiler et al., 2015, p. 196; Chan & Henry, 2014). Youth mentoring can develop relationships between adults and mentees to guide pro-social thinking patterns, helping to negotiate with family structures and peers, connecting young people to other social services and health resources, and helping them with formal tasks such as homework or finding employment.

Social Bonding Theory

Social bonding theory is explored to help understand the process of relationship development in the mentoring programs and how strong informal social relations may lead individuals to be dissuaded from criminal activities or potentially prevented. Sociologist Travis Hirschi developed the social bonds theory in his 1969 book titled *Causes of Delinquency*

where he explored ‘why people did not engage in crime’ to understand how some people followed the law and various social institutions by conforming to conventional social order (Kempf-Leonard & Morris, 2012; Akers & Sellers, 2013).

Hirschi reinforced the belief that you need to tackle problematic behaviours early on in childhood, so that delinquent behaviour does not occur. Kempf-Leonard & Morris (2012) state that the theory has an “underlying view of human nature include[ing] the concept of free will, thereby giving offenders the capacity of choice, and responsibility for their behaviour” (p. 1). Hirschi’s theory advanced criminological research to think beyond punishment or incapacitation theory to deal with crime. He believed that humans would naturally want to deviate because humans are “animals capable of committing criminal acts” (Hirschi, 1969, p. 31). Therefore, society must put external mechanisms in place to keep people from wanting to deviate from the law and harm others. Hirschi utilized previous theories to substantiate and test his logic. He used Reiss (1981) and Nye’s (1958) internal and external controls, which focused on how without those mechanisms people could live reckless lives. Additionally, he used Sykes and Matza (1957) containment theory and techniques of neutralization to understand how individuals were deterred from crime (Petrocelli & Petrocelli, 2005).

Hirschi discusses the attributes of the social bonds that are formed between individuals and conventional society. His theory states that “delinquent acts result when an individual bond to society is weak or broken” (Hirschi, 1969, p. 16). The premise is that without some form of stable control and guidance in society, delinquency will be the result of limited connections and the inability to see how your actions harm people (victims) and relationships (Lilley, Cullen, & Ball, 2007, p. 220). This theory, empirically tested by a study in Oakland done by Hirschi (1969), showed the internalization was a “process for social norms being taken deeply into the

self and being a part of the personality structure” (p. 113). This means that during an individual’s socialization, they would follow closely with the values and morals instilled by their parents and the social institutions to avoid criminal behaviour.

The following elements contextualize how someone could commit a crime if they were detached from society, excluded, and did not conform to the tenets of the social contract (White, 2016). There are four elements to social bonds including attachment, commitment, involvement and belief:

1. Attachment is the emotional connection between a child and parent, which is described as a loving, caring, and supportive individual who can help youth develop throughout their life journey into adulthood (Hirschi, 2004). The process of socialization is key to success in life because people will be taught to be sensitive to the opinions of others. It is also about creating expectations to abide by certain norms to be accountable to parents, peers, and society as a whole (Hirschi, 1969, p. 18). Parents exercise affection and communication, schools focus on academic competence and attitudes, and peers are companionship (Hirschi, 1969). They are the people or institutions youth can trust and confide in when problems arise and in doing so, they can help you avoid illegal activities and those harmful to general well-being. Open communication is of vital importance for attachment and being sensitive to the interests of others (Tepperman, 2010, p. 13).
2. Commitment is about an individual’s connection to conventional norms and institutions. Particularly to their parents, schools, and peer figures and how that person remains crime free by being invested to conforming and thinking in a rational way that abides by social expectations (Hirschi, 1969). Individuals will control how they manage their temptations to engage in illegal activities, so they can have meaningful futures and know the negative

outcomes that will come with criminal behaviour. By being committed, youth have put in time and energy into conventional activities to hopefully get into higher education and employment in the future (Ozbay, 2006).

3. Involvement in conventional activities and hobbies that keep people occupied with various skills development. Being involved keeps the mind busy with work, school, recreation, and community involvement. The basic idea is that people are too busy and the person is occupied with less time to think about breaking the law (Hirschi, 1969; Hirschi, 2004). They are overly busy in a society that is based on production through involvement.
4. Belief in a legitimate societal order is the value system that goes into an individual's self-identity and how that influences them not to be involved in crime. These are the "impressions and opinions that are highly dependent on constant social reinforcement" (Lilley et al., 2007, p. 122). The morality is reinforcement through a social bond to conventional society that follows certain values and norms that are prevalent (Hirschi, 1969).

Social bonds make crime an expensive loss as it can cause for disappointment from social relationships, but also without any social ties individuals can lose self-control and establish more criminal opportunities (Schreck, 2002). Interestingly Hirschi points out some of the motivations around committing criminal acts "is much more likely that most people experience deviant impulses frequently- at least in fantasy, people are much more deviant than they appear" (Hirschi, 1969, p. 32). Meaning that any individual is capable of engaging in crime and it depends upon their bonds to the social world.

Empirical Support

The empirical support for social bonds theory has been applied differently in many studies and lacks consistency around how bonds are operationalized and tested (Kempf, 1993). In Hirschi's (1969) study, he took data from the Richmond Youth Project, which included 17,

500 students entering eleven public and senior high schools in fall 1964 from San Francisco, Oakland California (p. 35). He stratified through probability sample of 5,545 students and obtained data from school records, questionnaires, and police records (Hirschi & Selvin, 1967). His results showed that boys who had close ties to their fathers were less likely to commit a delinquency act (p. 97). Also the boys who had academic competence and motivation to attend school were less likely to be a delinquent (p. 120).

Krohn & Massey (1980) study looked at the effects of Hirschi's social bonds theory on the frequency of drug and alcohol use and measures of minor and serious delinquent behaviour with 3065 male and female adolescents. Using a self-reported questionnaire, they found that attachment to parents and peers, commitment to involvement, and attachment to institutions and belief in conventional norms are correlated with deviance, however account for less serious crime (p. 534). Additionally, they found that "the relationship between educational aspirations, career aspirations and attachment to friends is disappointing" concerning deviance (p. 534).

Junger-Tas (1992) tested Hirschi's social control theory with its impact on delinquent behaviour with a random sample of about 2000 juveniles aged 12 to 18 years old. The study was performed in The Hague and Venlo Netherlands using self-report, official data from police, and personal interviews. She concluded that the stronger the social integration, that being strong bonds to parents, institutions, and conventional norms, the lower the level of juvenile delinquency. This indicated that "when social conditions change, social behavior will also change" (Junger-Tas, 1992, p. 23). Particularly, school integration was determined to be the highest predictor of delinquency (Junger-Tas, 1992, p. 16). She also discovered that when juveniles come into contact with the criminal justice system, it does not have an effect on later

offending. The limitations of this study were it had three times as many males as females, working youth were underrepresented (ages 16 and 17), and the study did not have a pre-test.

A longitudinal study by Robert Agnew (1985) used panel data from a national survey of 1,886 adolescent boys from Michigan to test Hirschi's (1969) control theory on delinquency. Results showed that the link between social bonds and delinquency could only explain about 1-2% of the variance. This research gave some support for cross sectional studies, as longitudinal data were not highly correlated. The effects of Hirschi's study were retested by Greenberg (1999), which showed a weak strength of social control theory and delinquency.

Criticisms to advance the theory

One of the major criticisms of social bonding theory is that weak bonds to individuals and institutions can only partially explain youth offending. The theory neglects the lack of economic means or meaningful opportunities to reach goals that could be compelling certain behaviour and thinking. Kelley (1996) points out that Hirschi puts all people under one individualized category to establish a correlation between social bonds and delinquency, "even [when] the healthiest people in this culture have innocently lost much of their natural capacity for healthy psychological functioning" (p. 13). This means that not all youth can be categorized as healthy and not healthy based on social bonds, and that even a person who is considered healthy could be suffering psychological issues in the future that are beyond an individual's control or capacity to control. An example is mental health, which can affect a person's behaviours without treatment or intervention. Kempf (1993) reinforces this since the theory has incomplete pieces that have only tested structural relationships.

Another criticism is that Hirschi neglects any institutional explanations of crime and larger social structural issues that may be causing a lack of social bonds or involvement in crime, which causes for a responsabilization of societal problems being placed on the shoulders of

individual's (Lilly, Cullen, & Ball, 2015, p. 120). The bonds could be weak due to "changing gender roles, neighbourhood disorganization, enduring racial inequality, the deterioration of urban industrial economy [and others]" (Lilley et al., 2015, p. 120). Hirschi ignored issues of racial discrimination when he claimed that the data applied to Black Americans equally to white Americans, without substantial proof that his data was not implicitly biased. However, Hirschi does focus on the individual and the environmental factors that lead young people into delinquent behaviour and persist offending, yet leaves issues of power and control out of his analysis without questioning the state's ability to decide what is and is not defined as a crime (Garland, 1996; 2001). Or why the behaviour and thinking of young offenders are not further problematized before interventions.

In 1990 Michael Gottfredson and Travis Hirschi wrote the General Theory of Crime to incorporate better the fact that criminal behaviour and age are highly correlated. It was no longer that social bonds were the essential controls that prevented people from committing a crime, but it was the internal self-control that people exercise to control their desires to engage in criminal behaviour (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990). However, social bonds were seen as an important preventative measure. The theory states that the lack of self-control occurred when individuals were "impulsive, short-sighted, prone to risk taking and will seek every kind of immediate gratification that criminal behaviour provides" (Pratt, Gau, & Franklin, 2011, p. 66). The elements for people with low self-control are: "criminal acts provide immediate gratification of desire, are easy, exiting/risky/or thrilling, few long-term benefits, take little skill or planning, and resulted in pain or discomfort for victims" (Gottfredon & Hirschi, 1990, p. 89). Despite the revisions, the original theory provides a better way to understand the contribution mentoring provides to at-risk youth.

Social bonding theory provides evidence that improved relationships with parents and schools can decrease the likelihood of youth engaging in criminal behaviour. Youth mentors may be able to help in this capacity by improving the mentees relationships with parents by keeping them involved and actively engaging in prosocial activities to change attitudes. They can also keep the youth focused and occupied on staying in school and assisting them with emotional coping strategies. If you have a non-parental mentor who is taking the time, is patient, and tolerant they can form a strong social bond with mentees that is likely to impact their involvement in criminal behaviour. Mentoring should be accessible to anyone in high need, but focused on mitigating risk factors that are amendable through social support such as functioning in school, alcohol and drug misuse, and violence. However, demographic or societal risk factors cannot necessarily be affected by mentoring but practical assistance with access to education, job opportunities, and other training could increase mentees chances of success (UCL Jill Dando Institute, 2016).

Conclusion

This chapter concluded that certain risk factors are essential for crime prevention initiatives, like mentoring, to address the underlying issues that lead youth into engaging in crime. Life-course and developmental criminology have proven that negative outcomes during childhood such as family conditions, poverty, lack of education, behavioural problems in school, lack of social cohesion, substance misuse, and abuse are correlated with later criminal offending. The ecological model helps to show that issues within a young person's life are multidimensional through an individual, relationship, community, and societal level. Also how certain protective factors can improve the socialization of youth and social bonding being identified as one of them.

Travis Hirschi's (1969) social bonding theory was discussed to determine why people do not engage in crime. The components of social bonding theory (attachment, commitment, involvement and belief), the empirical support for social bonds and crime, and the criticisms reveal that weak bonds between young men and conventional parents and the school are connected with a higher likelihood of criminal behaviour. The theory may help to understand the contribution that youth mentoring can make in relation to crime prevention because programs focus on facilitating a bonding relationship between mentors to mentees. These may also help establish bonds with parents and schools.

Chapter 4: Effectiveness of Youth Mentoring Programs to Prevent Crime

Introduction

This chapter focuses on answering the second sub-question: Is there evidence that mentoring youth is effective in preventing crime? The question will be answered through a description of four programs that included youth mentoring for which there is evidence on their impact on indicators of crime. Most of the programs are community-based, which has been the primary format with promising results towards preventing crime (Welsh & Hoshi, 2006). The programs are Big Brother Big Sisters community-based mentoring program, Youth Inclusion program, Mentoring Plus, and Quantum Opportunities Program. It also outlines the types of mentoring relationships and best practices of an effective youth mentoring program. The explanations are primarily based on literature regarding the effectiveness of youth mentoring programs in the United States and the United Kingdom.

In the last 30 years, youth mentoring programs have been used as an intervention strategy to reduce crime (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2007; 2008; Waller, 2014; Ministry of Children and Youth Services, 2013). The youth mentoring programs intend to “positively impact a young person’s personal development in the holistic sense” (Schneider, 2015, p. 133). Each program has distinct characteristics and success rates.

With the breakdown of social ties in some deprived communities, “there may be a need to develop structured relationships through the use of volunteer mentors who aim to be the supportive, caring individuals who are lacking in the lives of at-risk youth” (Roots of Youth Violence, 2013, p. 1). Mentoring can be described as either a pre-crime prevention strategy that targets known risk factors or an intervention plan for juvenile offenders after they have come into contact with the criminal justice system (Cavell & Elledge, 2014; Chan & Henry, 2014). Certain aspects of mentoring can lead to positive, moderate, or even negative outcomes for youth

depending on the type of relationship that is established, the duration, and frequency of meetings between mentors and mentees, and the use of best practices during implementation that is based on outcomes from evaluation research (DuBois, 2002; McCord, 1992).

Selected Youth Mentoring Programs and Evaluation Results

Big Brothers Big Sisters of American (Community-Based)

The first program is the Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS) program, which is a not-for-profit organization with a mandate to “facilitate life-changing relationships that inspire and empower children and youth to reach their potential both as individuals and citizens” (BBBS Ottawa, 2016, par. 1). The organization has a long history of helping at-risk boys and girls living in single parent households and low-income neighbourhoods. The primary objective is to connect youth between the ages of 6 to 18 with a non-parent adult mentor in afterschool programs, school-based programs, and community-based programs (Herrera, Grossman, Kauh & McMaken, 2011; National Institute of Justice, 2016). The movement all began in 1904 with Ernest Coulter, a court clerk in New York City, who was tired of seeing a number of young boys being prosecuted through his courtroom. He believed that connecting young men with a caring adult could keep them out of trouble and improve their quality of life through caring relationships. This led to the creation of the Big Brothers organization starting with only 39 volunteers in New York City (BBBS, 2016). In 1912, the Ladies of Charity later known as the Catholic Big Sisters was also connecting young girls with adult mentors through the New York Children’s court to help reach their full potential through mentorship. Both organizations joined together in 1977 and created a global movement for mentoring with each organization having its unique history.

Various mentoring formats work towards reducing instances of inequality for youth “through novel opportunities and increased social capital” (Albright, Hurd, & Hussain, 2017, p.

363). The most important function of the BBBS program is the mentoring relationship that takes place between mentors and mentees in a structured environment. The mentors are usually older youth or adults who go through defined screening procedures before volunteering that is determined by national standards. They are also asked to commit to a minimum of one year so that strong relationships can be formed and be maintained long-term (Tolan, Henry, Schoeny, & Bass, 2008). The overall goal of the programs offered by BBBS is to give youth more opportunities by helping them stay committed to school, avoiding criminal activities by establishing strong social bonds, having a trusting relationship with an adult, getting involved in the community by volunteering, and assisting in job prospects for the future (BBBS, 2016; Waller, 2006). BBBS attempts to be the social assistant by intervening in the lives of at-risk youth who are experiencing adverse life circumstances.

The community-based Big Brothers Big Sisters mentoring program has been proven to be effective with the results of a randomized design and multivariate analysis in 1995 by Public/Private Ventures research organization (Tierney, Grossman, & Resch, 1995). The community-based youth mentoring program takes place in cities where activities are more open to negotiation between the mentor and mentee. The main focus is on relationship development, guidance, and support.

The data was collected from eight BBBS sites in the United States from 1991 through 1993, with a total of 959 boys and girls that were randomly assigned into the experimental group – in the program or control group – on a waiting list (Tierney et al., 1995). The individuals in these program sites were between the ages 10-16 years old mostly from single parent families, living in poverty, and had histories of family violence and substance abuse (Tierney et al., 2000). About 56% of the group was from a minority population, but all the youth were “high risk for

exposure to violence and trauma in the community” (National Institute of Justice, 2011). In regards to the background of the mentors, they were three-quarters white and were educated young professionals. This is something to be cautious of when thinking about the privilege and power of the mentors who have different life experiences than disadvantaged youth based on race, class, and ethnicity (Albright, Hurd, & Hussain, 2017).

The survey results collected after 18 months showed that the intervention group reduced their likelihood of hitting another person by 32 percent in the previous 12 months, were 46 percent less likely to start using drugs (70 percent less likely for minority groups) and 27 percent less likely to start using alcohol during the study period, and 30 percent less likely to skip school (Grossman & Tierney, 1998; Tierney, Grossman, & Resch, 2000). The mentees in the program also had more confidence in school abilities, higher grades, and improved relations with parents and peers with higher levels of trust (Tierney et al., 2000). In regards to crime prevention, the goal was to “support the development of healthy youth by addressing their need for positive adult contact, thereby reducing risk factors for negative behaviour and enhancing protective factors for positive behaviour” (National Institute of Justice, 2011, par. 1). Also by lowering violence of individuals who are mentored will lower their likelihood of being arrested and harming future victims. These results cannot necessarily be inferred to other geographical locations or for other programs, but have helped to lobby support for further evaluations and the mentoring movement since it showed that positive results are possible. The program also lacks a replication or longitudinal study to show if results lasted or faded away with time, and what particular program features or theories led to the successful results. BBBS community-based mentoring “focuses on meeting the needs of communities that are facing hardship by helping youth withstand the many negative effects of adversity” (National Institute of Justice, 2016, par.

2). All mentors involved in the program are volunteers, but are supported by professional staff. Mentors and youth meet about three to four times a month for at least three hours over the span of at least one year, but usually much longer for best results (Welsh & Farrington, 2010, p. 20). Mentors engage in agreed upon activities with the youth (such as sports, movies, shopping, homework help, and eating at a restaurant) and are monitored throughout the match by a case manager to ensure the relationship is progressing well. BBBS community-based mentoring methods exercised by the mentors are relatively unknown and fluid to change depending on the mentor and mentees interests, which is one of the gaps this research attempts to answer so that other mentoring strategies can be reflective on what works and aware of unintended consequences that are detrimental to the health of youth. Table 1 shows the components of the program, the overall purpose, the definition of mentoring and the impact on risk factors for crime.

Table 1: Big Brothers Big Sisters of America Community-Based Mentoring

Components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteer-based with some paid staff • One-to-one formal mentoring relationship between an adult and youth in the community • Focused on healthy relationship development, support, guidance, and role modeling through activities • Intensive organizational infrastructure to improve well-being of the youth
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Support the development of healthy youths by addressing their need for positive adult contact, thereby reducing negative behaviour and enhancing protective factors for positive behaviour” (National Institute of Justice, 2011, par. 2) • “BBBS mentoring is designed to promote emotional support, positive social skills, feelings of safety and security, academic skills, and more positive relationships with family and peers” (Child Trends, 2011, par. 1)
The Definition of Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Mentoring is undiluted social intervention: connecting two strangers of different age groups, supporting and monitoring their relationships through the medium of an

	organization created for and dedicated to making those relationships work” (Tierney et al., 2000, p. 2)
Impact on Risk Factors for Crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mentored youth were: 46% less likely to start using drugs during the study (18 months) – minorities were 70% less likely; • 27% less likely to start using alcohol during the study • 32% less likely to have hit someone else in the previous 12 months (Assaults are a crime)

In 2007, there was a study on the feasibility of a randomized control trial for evaluating the effectiveness of BBBS community match program at the national level in Canada, which involved 2 agencies with 71 families and 30 mentors through interviews and questionnaires with children and parents about behaviour and psychosocial outcomes (De Wit, Lipman, Manzano-Munguia, Bisanz, Graham, Offord, O’Neill, Pepler, & Shaver, 2007, p. 383). Results after a 12 month follow-up showed positive findings based on child self-reports that youth had improved emotions, improved social anxiety, teacher social support, and social skills involving self-control (De Wit et al., 2007, p. 395). However, its validity is weak since conditions were not controlled. The study proved that a random control trial was feasible, although individuals on the waiting lists would be missing out on having a mentor, which displays an ethical concern.

The social return on investment is high for this type of mentoring, particularly due to the voluntary nature of the practice and the overall benefit it has for society economically. According to the Boston Consulting Group (2013) study on Big Brothers Big Sisters, for every dollar invested, society gets an \$18 return on a net present value basis (p. 1). The total was even more for economically deprived mentees with a \$23 return. The study (2013) analyzed 500 former ‘littles’ boys and girls to determine what their current financial status was compared to a control group who had not been matched with a mentor in the past. Results concluded that the youth who had a mentor made \$315, 000 more on average as an adult.

Youth Inclusion Program (UK)

Another proven program is the Youth Inclusion Program (YIP), which was developed in the United Kingdom through the implementation of the Youth Justice Board in 1998 with the passing of the Crime and Disorder Act. The board was responsible for reducing youth crime in England and Wales through a national strategy by using practical and positive programs and practices (Gov.UK, 2016). The board worked towards addressing offending behaviour to reduce the number of youth slipping into the criminal justice system.

England and Wales set up the YIP in 2000 by targeting at-risk youth between the ages of 13 to 16 living in troubled neighbourhoods with an initial 11 programs in 2001, which grew to 72 programs by 2006 due to its success and strong public support (Waller, 2014; Smith, 2006). The program was unique because it gave an individualized approach that was focused on the needs of the youth through a structured plan, meaning it was not blaming or stigmatizing youth who grew up in deprived social circumstances and was focused on the underlying causes that were leading to involvement in violent and property crime- street crime (Smith, 2006, p. 94). The program involved the parents to ensure the home environment was supportive of the key tenets of the program. It also focused on the needs of the community by looking to impact high-crime neighbourhoods, which were experiencing poverty, family breakdown, lack of social cohesion, and high levels of unemployment. Only the 50 most at-risk youth were the prime focus of each program, which was determined based on school and police records, but it was open to all youth in the disadvantaged areas to participate in general activities (Burrows, 2008). The aim of the YIP was initially about reintegrating “young people at risk of offending, truancy, and school or social exclusion” back into the conventional social order and later to “reduce youth crime within the neighbourhood” (Burrows, 2008, p. 4). They also wanted to deal with the social problems in

the United Kingdom by moving away from pure punishment, to a focus on prevention to invest in people and reduce the costs of criminal justice responses.

The YIP had various components by offering an average of 10 hours of activities per week. One of the program components included mentoring to ensure youth were in frequent and constant contact with an adult figure, who could be a role model and help them stay on track with their individualized action plans (Burrows, 2003). Mentoring was defined as an intervention that “seek[s] to offer support and positive role modeling for young people” (Burrows, Mackie, & Hubbard, 2008, p. 94). Other components of the positive programming included sports and recreation “family projects, education and training, health and drug education, arts and cultural activities, and environmental activities” (Linden, 2011, p. 67). Interestingly these programs had firm targets to be met, one being an adequate dosage and being driven to have reductions in youth crime by offering a multitude of services and supports (Burrows, 2003). The program was ran by paid staff and was operated and established by the Youth Offending team to ensure that there was consistency, trust, and that strategic plans could be followed collaboratively (Burrows, 2008, p. 4). The staff was trained and had a background working with at-risk youth in a community setting.

The first evaluation of phase one of the project was an experimental before and after study, which tested the number of arrests and the school records for the 50 core members. These members were youth between the ages of 13-16 who were determined as high-risk by the local school and police services, and were living in high-crime neighbourhoods. Results showed that the program reduced arrest rates overall by 65% for the top 50 youth, 44% of those who were not engaged had a 44% decrease in offending, 60% of the top 50 were not re-arrested, 29% increase in authorized absence-while there was a 51% increase in unauthorized absences, and a 12%

reduction in temporary exclusions and 27% reduction in permanent exclusions (which is where youth are suspended from school for behavioural issues) (Burrows, 2003, p. 10). Some of the overall crime trends in the neighbourhoods showed that in the first year crime increased by 3.6% in 59 project neighbourhoods, while in the second year crime in the 57 neighbourhoods rose by 7.9%. These results regarding the overall crime rates must be taken with caution as it is hard to know if the programs led to an overall impact or if it was a general trend in the reported crime in the area. The evaluation is promising; however, it did not have a control group to compare results and therefore must be interpreted with caution due to issues of internal validity.

Phase two of the program went from April 2003 to April 2006, which did a random control trial determining that it contributed to a 66.5% reduction in arrest rates for the 50 core members. Although it is unclear how much of this reduction was due to mentoring it is evident that it helped youth with life skills and training (Burrows, 2008, p. 8). Other programs could benefit from the core tenets of the YIPs and its focus on set crime reduction targets. Table 2 shows the components of the program, the purpose, definition of mentoring, and impacts on crime.

Table 2: Youth Inclusion Program (UK)

Components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid staff • One-to-one and group mentoring • Focused on 50 core members at high risk for criminal activity • Mentoring just one component • Crime reduction focus with set targets
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A strategy to deal with youth crime in England and Wales by engaging youth in constructive activities to prevent offending and re-offending
Definition of Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “These interventions seek to offer support and positive role modeling for young people” (Burrows et al., 2006, p. 94)
Impact on Crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 65% reduction in arrests for top 50 core members who were engaged in the program since it began (phase 1) • 44% of the top 50 not engaged had a decrease

	in offending (phase 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 66.5% reduction in arrest rates for the 50 core members (phase 2)
--	--

The YIP was eventually replicated in Atlantic Canada in 2010 and evaluated with funding from the National Crime Prevention Centre. The intention of the evaluation was to see how the program would be effective in other socio-cultural contexts. The main aim of the program was to “reduce youth crime and anti-social behaviour by creating a safe place where youth can learn new skills, take part in activities with others, and receive educational support” (Gagnon & Duncan, 2014, p. 1). The Canadian version followed the original tenets of the YIPs by focusing on the 50 most high-risk youth from ages 11 to 20, which were living in high-crime areas. Youth would get an average of 5-10 hours a week of support. The program activities had multiple components that would occur in either individual or group settings such as “life skills/training, mentoring and tutoring, outings, and youth and parent/guardian activities” (Laliberté, 2013, p. 1). The YIPs would also connect the young people with outside community resources to ensure they had all of their needs met simultaneously. Mainstream services were able to provide more professional and acute care such as counselling, medical, mental health and others. The multi-site impact evaluation from August 2010 to March 2014 analyzed data from three project sites including, Northside in North Sydney (79 participants) and Seeds of Change (60 youth participants) in Spryfield, Nova Scotia and ONE Change (119 participants) in St. John, New Brunswick (2013, p. 1). Due to the small sample size and feasibility, the evaluation was done through a single-group repeated-measure design with a pre, during and post-test. Data was collected from risk assessment tools used by staff in the program and officially recorded police data and school records (2015). The follow-up was done at one and two years post-intervention, with an additional qualitative component of 83 semi-structured interviews with 38 people.

The outcome evaluation showed that on average “67% of all participants decrease their total risk factors between the pre and post-program” (Gagnon & Duncan, 2014, p. 6). Findings showed improvements in life skill (53%), thinking and behaviour (49%), school and education (48%), and family and personal relationships (46%) for the youth. All the sites reduced the number of times youth skipped school by 27% from start and end of the comparison period (Gagnon & Duncan, 2014). Specific sites also had favourable results on grades, absenteeism, and suspensions. There was a reduction of suspected/charged criminal incidents according to police records. At the Seeds of Change site 50% of the youth saw a reduction two years after the program; Northside site 60% after the program and 59% two years after the program; and ONE Change site saw an increase of 63% one year after the program (Gagnon & Duncan, 2014, p. 8-9). All of the results must be taken with caution as the evaluators said they had issues of internal validity including selection bias of people who would participate in the study and attrition rates.

Mentoring Plus

Mentoring plus was a program in England United Kingdom that focused on helping disaffected youth in communities by providing mentoring relationships with local community members (Shiner, Young, Newburn, & Groben, 2004). The program had ten projects being evaluated in England that were volunteer based and focused on creating healthy relationships between mentors and mentees, but was also focused on meeting targets to reduce youth crime by focusing on individuals experiencing at-risk behaviours. The program was run by Crime concern, which was a voluntary charity organization in England that focused on solutions to reduce crime through policy and action (Gilling, 1997). The overall goal of the program was to help “at-risk young people back into education, training and employment, and enabling community members to get involved in solving community problems through volunteering” (Shiner, Young, Newburn, & Groben, 2004, p. 1). The program paired mentors and mentees one-to-one in the community

and engaged in a plus element by having them in employment and education courses for skills building, but also had some social events with other groups. The program ran for about 10 to 12 months with some periods of intense programming, particularly at the beginning with the residential weekends where mentors and mentees would meet with other groups. Most of the young people found the mentoring very helpful (37%) or fairly helpful (33%), and for the education and training, they thought it was very helpful (45%) or fairly helpful (33%). This showed that the focus on education and work was what they assessed as most important compared to a focus on reducing the offending behaviour.

The evidence from the evaluation of mentoring plus was collected using a longitudinal survey from July 2000 to September 2003 with 378 in the experimental group and 172 in the control group. The reason for the small control group was due to feasibility and being unable to follow-up with some members of the study. The first follow-up survey was answered by 188 respondents in the mentoring cohort and 102 for the second survey, but for the comparison group only 56 responded to the first survey and none for the second (Shiner, Young, Newburn, & Groben, 2004). This poses an issue of internal validity with the lack of comparison to an equal sample for the control group. Information was also collected through qualitative interviews with the mentees, mentors, project workers, and referral agents and observation from the research team of about 150 project sessions.

Youth in the sample were between the ages of 15 to 19 years old, the majority being male, mostly white and black African/Caribbean, adverse family breakdown, and school problems. They were determined to be high-risk as about 93% of them had committed an offence at some point, and 85% had done so during in the previous 12 months. The questionnaire was distributed three times including when they joined, when the program ended, and six months

follow-up. To improve understanding of the results, the researchers also did in depth interviews with 100 of the individuals in the program (Shiner et al., 2004).

The evaluation had mixed results as it showed there was an 11% increase in offending from the previous 12 months, persistent offending dropped by 21%, reports of violence fell by 27%, criminal damage dropped by 12% and carrying weapons to attack someone dropped by 60% (Shiner, Young, Newburn, & Groben, 2004, p. 62). It also showed that the program was able to recruit some of the most disaffected young people in communities with most of them experiencing family troubles, skipping school and dropping out, offending, using drugs, and coming into contact with the justice system. About 57% of the young people recruited were engaged in the program on a monthly basis and found that the mentoring element was crucial to their education and work success. The impact on education, training and work was with an increase in engagement from 49% at the beginning of the program to 63% at the end (Newburn & Shiner, 2005). Table 3 shows the components of the program, purpose, the definition of mentoring, and the impact on crime.

Table 3: Mentoring Plus

Components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volunteer-based with some paid staff • One-to-one formal mentoring • Aimed at skills building and dealing with exclusion of youth • Youth crime reduction focus
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The programs aim to reduce youth crime and at risk behaviour, helping at-risk young people back into education, training and employment, and enabling community members to get involved in solving community problems through volunteering” (Shiner, Young, Newburn & Groben, 2004, p. 1)
Definition of Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Mentoring generally involves establishing relationships between two people with the aim of providing role models who will offer advice and guidance in a way that will empower both parties (NewBurn & Shiner, 2005, p. 1)
Impact on Crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11% increase in offending from the previous 12

	<p>months</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent offending dropped by 21% • Reports of violence fell by 27% • Criminal damage dropped by 12% • Carrying weapons to attack someone dropped by 60%
--	---

One of the issues with mentoring plus was that it did not have a well-established theory for mentoring or a particular focus on the process of mentoring. The evaluation did discuss a three-stage process that helps conceptualize the progress within mentoring relationships, but showed that most of the matches did not improve as fast as expected due to it taking time for young people to trust their mentors and learn about them. The three stages were the basic cycle, the problem-solving cycle, and the action-oriented cycle. The basic cycle was merely the young people meeting with the mentor and doing activities. Movement into the next stage of helping the youth problem solve through guidance usually occurred after a crisis arose and the mentor had to respond adequately. The last stage was the ideal mentoring relationship that was action oriented with a plan and set goals in hopes of achieving those (Shiner et al., 2004). Another issue was that the program implementation had flaws with a lack of funding for the program to remain fully functional and employees had temporary work contracts, so staff turnover rates were high.

Quantum Opportunities Program

The Quantum Opportunities Program, on the other hand, focused on improving high school grades, graduation levels, and improving life skills through close mentorship in schools. The program was first determined as effective during its operation from July 1995 till September 2001 by the U.S. Department of Labor and the Ford Foundation, as an “after-school program providing case management and mentoring, supplemental education, developmental activities, community service activities, support services, and financial incentives” (Schirm, Stuart, & McKie, 2006, p. vii). The study was based in seven U.S. sites and randomly selected 1, 200 students in grade 9 with 580 in experimental and 489 control. Results from 2003 showed that

students in the quantum program were more likely (46 percent) to graduate high school versus of control (40 percent) and more likely (32 percent) to attend post-secondary education or jobs training versus the control group (26 percent) (Schirm et al., 2003; Promising Practices Network, 2010). This program also targeted the youth experiencing problems in school with low grades with the ultimate goal to decrease dropout rates and having more youth enrolling into post-secondary education and jobs (Schirm, Stuart, & McKie, 2006).

Most recently, a replication study took the core tenets of the program and saw substantial improvements in youth development through one-to-one and group mentoring. The Eisenhower Quantum Program ran a school/community-based program that recruited youth in grade 9 and paired them with an adult mentor in the school over a four-year period. The program targeted high-risk young people living in inner-city neighbourhoods and got them connected with an adult role model educated with a college degree and with experience dealing with youth (National Institute of Justice, 2016). Each student “was provided with 180 hours of academic support (adult tutoring, peer-assisted tutoring, homework assistance), 50 hours of service activities (participating in community service projects, civic activities, volunteering), and 180 hours of development activities (acquiring life/family skills, planning for college and jobs)” (Blueprints, 2016, p. 2). Results from Curtis & Bandy (2016) using a random control trial with 300 youth between 2009 to 2014 from Albuquerque, Boston, New Bedford, Milwaukee, and Baltimore showed that grades for the experimental group improved with a 2.33 grade point average versus the control groups 1.76 grade point average, graduation rates were higher 76 percent versus 40 percent, and the acceptance rates for post-secondary was higher. Table 4 shows the components, purpose, the definition of mentoring, and the impact on risk factors of crime.

Table 4: Quantum Opportunities Program

Components	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paid staff • Mentoring a component of the program (Individual and group) • Different variations adopted • Improving overall well-being of youth
Purpose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “After-school program providing case management and mentoring, supplemental education, developmental activities, community service activities, support services, and financial incentives” (Schirm, Stuart, & McKie, 2006, p. vii)
Definition of Mentoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having a relationship with caring adults and peer groups
Impact on Risk Factors of Crime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More likely to graduate high school • More likely to attend post-secondary education or job training

Mentoring Relationships

The above mentoring programs determine which type of relationship will take place between mentors and mentees by offering a variety of formats such as one-to-one, group, and peer mentoring (National Institute of Justice, 2016; Ministry of Children and Youth Services, 2013). One-to-one mentoring and peer mentoring occur between two people in a private relationship, whereas group mentoring has many adults and peers interacting at one time. In each format, bonds will develop in a variety of different ways that can be individually focused or standardized to give the same treatment to a large group of mentees (Rhodes & Lowe, 2008). These relationships take place in specific locations such as schools, communities, workplaces, churches, and online (DuBois & Rhodes, 2006). Most mentoring programs tend to focus on general risk factors and interventions to deal with behavioural problems, poor grades, truancy, violence, and alcohol/drug misuse (Welsh & Hoshi, 2002). Some authors discussed the importance of providing youth with an individualized response using holistic strategies that can deal with the needs of the youth and the various circumstances they face through other social systems (Keller, 2005; Lakind et al., 2015). It is important to “respond to each child’s needs,

strengths, and interests” (Lakind et al., 2015, p. 52) versus focusing on their deficiencies because the purpose of mentoring is to improve self-worth and coping mechanisms.

It is evident that relationships are built on strong moral support and positive reinforcement through role modeling socially acceptable behaviours (Keller, 2005; Butera, 2014). Higley et al. (2014) state that in the 4Results-mentoring program¹ in Vancouver Washington State, mentors focused on the assets of the youth versus trying to fix youth by focusing on their deficits. In an effort to empower change, the program determined that youth needed to feel comfortable and “achieve a balance of unconditional acceptance and promotion of pro-social values through mentor modeling” (Higley et al., 2014, p. 243; Foster, 2001). The mentors in the 4Results-mentoring were trained in attachment theory to ensure they focused on setting goals with mentees collaboratively to impact connections. Rhodes (2002) model of mentoring talked about “a trusting, empathetic, and mutual relationship” (in Spencer, 2012, p. 303) that was open and transparent to the developing minds of the youth. This means that being youth centered is necessary to be able to develop a lasting relationship based on trust.

Additionally, mentoring programs can prevent crime and enrich the lives of young people by providing them with a caring role model who can assist in developing skills, building trust, sense of belonging, and improving competency (Jones-Brown & Henriques, 2001; Herrera et al., 2011). It is important that the relationship does not cause harm and has positive outcomes through “close, consistent, and enduring” techniques (Rhodes & DuBois, 2006). Relationships are highly dependent on maintaining commitment between mentors and mentees to ensure that promises are kept and emotional bonds are fostered (Gettings & Wilson, 2014; Grossman & Rhodes, 2002).

¹ 4Results mentoring is a one-to-one community-based volunteer organization that matches adult mentors with vulnerable children between the ages of 7 and 18 in Clark County, Washington.

To ensure effectiveness, relationship bonds and trust need to be established over a significant period of time, because if the duration is cut shorter than 6 months it can have negative consequences on the youth with feelings of abandonment, rejection, and low self-esteem (DuBois & Rhodes, 2006; Higley et al., 2014; Grossman & Rhodes, 2002, Deutsch & Spencer, 2009; Britner et al., 2006). To rectify this concern, volunteers are asked to commit to at least one year of service with the youth and to continue the relationship for as long as possible, in an effort to avoid unintended negative consequences that could lead to further psychological problems (Gettings & Wilson, 2014; DuBois, Holloway, Valentine & Cooper, 2002, Rhodes, Liang & Spencer, 2009). They also have to be willing to meet frequently throughout the month to help foster a strong relationship and have open communication to help youth cope with daily challenges (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009). A mentor's availability assists in reducing harmful and risky behaviours that the youth would otherwise be engaging in (Foster, 2001). Rhodes (2002) proposed a model for how this emotional bond can influence mentees "developmental outcomes by (1) enhancing social skills and emotional well-being, (2) improving cognitive skills through dialogue, and (3) serving as a role model and advocate" (in Britner, Balcazar, Blechman, Blinn-Pike, & Larose, 2006, p. 750). Despite the possible positive outcomes, some relationships can have damaging consequences due to "lack of program structure, lack of training and supervisor for mentors, commitment" (Jekielek, Moore, Hair, & Scarupa, 2002, p. 6). There is a gap in this information as the process of mentoring strategies is relatively unknown between the program objectives and practical application that mentors establish to effect change (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009; Keating, Tomishima, Foster, & Alessanri, 2002). This is even more apparent when looking at youth mentoring as a pre-crime prevention strategy, as certain practices are necessary for it to

affect problematic thinking and behavioural patterns that lead to a higher probability of involvement in crime.

Best Practices of an Effective Youth Mentoring Program

Best practices for youth mentoring programs are distinct and require a significant amount of time, investment, strategic planning, implementation, and outcome evaluations. According to DuBois et al. (2002) mentoring is “one of the most commonly-used interventions to prevent, divert, and remediate youth engaged in, or thought to be at risk for, delinquent behaviour, school failure, aggression, or other anti-social behaviour” (in Tolan, Henry, Schoeny, & Bass, 2008, p. 2). A systematic analysis of the evidence was completed in 2011 by DuBois, Portillo, Rhodes, Silverthorn, & Valentine to determine the effectiveness of mentoring programs for youth. They looked at 73 independent evaluations of mentoring programs from 1999-2010 to determine that programs are most effective when:

“Participating youth have either had pre-existing difficulties or been exposed to significant levels of environmental risks; evaluation samples have included greater proportion of male youth; there has been a good fit between the educational or occupational backgrounds of mentors and the goals of the program; mentors and youth have been paired based on similarity of interests; and programs have been structured to support mentors in assuming teaching or advocacy roles with youth” (DuBois, Rhodes, Silverthorn, & Valentine, 2011, p. 60)

These results show that mentoring programs need to be structured in a way that they can have large impacts on vulnerable young people by providing adequate support and resources in determined areas of need. This includes reaching out to the most disadvantaged youth in communities so that they can equally access the social supports offered by mentoring programs (Jekielek et al., 2002). It is equally important to recruit mentors that are best suited for the objectives of the mentoring organization. Additionally the mentors should be provided with enough resources be able to help youth through education and advocacy.

Another critical component to discuss in mentoring is the involvement of parents in the process, as they are the first role models a youth has been socialized to respond to and the foundation of their social being (DuBois et al., 2002; Rhodes, Grossman, & Resch, 2000). Receiving the help of parents to support the youth mentoring relationship has shown to assist in youth developing the trust of the mentor and ensuring goals are sought with the approval of parents (Cavell, DuBois, Karcher, Keller & Rhodes, 2009, p. 1). Family supports are essential because they are usually involved in the youth's daily environment and have a meaningful role in their socialization (Spencer & Basualdo-Delmonico, 2014; Cavell et al., 2009). Moreover, for some cultures it is necessary to include the family so that further support is provided to all aspects of the youth's social system (Farruggia, Bullen, Solomon, Collins, & Dunphy, 2011). For example, parents may need some coaching and help in supporting and improving their relationship with their children. Formal mentoring programs have tended to call mentors pseudo parents, however for the relationship to flourish the mentors should be considered more like a friend to the mentees with set boundaries (White, 2014; Butera, 2014). However, mentoring is not to be used as a replacement for parenting children.

Another component is to ensure that mentors are security screened and go through a lengthy training process, so that all people understand the social circumstances youth come from, as well as how to respond to their challenges (Deutsch & Spencer, 2009). Many organizations will do multiple interviews, police background checks, and matching processes to determine an appropriate fit between youth and mentors (Miller, Barnes, Miller, & McKinnon, 2013). Even having case managers to assist with supporting the relationships can help in mitigating any issues that may arise such as disputes on times to meet, activities, discussions, and overall morale. They can also contact parents, youth, and mentors to see how the relationship is progressing and offer

any needed support and advice (DuBois & Rhodes, 2006; Blueprints, 2016). During the implementation, mentors should go through extensive training so that they can learn skills on relationship development through proven techniques and be sensitive to other views, perspectives, and systematic injustices mentees may be experiencing in their lives (Rhodes, Liang, & Spencer, 2009). One way to make sure mentors are an adequate candidate for the mentoring position is by screening to see if the person has a sustainable income, housing, stable relationships, and the type of career they have (Grossman & Tierney, 1998).

The study by Higley et al. (2014) showed that the 4Results Mentoring program in Vancouver, Washington State did 20 hours of training for mentors to learn about “relationship development strategies, including the following topics: relationship stages, active listening, empathy, healthy boundaries, emotional health, self-awareness, differentiation, fostering inner discipline, and empowerment and elements of motivational interviewing” (p. 244). This played a significant role in retaining mentors (98% stayed for at least a year and the average was 3.7 years) and making sure mentors felt confident in their roles and the expectations of them by the organization (Higley et al., 2014).

Matching mentors and mentees based on gender, race, ethnicity, and mutual interest is also an important component to consider, so that they can connect and interact with open understanding (DuBois & Rhodes, 2006; Calhoun, 2016). There are certain things that some adults will not understand if they are not a part of a certain culture and are not educated on the historical contexts that shaped the current circumstances their mentee is facing (DuBois et al., 2002; Darling, Bogat, Cavell, Murphy, & Sanchez, 2006). It is important for adult mentors to be culturally sensitive and being open to all other perspectives, rather than having pre-conceived judgments (Keating et al., 2002). When recruiting mentors, organizations should ensure they

have a variety of backgrounds so that youth can be matched with a suitable role model they will be able to get along with and develop strong pro-social relationships with (White, 2014; Darling et al., 2006). Most relationships in formal one-to one youth mentoring programs are of the same gender to ensure that ways of learning and psychological needs are met holistically (Spencer & Liang, 2009; DuBois & Rhodes, 2006). Foster (2011) outlined some of the needs, which include “safe places and activities, health and mental health, marketable skills, and opportunities for service and civic participation” (p. 2). These needs could be improved with an adult mentor and assist in getting to the root causes of youth violence and misbehaviours by addressing the associated risk factors (Calhoun, 2016).

Mentoring should also be a component of a larger prevention or intervention scheme to help with a variety of needs and wants of youth by combining services to address education, healthcare and employment (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2007; 2008; DuBois et al., 2002). To establish quality youth mentoring programs, they need to be able to address personal, academic, and career goals through a structured format (Britner et al., 2006; Grossman & Carry, 1997). As discussed above with the youth inclusion programs, education and mentoring is only a small component of a wider program that focuses on team building and sports. This can help to improve the lives of youth in multiple ways and not try to use a single program with a one size fits all mentality to fix the problems. Additionally, it moves away from seeking individualized answers to why crime occurs and addresses the systemic injustices that contribute to these behavioural manifestations (Knepper, 2007; Case, 2006).

Deutsch & Spencer (2009) discuss the approach mentors use to engage and respond to youth when developing the terms of their relationship. The goals are either determined together with the youth at the beginning of the program through a developmental approach, or if mentors

believe they know what is best, they try to take the role of an expert with a prescriptive approach. Mentors that follow a prescriptive approach in their relationship with mentees has shown to be highly problematic and ineffective in empowering youth to change their thinking and behaviour (Morrows & Styles, 1995). Allowing the youth to be a contributing member of the relationship and developing goals collectively can help youth feel involved and motivated to seek out new opportunities and openly disclose things to their mentor (Darling et al., 2006; Spencer, 2012). It will also help the tenets of the relationship to have lasting effects as the youth will have conceptualized the modes of thought themselves and be internally driven to remain crime-free.

In addition, if the program is poorly lead and improperly implemented, they can further stigmatized youth (Piper & Piper, 2000). The programs usually rely on volunteers to take time out of their week to dedicate it to assisting their mentee. A qualitative study by Lakind, Eddy & Zell (2014) researched the perspective of professional mentors who “described the importance of professionalism in prioritizing mentoring, expending considerable effort, and performing difficult or unpleasant tasks” (p. 705). Mentors are important to help high-risk youth living in difficult social positions; however it is still relatively unknown what the process is for mentors to be the essential ingredient for youth to be dissuaded from engaging in criminal activity. Having paid employees was one of the proposed solutions by professionalizing mentoring and making people more accountable and focused on directives (Lankind et al., 2014). This project seeks to assist in addressing the lack of consistency in best practices and what mentors in communities should be doing.

Jolliffe & Farrington (2007) looked at the influence of structured youth mentoring on reoffending with a meta-analysis of 18 studies in the United Kingdom and the United States. The conclusions from seven of the studies showed that reoffending was reduced by about 4 to 11

percent, which was determined by studies with lower methodological quality, mentoring combined with other support services, but had limited generalizability (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2007, p. 5). The positive effects came from the duration of meeting, the frequency of each meeting (once a week), and mentoring as part of a multi-modal treatment (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2007, p. 8; Chan & Henry, 2014).

To ensure the effectiveness of youth mentoring programs they must establish standards that are based on evidence collected from experimental trials. They must also have “manuals, training, and technical support, evidence of the ability to go to scale, clear cost information, and monitoring and evaluation tools so that effectiveness can be tested in various settings” (Rhodes & Lowe, 2008, p. 12). A study in the United Kingdom by St-James Robert et al. (2005) showed that mentors failed to assist youth in reducing problematic behaviours, increasing education skills, or reducing the use of drugs or alcohol, likely to the lack of training or standards based on best practices. Similar to McCord’s (1979) conclusions that youth mentoring programs caused negative results with behaviours worsening since the underlying systemic injustices were left untouched and ‘experts’ tried to cure a problem beyond the individual’s control. This caused for people to be blamed for living in circumstances of oppression defined by race, class, and gender and was only focused on control and management of the youth (Knepper, 2007). One of the gaps in the literature is the types of training that are used by mentoring programs and if mentors follow policy and procedures defined by their respected organizations (Spencer, 2012).

Mentors play a vital role in the lives of youth because they become a parent-like figure and are expected to give up their time to be able to talk with the youth and be there for the youth when needed. This whole process has an impact on the quality of programming since mentor’s attitudes are important to consider when contributing to youth development (Spencer, 2012).

Individuals “with more secure attachment styles, know how to deal with challenges and conflict” (Spencer, 2012, p. 302). The characteristics and skills of mentors need to be monitored and assessed by mentoring programs to ensure they are able to perform their duties effectively and can engage young people in meaningful relationships (Spencer, 2012).

Relevance of Social Bond theory to the success of Mentoring Programs

The impact of social bond theory on the success of selected mentoring programs is not known other than the programs statements about objectives and then the outcome evaluations that showed reductions in offending and other risk factors. There are two types of social bonding relevant to this thesis. The first is the relationship between the mentor and mentee. The second is the impact of the first on attachments to school, parents, and jobs.

Bonding between mentor and mentee

All of the programs likely created a bond between the mentor and mentee but the bonding was not measured. Within the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based mentoring program, the first type of bonding is likely happening through matched relationships between mentors and at-risk youth living with many of the identified negative life experiences from life-course/developmental studies. The youth inclusion program was creating this bond indirectly through the trusting relationship that attracted the youth to the YIP. Mentoring plus was doing bonding as was Quantum Opportunities Program.

Was the bonding between mentor and mentee used to achieve attachments to parents, schools, and jobs?

From the available evidence on these mentoring programs, it is not clear whether the mentoring relationship led to attachments with parents, schools, and jobs. However, YIPs, Mentoring plus, and Quantum Opportunities Program all had these attachments in their objectives. Mentoring Plus was linking disadvantaged youth to skills development and jobs.

Quantum opportunities program was focused on improvements in grades and continuing in school, which it achieved.

Which bonding ingredients led to the reductions in crime?

It is not clear if the bonding created better attachments to parents and schools, nor more generally, what was specifically occurring in each program to make them effective. Further research would need to confirm that mentoring with mentee established the expected bond and then whether this contributed to attachments with parents and schools and jobs.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the selected youth mentoring programs and their evaluation outcomes including the Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, Youth inclusion program, Mentoring Plus, and Quantum opportunities program. These programs showed that there are some promising examples of youth mentoring strategies that are effective at preventing crime and other aspects that have worked to improve the well-being of youth by tackling known risk factors. The relationships that are fostered in the mentoring programs occur in different formats and place. For emotional bonds to be fostered, it is important for mentors to focus on the assets of the youth, role modeling, having a strong commitment, and ensuring the duration of the relationship. The best practices of an effective mentoring program include outreaching to disadvantaged youth, involving parents, screening and training mentors, matching mentors and mentees based on shared interests and background, make mentoring programs apart of other supports, mentoring should be a holistic developmental approach, and strong implementation of developed standards. The relevance of social bonding to youth mentoring was evident in the programs objectives, but further evaluations would need to test the concepts on indicators of crime. It is evident that there is some existing evidence on the effectiveness of youth mentoring

programs, but more research needs to be done to understand the strategies and inputs that mentors have in creating strong social bonds and possibly preventing crime and violence.

Chapter 5: Review of Ontario policy frameworks and reports on Crime Prevention through Social Development

Introduction

This chapter examines the policy frameworks and reports on crime prevention through social development for the Province of Ontario. It answers the second sub-question: Is Ontario committed to investing in evidence-based crime prevention through social development and would this embrace mentoring?

The question is explored through a discussion of the history of crime prevention policy in Canada, the two Province of Ontario reports *Crime Prevention in Ontario: A Framework for Action* (2012) and *Community Safety and Well-Being in Ontario: A Snapshot of local voices* (2015), the availability of funding for municipal crime prevention, public opinion, and the development of the Ontario Community Safety and Well-Being planning framework.

The principal researcher collected information from online government reports, available academic literature, and further exploration from a letter received (see appendix E) from the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, and brief questions and interviews with political stakeholders.

History of Canadian Crime Prevention Policy

In Canada, a pivotal moment for social and community crime prevention was the attention it received from the 1993 Federal Government House of Commons Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General, also known as the Horner committee. The committee made elected officials and public servants aware of the importance of crime prevention through social development and began to shift Canada towards proactive responses to crime and social disorder (Valleé, 2010).

The report of the standing committee was titled “Crime Prevention in Canada: Toward a National Strategy” which was chaired by Dr Bob Horner from November 1992 to February

1993. The focus of the committee was “the problem of crime affect[ing] the quality of life throughout the world, especially in cities...[and] recognized that traditional criminal justice processes, while necessary, are insufficient deterrents to acts that threaten public safety and security” (Parliament of Canada, 1993, p. 1). This report called for a fundamental shift towards prevention over punishment, for instance with the establishment of new policies based on strategic recommendations, a study on the statistics of crime and victimization to understand the seriousness of the issue, and a national office that would lead a strategy to reduce harm and crime rates.

The primary purpose of the strategy was to move Canada away from costly criminal justice responses that would hire more police officers and build more prisons, to an alternative method that would seek to solve social problems and make communities safer long before punitive responses had to react (Parliament of Canada, 1993, p. 2). A major focus was on helping at-risk youth with early intervention through education and skills development to stop them from becoming potential persistent offenders. The hope was to help young people develop marketable skills and get access to a decent education, which would hopefully lead to meaningful employment. The committee recognized “the underlying social and economic factors associated with crime and criminality” (Parliament of Canada, 1993, p. 2). This led to an emphasis on crime prevention through social development, as its main purpose is to improve the lives of people socially and economically through programming that addresses the root causes of crime such as family violence, school performance, low self-esteem, relationships, employment, and the community (Parliament of Canada, 1993). The following were the main recommendations from the committee:

1. A national leadership role in crime prevention at all levels of government with a national policy;
2. Develop a crime prevention council with the support of all levels of government to reduce crime; and
3. Funding from the federal government equivalent to 1% a year of the current federal budget for police, courts, and corrections to crime prevention- and after five years spent 5% (Parliament of Canada, 1993).

The Horner Committee reinforced the safer cities approach to community safety as it outlined “the focal point for effective crime prevention activity by encouraging problem identification and resolution through inter-agency, citizen, and business community partnerships” (Valleé, 2010, p. 34). The integrated approach means that everyone has a role to play in crime prevention strategies and to address the needs of the most marginalized by solving the roots causes of their behaviours (Parliament of Canada, 1993, p. 12).

Following the Horner committee in July 1994, phase one of the National Strategy on Crime Prevention and Community Safety was developed by the Federal Liberal government to address pressing crime problems through preventative measures (Hastings, 2005; Leonard, Rosario, Scott, & Bressan, 2005). The strategy led to the creation of the National Crime Prevention Council, which did policy work and research briefs to provide the government and public with “pro-active approaches to crime, victimization, and insecurity and by acting as a voice for communities in the development of prevention policy” (Hastings, 2005, p. 209). They coordinated a framework for crime prevention to remain on the policy agenda. Once, the National Crime Prevention Council submitted its final reports to the government it dissolved.

Later this led to phase two of the National Crime Prevention Strategy in 1998, where the National Crime Prevention Centre (NCPC) was established to oversee the implementation under the Ministry of Justice (Hastings, 2005). The strategy focused on youth, women, and the elderly through “funding for social and community projects and partnerships” (Shaw, 2017, p. 430). The NCPC disseminated crime prevention resources and tools for practitioners as the national centre of responsibility such as the Blueprint for Effective Crime Prevention. The NCPC had a budget of about \$30 million per year for small projects and \$2 million for the capacity group through the Department of Justice. Shaw (2017) states that the strategy took a turn away from its original welfare orientation in 2006-2015 due to the Harper Conservative Government’s tough on crime punishment agenda, which focused on setting focused deterrence through targeting ‘at risk’ youth, particularly gangs and Indigenous youth, in high-crime areas. However, the Conservative government in 2008 doubled the funding to \$62 million for the national crime prevention strategy which the NCPC was responsible for (Public Safety Canada, 2009; Beeby, 2015). In 2015, the centre operated within various divisions in Public Safety Canada under policy, research, and programs to implement the National Crime Prevention Strategy. NCPC continues to fund local projects through pilot funding for five years for an estimate of 1 ½ million per year, which is 7 ½ million in total. They have a budget of about \$60 million a year, which can go towards promising social crime prevention programs and some for evaluations (Beeby, 2015; Public Safety Canada, 2016c). They also have other funding opportunities that range from important crime issues like gangs, gun violence, drug-related, and sex crimes.

Another significant initiative involving collaboration and increased use of research on what works in prevention was the final declaration of the first forum on Evidence-based Crime Prevention for Canada titled the “Agenda for a Safer Canada” (Canadian Forum for Crime

Prevention, 2003, p. 1). The Canadian Forum for Crime Prevention hosted the conference on *What works: the power of prevention* by bringing together over 125 policy-makers, practitioners, and researchers in Waterloo Region (Ontario) from December 4-6 in 2003 to agree on solutions and a strategy forward to reduce crime and victimization in Canada through evidence-based and cost-effective prevention (Allen et al., 2004). The document created an overview of crime and its costs to Canadians through facts and statistics on harm as well as an action plan for all orders of government through the voices of members. The key elements of the strategy aimed to: “concentrate investments in areas of need; be comprehensive, impact-driven and evidence-based; build relationships and foster partnerships; initiate and sustain community mobilization; elicit public support; and assure intergovernmental cooperation and coordination” (Canadian Forum for Crime Prevention, 2003, p. 1). The final recommendations pushed for innovation in solving the root causes of crime through a collaborative effort, mainly getting support from all orders of government. They recommended the federal government to have an action plan for prevention, create legislation and implement policy for crime prevention, continue research and disseminate the evidence on crime prevention, and echoed the Horner committee’s recommendation to invest 5% of the existing annual spending for reactive criminal justice into crime prevention (Canadian Forum for Crime Prevention, 2003, p. 2). Provincially and territorially it recommended inter-ministerial capacity to plan and coordinate for best results, analyzing crime problems and solving them by investing in prevention programs and a crime prevention office to lead the initiative. Municipally they recommended creating and supporting local crime prevention efforts, providing adequate funding to address needs, and community participation. The Ontario government has been inspired by this grassroots work and is moving towards the shifts in policy recommended in this forum.

Ontario Crime Prevention Policy Frameworks

Currently, the Province of Ontario has two policy documents regarding crime prevention, conceptualizing how it can be used to reduce crime and victimization rates and improve feelings of public safety. In a three-phase provincial approach, the province is focusing on “educating and working with stakeholders, as well as developing provincial booklets, [and] this approach helps communities address community safety and well-being on a sustainable basis” (Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services, 2016, par. 1). The approach started in 2009 by collecting information from across the province to understand the current state of prevention, the crime problems, and the types of beliefs the public and agencies have around risk factors for criminal behaviour. The province adopted the approach after over 50 years of accumulated knowledge on the effectiveness of evidence-based crime prevention through social development programs and some situational crime prevention such as environmental design and proactive policing (Winterdyk, 2017; Waller, 2014). The approach helps to enhance the role of municipalities and draws the attention of other organizations that agree with the principles of prevention and want to know about the available resources.

The first policy document, developed in 2012 is titled “*Crime Prevention in Ontario: A Framework for Action*” and was brought together by the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services in partnership with the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police (OACP). The purpose of the document is to bring information together on how and why crime prevention works and to provide an overview of what needs to be done theoretically and practically to prevent the risk of crime in communities. The document was created as a “useful resource that provides integral background information on the current criminal landscape, offers a variety of crime prevention approaches, and outlines the cost-effectiveness of being proactive when it comes to addressing root causes of crime” (Ontario & OACP, 2012, p. 2). This

document reinforces the argument of Hastings and Melcher (1990) that not a single institution or actor owns the responsibility of preventing crime because it must be a communal, collaborative effort. This collaboration needs to involve the state and the citizens it serves equally because the government cannot be the sole proprietor dealing with crime (Garland, 1996). A significant portion of this document was about multi-sectoral strategies that involve many organizations including not only the police, but also social services, mental health services, schools, parents, parole, and community members to address the needs of individuals who are at a higher risk of committing crime or harming themselves (Ontario & OACP, 2012, p. 8). The strategy advocates bringing multiple agencies together to share resources, data, and create actionable recommendations to reduce crime and improve safety in municipalities. If done properly, it could tackle risk factors upstream by identifying individuals who are experiencing multiple forms of deprivation and psychological issues by connecting them with the right services that can adequately address their individual needs. It also assists in offering a triage of services to persons in conflict with the law or who have already been charged or sentenced to time in prison. The purpose is to identify people before coming into contact with the justice system so that victims can be spared and public safety is increased. By increasing protective factors in the lives of people, the exposure to risk factors can be moderated.

Looking at the cost-effectiveness of crime prevention through social development, it is important to see its overall benefits to society and how it can be expanded to help more individuals in need of resources. Crime is very costly to society both in human terms and property loss, but also regarding the costs incurred by the system through criminal justice, healthcare, and victim services (Waller, 2014; Lab, 2010). These expenses add up and take away from investment in other social services, job creation, and education for individuals who are

facing systemic injustices and are excluded from the market in some form. Coordinating strategies, programs, and services can offer a more holistic approach to healing.

Municipalities are the closest government to the ground, working directly with citizens and therefore need sufficient funding to address community concerns with the support of the federal and provincial/territorial government (European Forum for Urban Safety, Federation of Canadian Municipalities & United States Conference of Mayors, 1989). However, for funding to remain sustainable over the long term, they need to leverage “partnerships and resources to continue programs, services, and/or strategic activities” (Savignac & Dunbar, 2015, p. 18). According to the framework for action, if society prevents one career criminal from causing harm it can save an estimated \$2 million for what would have been spent on crime for the cost of police, courts, incarceration, and victim costs (Ontario & OACP, 2012; Day et al., 2016; Cohen & Piquero, 2009). Also, it is estimated that for every dollar invested in crime prevention through social development, society gets a return of at least \$7 in criminal justice and victim costs (Ontario & OACP, 2012; Waller, Bradley, & Murrizi, 2016).

In 2015, there was a shift in provincial terminology from crime prevention to ‘community safety and well-being’. The reason for this change in language is because in the past crime prevention has been criticized as becoming an extension of the crime control industry primarily based in policing and correctional strategies, which the new term moves away from to focus on collaborative approaches that involve communities and social services (Ontario & OACP, 2015; Baker, 2016; Gilling, 1997; Garland, 1996). The new terminology allows for a broader analysis of the causes of crime, which are highly complex and stemming from multiple sources of social, economic, political, and cultural contexts.

A second policy document called *Community Safety and Well-Being in Ontario: A Snapshot of Local Voices* was published in 2015 after 30 public consultations in 2013 to determine what is going on practically in the province when it comes to preventing crime and violence. The analysis “encourages communities to move away from relying solely on reactionary and incident driven responses and implement social development practices by identifying and responding to risks that increase the likelihood of criminal activity, victimization or harm and working together to build local capacity and strong networks to implement proactive measures” (Ontario & OACP, 2015, p. 3). It is about moving from a punishment focus to a smart proactive prevention model that addresses the root causes of crime by looking at risks and addressing them through proven solutions (Waller & Martinez, 2016). This requires community members not simply to report crimes, but to take an active role in determining how harmful behaviours can be eliminated. This document had a different tone because it identified the local challenges through existing structures and the gaps in services.

The document also focused on promising practices, of which mentoring played a role in an Aboriginal diversion program (Niigan Mosewok) aiming to reduce youth violent crime by improving relationships and access to services. However, the program did not have an evaluation to show its effectiveness. The report stated that organizations should share more data using technology and to stop working in silos to tackle community safety. The document stressed the need to put more funding in evaluating programs so that the effectiveness can be determined through quantitative and qualitative analyses that are Canadian based. This would allow programs to adjust and consider community contexts while following the evidence-based policies.

Additionally, an important component of the Community Safety and Well-Being document was the section on resources and sustainability. This section determined that resources are limited because of existing funding structures, funding criteria, and evaluations that are very strict and sometimes the public organizations are unaware of the funding processes (Ontario & OACP, 2015, p. 12). All programs must follow strict guidelines determined by the grant providers and follow their logic models to ensure outputs are achieved and sustained. A suggestion to rectify the concerns of grant funding was to have a coordinated funding system so that it “streamlines administrative requirements and ensures the accountability of funding” (Ontario & OACP, 2015, p. 13). Community organizations that are funded by the Ontario government should not be competing for funding and need to have sustainable investments for reductions to come to fruition. Moreover, if they want to see benefits from their programs, they must be able to support the infrastructure to serve the community to its full capacity. Evaluations are also important because they reinforce the proven effects of a program and its structure. Although outcome assessments are time consuming, they should be invested in for increased political and public support.

The last and final document called *Community Safety and Well-Being Planning Framework: A Shared Commitment in Ontario* is scheduled to come out sometime in 2017 with the framework and a practical guidance toolkit on community safety and well-being. Unfortunately a complete analysis of this document is not yet possible, but I am hopeful that the government will have a robust framework for Ontario to become safer and address some of the systemic injustices (relative deprivation, mental health, lack of jobs, housing, and food insecurity) that create barriers for people to live crime-free lives. Also that it promotes the use of data to tackle social risk factors that can be used to provide positive programming to those in

need. Preliminary information states that the framework will focus on addressing risks and needs of communities through strategic and holistic approaches using social development and prevention. Table 5 shows Ontario’s progress towards effective social prevention through its support for CPSD, addressing risk and protective factors, youth mentoring, and funding. These policy documents and the developing framework show support and commitment from the Government of Ontario to move forward on investing in crime prevention through social development. However, funding for the framework has not been announced or discussed.

Table 5: Ontario Progress towards Effective CPSD

Provincial Approach	Support Crime Prevention through Social Development	Addressing Risk Factors and Protective Factors	Youth Mentoring	Funding
<i>Crime Prevention in Ontario: A Framework for Action (2012)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Evidence-based and cost-effective CPSD ✓ Collaborative approaches ✓ Awareness of what works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Risk factors contribute to crime and victimization ✓ Protective factors moderate exposure 	X Not mentioned	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Support funding from the National Crime Prevention Centre ✓ Coordinated strategies
<i>Community Safety and Well-Being: A Snapshot of local voices booklet 2 (2015)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Social Development practices ✓ Collaborative approaches ✓ Challenges & Promising practices 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Risk and protective factors through positive programming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Adult mentors – example had no evaluation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Safer and Vital Communities Grant (limited \$)
<i>Community Safety and Well-Being Planning Framework (Coming soon)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Social development ✓ Collaborative approaches ✓ Prevention 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Address priority risks and needs of community ✓ Strategic and holistic way 	Unknown	Unknown

In addition to the three documents, the province has decided to tackle the issues of policing. Yasir Naqvi, former Ontario Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services, is revising the Ontario Police Services Act to change the way policing operates in Canada. The transformation is a first step to advancing the police to technological changes, having more tools

to respond to vulnerable individuals, and changing oversight and accountability expectations in regards to use of force (Ontario, 2016a). The Ministry has consulted the public and stakeholders, and the revisions will be released in 2017. The act has not been revised in 25 years according to the Star interview with Hon. Yasir Naqvi. The revisions to the act will change the laws around policing and civilian oversight to enhance the trust and accountability of police in Ontario by providing them with up to date guidelines and rules (Gillis, 2016).

The Province is also adopting the hub and the situational table model, which offers a variety of services and supports to at-risk individuals by diverting problems from the police to social services (Baker, 2016). This model was inspired by the success in Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, which used an integrated approach to reduce crime and a centre of responsibility. Although they were not as successful as the Glasgow Scotland's Violence Reduction Unit, which used the police, social support, youth outreach, and collaboration to cut crime rates substantially by addressing risk factors (Glasgow, 2016). This approach will help police in Ontario to get away from just reacting to people by arresting and charging them, and should take a more preventative approach. These collaborative approaches involve municipalities and are required to tackle the roots of crime such as family breakdown, lack of education, drug and alcohol misuse, housing, mental health problems, racism, and unemployment (Kelley et al., 2005).

On August 8th, 2016, my colleague Manjinder Sidhu and I had a meeting with the Ontario Minister of Community Safety and Correctional Services, Yasir Naqvi, to have an informed conversation about crime prevention and community safety policies. We discussed how the government could improve these issues through evidence-based policy making to help parents and youth by addressing unemployment and the lack of access to education. We proposed some possible solutions to the Minister to reduce crime through a community safety act that would put

funding into crime prevention programs, a board for the prevention of crime and violence that would be legislated, and funding at the equivalent of 5% of the current provincial government spending on police and corrections into crime prevention (Bradley & Sidhu, 2016). Ideally, the board for the prevention of crime and community safety would develop sustainable actions and programs with set targets to be reached. To ensure the plan meets its objectives, it would be necessary to evaluate it to ensure it improves feelings of safety and reduces victimization and crime rates. Y. Naqvi did not disagree with anything we said, but stated there are current strategies and social policies being developed to address these issues upstream such as poverty reduction, long-term housing plan, youth action plan, development of community hubs and centres, and a strategy for a safer Ontario (Ontario, 2015). Y. Naqvi stated that Ontario is rebuilding the policing model so it is proactive and community focused by amending the *Police Services Act*², which will impact police training, the culture, and behaviours (Personal Communication, August 8, 2016). Additionally, that Ontario is increasingly establishing situation tables and community safety hubs to deal with broader and individual challenges through triage support and empowering local communities to develop community safety and well-being plans. These measures are all based on data and issues to develop plans to tackle crime through coordinated partnerships (Y. Naqvi, Personal communication, August 8, 2016).

I also received a letter reacting to a question I asked the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services on the current crime prevention policies in Ontario and legal frameworks. In response, Oscar Mosquera, the Manager of Program Development section in the External Relations Branch, stated that “to meet the challenges we face in today’s world of limited budgets, changing demographics, rapid technological innovation and ever-changing demands for police services, the province is developing the Strategy for a Safer Ontario”

² The Police Services Act of Ontario is the governing legislation that guides police conduct.

(MCSCS, 2016, par. 2; See appendix E). He discussed how it would be a collaborative effort with multiple sectors to increase the safety of Ontarians and that more details would be released soon. Currently, the planning strategy is not yet fully available. However, the Ontario Working Group on Collaborative, Risk-driven Community Safety within the Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police is doing research briefs about *New Directions in Community Safety: Consolidating Lessons Learned about Risk and Collaboration*. The group has been working closely with the Ontario government to help develop and implement new plans within policing (Russell & Taylor, 2014).

Availability of Funding for Crime Prevention in Ontario

In March 2016, the Ontario government announced an investment of \$3.7 million in the safer and vital communities grant to enhance community safety and well-being. The government did a call for municipalities and local organizations to apply for the funding, which could be used to help improve community collaboration and prevention programs that were alternatives to the correctional system (Ontario, 2016b). The focus of the 2016 funding was on safety initiatives and diversion, which leaves less of a focus on pre-crime prevention programs like youth services, early childhood, or parenting programs. This grant money exists to help municipalities start up new programs that address the social determinants of crime and improving existing programs that have a new component. However, these funds are minimal compared to the billions of dollars being spent annually on reaction to crime (police, courts, and corrections) and is unsustainable with limited-time grant money.

Through a phone conversation with Steffie Anastasopoulos, the community safety analyst for the external relations branch public safety division for the Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services and Community safety, she discussed that the ministry supports crime prevention programs like youth mentoring and social assistance. Moreover, she stated that they support the

prevention programs through financial grants and practical support to help facilitate locally based implementation (Personal communication, September 20, 2016). They believe that municipalities are in the best position to know the needs, gaps, and programs that help deal with local issues, which has been the same conclusion of other Canadian committees and conferences on crime prevention. Municipalities can consult with communities to know what is needed and work with them in an integrated, flexible, and bottom-up approach (Kelly, Caputo, & Jamieson, 2005). However, they require funding from other orders of government to remain sustainable.

The grant itself is open to all municipalities in Ontario for two years, including non-for-profit and chief and band councils. They have 5-10 application questions about the needs of the community, the reason this program will help address community safety, what has been proven to work, and others. Any evidence-based research on the program or practice is necessarily to put into all applications, as this will help in determining the amount of money that an organization will receive once being analyzed by the application committee (S. Anastasopoulos, personal communication, September 20, 2016). S. Anastasopoulos claimed that the Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services also works in close collaboration with other ministries like the Ministry of Health and Long-term care and Children and Youth Services so they can help with directing municipalities to apply for other grants that may be able to help (personal communication, September 20, 2016). The theme in 2016 focused on community collaboration to addressing known risk factors for crime and victimization rather than responding to issues after the fact (Ontario, 2016c). Although this is a start with a change in language, these grants are not enough to help organizations remain sustainable and require other private funding or donations. For a paradigm shift to occur, the amount of funding must be increased as the current amount is minimal compared to the billions of dollars going into the crime control

industry- police, courts, and corrections in Canada (Story & Yalkin, 2013; Easton, Furness, & Brantingham, 2014). This change can be brought to the attention of elected government officials and the Premier of Ontario, so that more funding is put into upstream social crime prevention. Also through more long-term supports with investments in education, healthcare, and jobs that can assist communities suffering from systemic inequalities “and social conditions that lead or push people into criminal behaviour” (Lab, 2004). It is not about putting more money into police, courts, and corrections that respond to crime, but using collaborative multi-sectoral approaches that use existing data resource to diagnose problems and provide assistance to reduce risk factors.

At this point, only the two policy documents and limited information is available through online government announcements. My meeting with the Minister is reinforced by the letter from the Ministry and shows a continued interest by the Province of Ontario to tackle risk factors and put time and investments into prevention programs that reinforce social development.

Public Opinion

Canada’s most recent public opinion polls show that the general public supports investment in crime prevention over punishment (Ontario & OACP, 2012). This includes education and social programming for youth rather than more resources going into law enforcement (The Environics Institute, 2013). According to Roberts & Hastings (2007), since 1985 to 2005 public opinion has been largely in favour of investing in crime prevention over law enforcement and prisons to deal with crime because they want to deal with the social problems by improving economic and social conditions (p. 199). Public opinion survey’s consistently show that about 60% of the Canadian population prefers crime prevention to punishment through police and corrections 35% (The Environics Institute, 2013; EKO’s Politics, 2010; Waller et al., 2016). Therefore, the public believes tax dollars should be spent with sound evidence-based

policies and smart investments to help improve the lives of people. This is supported by Roberts & Hastings (2007) analysis as about 51% of the 1997 Angus Reid survey showed that the public wanted crime prevention through social development efforts to respond to “their intuitions that crime often originates in poor parenting, or misspent childhoods” (p. 20). Despite the wave of nothing works and deterrence through punishment rhetoric, the public still feels that prevention is the most efficient way to tackle the root causes of crime before serious harm occurs to a victim and impacts the community safety and well-being. Even the public prefers tax dollars going into prevention and rehabilitation programs instead of investing in harsher prisons and long sentences. Any support for punishment and more prisons to get tough on crime are usually politically conservative (Roberts & Hough, 2005).

Ontario Community Safety and Well-Being Planning Framework

The Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services is in support of moving municipalities’ forward on strategic planning through collaborative strategies to improve citizens’ quality of life, reducing crime and social disorder, and making citizens feel safer in their communities (Russel & Raylor, 2014; Ontario & OACP, 2012; 2015; Leonard & Jefferson, 2017). The Government of Ontario is aware that they can no longer afford the unsustainable costs of reacting to crime and must reduce the demands for police, courts, and corrections through practical and evidence-based means. The provincial government is increasingly aware of the social problems that continue to affect Ontario through evident rates of poverty, child abuse, addiction, homelessness, gender-based violence, violence against women, inter-generational trauma affecting Indigenous peoples due to a history of colonization, mental health, and the over-incarceration of vulnerable populations. They have interest in addressing these issues upstream by investing in people centered and cost-effective solutions. The Province is aware of evidence-based research on crime prevention through social development and meeting the needs of the

community through a coordinated effort that is strategic and holistic (Leonard & Jefferson, 2017; Ververi, 2017). The Federation of Canadian Municipalities (2017) has been addressing the fact that “the unsustainable growth in policing and public safety costs for municipalities, [are] often crowding out other essential services such as early intervention and crime prevention programs” (par. 2). This means that more money is going into responding to crime after the fact and is not necessarily working to prevent the behaviour or solving the social problems that compel people into certain choices in the first place (Garland, 1996).

The Province is developing a strategy for a Safer Ontario and will continue to develop tools to move the agenda forward for prevention and likely mentoring initiatives (Jefferson & Leonard, 2017; Crawley, 2017). If municipalities get the mandate to develop community safety and well-being plans under the law in Ontario, they will be able to deal with problems through a four stage intervention process including social development, prevention, risk intervention, and emergency response (Ontario, 2016a; Russel & Taylor, 2014, p. 1). These strategic plans will focus on meeting set goals and evaluating outcomes. Specifically, the prevention piece is essential to reducing identified risks through protective measures and having more support for social development programs.

Many municipalities have been developing situational and hub models, where services like the police, schools, housing, and others work together to come up with a plan to respond to the acute needs of vulnerable individuals referred to them (Nilson, 2016). However, for municipalities to have the capacity to have a structured plan based on research and practice, they would need a centre of responsibility to lead it. This would require funding for an office with municipal staff to focus on crime prevention (Institution for the Prevention of Crime, 2008; 2009).

Studies continue to show that for evidence-based crime prevention programs to flourish at the local level, they require sustainable long-term funding and resources from all levels of government to reach their full capacity in addressing short, medium, and long-term goals (Linden, 2011, Dickson-Gilmore, 2007; Monchalin, 2016). Investments in communities require political support from elected officials to raise it onto the policy agenda, and the public to put pressure on the government. Despite the accumulation of knowledge on upstream crime prevention measures, Canada lacks evaluation research of programs. This is due to limited funding available for outcome evaluations and cost-benefit analysis of crime prevention programs, which would allow for addressing the gaps in service and reflecting on what is effective and what is not (Sutton et al., 2004, p. 84). Through evidence-based evaluations on CPSD programs like youth mentoring, the government could facilitate funding for municipalities and local organizations to set up programs with set targets to reduce crime (Waller, 2014). Once evidence-based programs are adapted to community contexts they could be re-evaluated to determine how best to address local crime problems (Savingnac & Dunbar, 2014).

Existing and developing CPSD initiatives need to be tested with both quantitative and qualitative studies to determine the effectiveness of each program and its process within different societal contexts (Lab, 2010). With this support, CPSD could be viewed as a legitimate alternative to the existing criminal justice system, since it can effectively address the root causes of crime- poverty, lack of social ties, education, support, job opportunities -and is cost-effective. While prevention seeks to provide services and support to vulnerable youth, it also tackles social risk factors by offering meaningful solutions like training, education, guidance, and negotiating with social systems through a problem-solving framework (Schneider, 2015).

Municipalities have an important role to play in crime prevention through social development as they are the closest level of government to the people and know the issues affecting communities (Institute for the Prevention of Crime, 2007). It is also evident that municipal budgets can be effectively used by transferring at least 1% of the current spending going into policing and local jails into upstream crime prevention programs and practices. According to Sutton et al. (2014), local governments can initiate crime prevention delivery through strategic planning and partnerships with multiple sectors.

For example, Ontario is interested in having municipalities develop Community Safety and Well-Being plans to identify local priorities to meet the diverse needs of distinct communities. In order for the planning framework to be effectively implemented, it will require taking a multi-sectoral approach involving “share responsibility between community members, traditional and political leaders, the police, other justice partners and community organizations, including healthcare, social services, victim services, education, housing, cultural groups and private enterprise” (Leonard & Jefferson, 2017, p. 6). These actors will mobilize partnerships, diagnosis the crime problems, strategically plan how to tackle them, implement the plan with set targets, evaluate for success and failures, and adapt to context based on evidence (Shaw, 2001 in Institute for the Prevention of Crime, 2007, p. 3).

Conclusion

This chapter focused on the history of Canadian crime prevention policy, the existing crime prevention policy frameworks and reports in the Province of Ontario, the availability of funding, public opinion, and the development of the Ontario community safety and well-being planning framework. The evidence is clear, and Ontario has a policy framework that is taking shape so that crime prevention can be taken seriously as an alternative to the existing criminal

justice system. However, significant investment and political support in CPSD programs like mentoring is needed to reduce crime and improve social well-being. It is evident that if Ontario wants to reduce crime through youth mentoring and other proven CPSD measures, it must provide an implementation strategy, sustainable funding, continued research and evaluation, and an office for the prevention of crime to lead its success.

Chapter 6: Methods of Youth Mentors from Big Brothers Big Sisters Community-Based Mentoring Program

Introduction

This chapter focuses on five qualitative interviews with two Big Brothers, two Big Sisters, and one staff member working with high-risk male and female youth between the ages of 12-17 years old in the structured one-to-one community-based mentoring program. The chapter seeks to answer the third sub-question: What are the methods used by youth mentors' in the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based mentoring program to prevent crime and violence?

The principal researcher interviewed youth mentors volunteering with the non-for-profit organization called 'Big Brothers Big Sisters' (BBBS) in the municipalities of Sudbury and Ottawa, Ontario. The main themes evident from the analysis of transcribed interviews were the organizational procedures of the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based mentoring program, youth and risk factors, the process of bonding between mentors and mentees, challenges of mentoring high-risk youth, and the perceived impact on the prevention of crime and violence. Lastly, the aspects of social bond theory that was reinforced or challenged by the mentors in the BBBS program is discussed.

Organizational Procedures of the BBBS Community-Based Mentoring Program

The first theme is the organizational procedures of the BBBS community-based mentoring program to ensure its implementation features follow national standards. Cavell et al. (2009) state that "good intentions and a ready corps of volunteers are not enough to deliver an effective youth mentoring program- a solid infrastructure is essential" (p. 3). BBBS has an infrastructure as a national not-for-profit organization that has over 40 thousand children matched in mentoring programs with resources and capacity. The organizations vision is that "every child in Canada who needs a mentor has a mentor" (Big Brothers Big Sisters of Canada, 2017). The primary focus of the organization is the structured one-to-one community-based

mentoring which has a strong emphasis on sound implementation to avoid negative or unintended consequences for vulnerable young people by following evidence-based practices (DuBois, Holloway, Valentine, & Cooper, 2002; McCord, 1979). To ensure pro-social relationships, the organization works towards increasing protective factors to reduce the likelihood of negative life circumstances for young people. The organization provides mentoring to at-risk youth by connecting them with an older more experienced adult who they can communicate with and build trust through social and recreational activities (Norm, p. 2). BBBS aims to address vulnerable youth by “providing them [with] a role model that is not a parent and who can guide them [by] teaching them how to have a relationship and learn how to trust adults” (Emily, p. 1). The mentors are asked to develop friendships with the youth and guide them through life challenges. The organization asks the mentors to instill positive values, morals, behaviours, and ethics by being a respectful and kind individual who can support the youth emotionally and socially to reach their full potential. It is “basically about building the [youth’s] resilience and self-esteem to not engage in those risky behaviours” (Carmen, p. 2). The youth mentors discussed the following procedures when describing how the organization facilitates the mentoring relationship.

The mentors initially described the intense screening process that they underwent to become a volunteer with BBBS. After applying to become a volunteer through a written application, the mentors were asked to provide a police record check to ensure that none of them had a criminal record, since they would be working with young people. This is also utilized as a measure for the organization to protect the safety and security of all youth and is part of their due diligence process when selecting mentors. Furthermore, mentors were required to provide three or four character references from community members, such as friends, work colleagues or past

employers, who could speak to their personal qualities such as being a reliable and trustworthy individual to work with youth. Following the application, the mentors undergo an intensive interview, which was highly personalized to determine if the individual was sufficiently qualified for the organization. Emily stated that the organization was looking for people that “understand youth, being youth centered, being able to commit, being persistent, motivated and available” (p. 3). The organization requires the mentor to be committed to the mentee over a substantial period of time, so they are readily available and can understand their complex needs (Carmen, p. 32). The mentors must also demonstrate that they have dealt with the development and closure of a relationship (Emily, p. 4). The purpose of questioning mentors about past relationships is for the staff to diagnose how the applicant handled rejection, and how they will be able to manage these types of challenges with the mentee. The professional staff working for the organization, known as caseworkers, will perform home visits to ensure the environment is safe for mentees, since they may be visiting the mentor’s residence and other individuals who occupy the space at some point (Norm, p. 2). These safety procedures ensure that volunteers are stable, truthful, and serious about helping vulnerable youth in their communities. This information is consistent with previous literature on best practices for screening mentors through safety checks to enable the organization to gain a better sense of the personalities and interests to match with mentees (Dolan & Brady, 2012).

Following the screening procedures, there is orientation training for volunteers to learn about the organization, the expectations, child safety, and boundaries. Additional workshops are offered at later times throughout the matching process, but are more specific to the process of mentoring such as relationship building and responding to mental health (Bill, p. 18). Caseworkers can individually provide training information to the mentors dealing with specific

issues in their match. However, one mentor mentioned that she wished there was more training available to help her respond to the high-risk needs of her mentee. When asked about being aware of the crime prevention aspects of mentoring and knowledge of best practices she stated that, “there was no training or nothing like this” (Brandie, p. 11). Bill also said that there was nothing related to the continuous education on the prevention of crime or how to affect crime rates (p. 18). Although the basic training is mandatory, the organization is progressively expanding by providing more workshops, which offer more tools for mentors (Carmen, p. 24 & Emily, p. 14).

Once the mentor is approved, the organization will start the matching process to connect the mentor with a mentee. The organization usually pairs people based on interest, culture, and the needs of the mentees. All matches are paired based on gender identity, and the organization works to connect people through an open and fair process. Bill said, “it is pretty much, here is two people and they say here is his name, here is his interests, he is this old. They give you options” (p. 21). Once someone is chosen, the caseworker will set up a meeting with the mentor, youth, and the parent/guardian to see if they approve of the choice (BBBS, 2011). Norm stated that, “every Big Brother is different and each will have strong points. That is where the caseworkers come in so if you had a kid who was having trouble with this so maybe you have a big brother strong in that development area” (Norm, p. 12). Both quotations emphasize the options that the organization provides to mentors and mentees by ensuring the matches are compatible and will be long lasting. It is also important that the mentors have a cultural understanding of the circumstances in which certain youth come from, such as Indigenous youth (Emily, p. 3). Likewise, if a mentee has had a traumatic experience, they will find someone who can connect to that individual through an “unspoken language” (Carmen, p. 7). Carmen

emphasized that you cannot force a relationship to start because connections should happen naturally. This philosophy ensures that the needs of the mentees are addressed, that youth have a voice in deciding who they want to have a relationship with, and that mentors have some similar experiences to connect positively with young people.

All the mentors specified that the organization required them to meet with their mentee about 2-4 hours a visit at least two times a month to ensure consistency. Brandie stated, “what we would do is hang out at least two times a month, and there is you know texting in between” (p. 2). Norm mentioned he would do more visits with his little brother some months depending on availability and the needs of the mentee. Even when the match is not physically meeting, mentors and mentees will remain in contact through technology as things could come up during the week where the mentee may need support (Norm, p. 5). The volunteers must commit to at least one year to the mentoring match, and the hope is for the relationship to continue (Emily, p. 12). The organization will monitor the match until the youth is 18 years old when they graduate from the program. However, these relationships usually last much longer without the need for support from the organization.

Throughout the match, the caseworkers provide oversight to ensure the relationship is developing effectively and that all parties (mentor, mentee, and parents) involved in the relationship are satisfied with its progress. Caseworkers are professional staff, usually with social work backgrounds, that monitor to ensure policies and procedures are followed and that the match is safe and healthy (BBBSC, 2011). Caseworkers will ensure that mentors are aware of as much information as possible to be able to work in close collaboration with the mentees and understand their circumstances individually and within their social context (Carmen, p. 7). Most of the youth come with diverse backgrounds from poverty, abuse, neglect, homelessness, and

mental health. To ensure that any issues with the match are discovered as early as possible, the caseworkers have face-to-face interviews and quarterly questionnaires to monitor the match (Emily, p. 10; Bill, p.7). Norm stated, “every three months you have to do an in-person interview” (p. 8). During these meetings, it is about the interaction “how is he doing, how are you doing, or anything else we can be doing and what have you guys been up to” (Bill, p. 19). After a year, caseworkers will conduct phone interviews or contact mentors through emailing to inquire about the progress of the relationship with the mentees. This also provides mentors with the chance to disclose any situations or concerns of which the organization should be aware (Norm, p. 8). These follow-up interviews are to inquire about any problems and how each party is feeling about the relationship (Brandie, p. 1). This provides a positive support structure for the relationship to prosper and allows the professional staff to connect the mentee to outside community resources if necessary to meet their broader needs (Norm, p. 11).

One of the last essential procedural components of the program is the support system. The caseworkers are always available to address any concerns mentors may have about the match and will provide resources systematically. Norm stated, “if I had a question or I didn’t know how to answer a question properly because you want to make sure you are steering them back the right way. You don’t want to give them the wrong information. They were so supportive” (Norm, p. 6). Open communication is essential to addressing issues with the mentees, as is reporting any concerns that would impact their safety. Caseworkers will provide support in dealing with certain behaviours and ways to correct them. All mentors mentioned they would receive an instant response anytime they text or call any of the BBBS staff to ask a question or address a concern about mentees. If a life circumstance happens where the match must come to an end, the caseworkers will engage in a formal closure process that will take place

with the support of mentors and parent/guardian. “Sometimes it will work for a while and the kid changes a bit and you’re not the best suited person to deal with some of the problems they have” (Norm, p. 13). Since it is a relationship, sometimes they will prosper and other times they will end. On the other hand, if a mentor is to display unprofessional or illegal behaviour they will suspend the match to protect the young person from any harm (Carmen, p. 34). The process of ending the relationship was not described in detail, but previous literature has determined it to be a key component to ensure the achievements of the youth are celebrated and future contact agreements are determined in such a way that they are not disappointed and continue to be supported (Dolan & Brady, 2012, p. 80).

National standards set all of the above procedures that Big Brother Big Sisters organizations in Canada must follow to maintain their accreditation. Although they have the flexibility to adapt the methods to their community needs, they have a formal audit every five years by the national headquarters to ensure procedures are correctly followed (Carmen, p. 24). All of the standards are based on best practices from research on mentoring set by the national headquarters (Carmen, p. 27).

Youth and Risk Factors

BBBS identifies at-risk youth to recruit into their mentoring programs and seeks to address the need for a stable relationship. Most individuals are referred to the program through parents, guardians, social workers, child’s aid society, immigration services, community organizations, schools, health practitioners, police, and self-referrals (BBBS, 2016). All individuals must consent to participate in any of the programs. The program focuses on youth with a variety of backgrounds, but particularly on youth living in single parent families who tend to experience higher instances of poverty and lack another positive role model (BBBSO, 2016). Most of the individual and societal factors discussed under this theme display the multiple needs

and levels of deprivation experienced by young people. Mentors described these examples as being some of the reasons they believe their mentees is considered high-risk due to their behaviour, thinking patterns, and social circumstances.

Mentors mentioned family breakdown as an environmental factor affecting mentees, because most of them come from single parent homes and are living in disadvantaged areas (Bill, p. 1; Norm, p. 3; Carmen, p. 2; Emily, p. 4). Bill described it as a “lack of cohesion in the family” and that the absence of a father or mother had an impact on the mentees lives because they could not talk to them or seek guidance (p. 5). Thereby, mentees would benefit from another positive role model in their life. Brandie believed that the lack of discipline and structure in the mentees home played a factor in their current disposition (p. 5). Parents who do not have adequate disciplinary techniques to control their children’s behaviour will negatively affect their children’s ability to have positive interactions with others. Carmen described the issues of youth witnessing abuse in the home or being victims themselves and how that impacted the mentee traumatically (p. 7). Brandie explained that her mentee did not have parents involved in her life, due to their addiction issues and was put into foster care (Brandie, p. 3). Bill stated that his mentee was living in a group home, which he believed was problematic because there were bad influences on his little brother who were into drugs or other behaviours like vandalism (Bill, p. 2). Some of the most high-risk youth Emily has dealt with are living “in an area where there are gangs” (p. 6). These are high-crime areas where youth are experiencing elevated levels of poverty, lack of social cohesion, poor housing, high unemployment, and high levels of violence. Some parents are also incarcerated, leaving the youth with one less emotional support (Carmen, p. 7).

This is also closely connected to issues of youth living in poverty. Some mentors mentioned that the mentees' parents lived on social assistance (Bill, p. 5). Another said that the guardians did not have a lot of money (Brandie, p. 12). Many single parents are struggling financially, which is why the organization deals with many more kids that are lacking a second positive adult figure in their life (Carmen, p. 2). Emily stated, "I believe that poverty is the root of a lot of it. And you know these kids are coming from [...], poor upbringing and [...] you're thinking how am I going to get out of it, so I might as well be able to make some money" (p. 2). They see criminal activity as a compelling option to be able to make money and feel accepted.

Another risk factor mentioned included individuals experiencing mental health problems. Many of these health outcomes play a crucial role in the mentees lives, as it affects their daily interactions. Some examples include hyperactivity, oppositional defiant disorders, autism, attention deficit, depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder (Bill, p. 4; Norm, p. 2; Carmen, p. 3; Emily, p. 6). Carmen stated that, "all of...[the mentees] hold a lot of self-blame. Blame themselves for whatever the situation is" (p. 3). This can lead to low self-worth and even suicidal behaviours with the feelings of hopelessness, likely due to the multiple labels placed upon them (Brandie, p. 7). Some of this can stem from feelings of abandonment with lack of family structure and lack of legitimate resources (Carmen, p. 4). Mental health "impacts the whole community [...] not only that person, that child or individual. Many will look at the diagnosis and the medical bills and the doctors and then its impact [because] here you have kids that didn't learn to cope" (Carmen, p. 4). A lot of the diagnoses label youth with many prognoses, but do not provide the tools to improve their health outcomes. If we want to help youth with health outcomes, mentors can be that sources of guidance and advocacy (Bill, p. 7). Advocacy has been proven to have a significant impact when mentoring high-risk youth and

lowering their likelihood of delinquency (Tolan, Henry, Schoeny, Bass, Lovegrove, & Nichols, 2013; Tolan et al., 2014).

Some youth had more problematic behaviours involving violence due to their temper and stemming from their underlying mental health issues (Bill, p. 5). These types of behaviours are not tolerated in the home, school or public and lead to involvement with police. Without some intervention, youth experiencing these risk factors will continue in the same behaviour patterns. Brandie stated that her mentee was violent towards peers at school during a bullying altercation and the police were involved (Brandie, p. 7). Brandie got involved afterwards by talking with the mentee about why she lashed out to understand how her mentee could use non-violent ways to address problems in the future. Some mentees were also involved in petty crime, such as vandalism and theft, but not the violent crime (Carmen, p. 12). Many of the negative behaviours are the result of a system that has failed to address the needs of youth.

Peer influence and pressure is an issue that all youth deal with during their life development (Carmen, p. 2). Bill stated that, “you know he [the mentee] gets sort of these ideas about you know- oh that would be cool to do like drugs” (p. 2). Many of these ideas came from the people in his environment and the mentality within the group home. Many of them are easily influenced by what their peers say and do, because they don’t have an adult around to help guide them (Emily, p. 2). Brandie stated her mentee “gets influenced very easily and I think that is what concerns me the most. You know whatever her friends are doing she will go about to do” (p. 2). Much of the behaviour exhibited by mentees was described as learned behaviour that could be altered with a strong positive influence and social bond. This is especially the case “when you’re hanging out with the wrong crowd and don’t have the right influences. It is very

easy to go down that path. So when you see somebody like a big brother [or big sister] you can talk to or you know ask questions to” it helps (Norm, p. 2).

Lastly, trouble in school was described as a risk factor because mentees that were not succeeding in class were not learning in the education system. One mentee was described as not being engaged because he was unable to focus in a conventional classroom setting (Bill, p. 9). Without the proper support in school, mentees struggle to meet the academic expectations and lose interest in school. The fear is that individuals, who are not getting good grades and not participating in school, are at higher risk for dropping out and school failure. A lack of education will result in a higher likelihood of unemployment or low wages in the future. It can also result in youth having a lack of attachment, involvement, and commitment to school (Hirschi, 1969). Other factors including poor attendance could also be the reasons for being uninterested in school, which stem from the family life and lack of pro-social supports (Brandie, p. 3). These risk factors, when accumulated, result in a higher likelihood of criminal involvement in the future and must be tackled through social bonds.

Process of Relationship Bonding between Mentors and Mentees

The process of the relationship bonding between mentors and mentees was described through the following practices to ensure the quality of the match over time. Carmen stated, “it is basically all about giving them those opportunities to you know fill their potential [...] so helping them through the healthy mind stages” (p. 2). Mentors described the following processes as attempting to meet the diverse needs of youth by taking small steps to gaining the trust of the mentees and building a social bond through an impactful relationship (Britner et al., 2006).

Consistency was one of the main components mentioned by mentors, because the relationship develops by having that positive role model in the lives of mentees (Bill, p. 1). Past research has shown that a minimum of 12 months is needed for relationships between mentors

and mentees to be impactful (Grossman & Rhodes, 2002; Higley et al., 2014). For the mentor and mentee to be able to develop a strong bond, they need the mentorship to last for a substantial period of time to go through the stages of relationships. Consistency is what creates an attachment between the mentor and mentee because it leads to feelings of care, love, and respect (Hirschi, 1969). Brandie described the bonding as “providing [a] good relationship and demonstrating what good values would be” (Brandie, p. 1). To gain the trust of the mentee, you need constant reinforcement from a positive role model (Brandie, p. 10). “It is about that positive reinforcement of decision-making” (Carmen, p. 2). The consistency ensures that mentors are reliable and committed to the relationship (Emily, p. 1). “The important thing is that consistency, and he knows he is picking him up every week and they are going to hang out with each other... and there is somebody there that cares and he can talk to him” (Emily, p. 9). Overall, it is important that the mentor proves to the mentee that he or she wants to help them from the goodness of their heart and develop a friendship for personal growth.

To build the relationship, you need “a lot of conversation and engaging in activities that are enjoyable for him and almost enjoyable for me” (Bill, p. 15). Bill stated that for his mentee, he had to make sure the environment was safe, so his little brother was comfortable to share experiences and he could give advice (Bill, p. 13). “Like his idea of the relationship is that we are brothers and are the same age” (Bill, p. 10). It is giving the mentee a consistent person “they can trust, talk to, anything of that nature” (Norm, p. 1). The mentees ask any questions they have and are confident that they will not be judged in the process (Norm, p. 4). Brandie stated, “I feel like a friendship is built on just listening and trying to support rather than try and criticize” (p. 10). The openness creates strong emotional connections because mentees “want to be liked, want to be appreciated, and they want to matter” (Carmen, p. 16). “They need an adult in their life that

they can trust and who they can count on and talk to. Who will guide them and role model them” (Emily, p. 8).

Mentors engaged in a variety of activities with mentees to establish a healthy relationship. The activities attempted to keep the youth grounded with a balance between an adult friendship and mentors providing guidance and support. Some examples of activities included going to the movies, watching hockey games, swimming at the beach, playing video games, attending concerts, socialization, and playing sports. Most mentors were accommodating of mentees’ interests (Bill; Norm; Brandie, p. 12). Bill believed that the purpose of mentoring was keeping the young person busy and preventing them from getting involved in crime through a friendship (p. 2). Norm believed the mentoring relationship was about doing agreed upon activities together and trying new things to learn new skills (p. 3). Norm also mentioned that he gives back to his community by volunteering and invites his mentee to help, this is done in hopes of teaching him a work ethic (p. 3). Emily believes mentoring was all about having fun “because if they’re not having fun than you’re bored and they won’t build a bond” (Emily, p. 12).

Engaging in activities is an easy way to build rapport and learn to approach new situations as a team. These descriptions are similar to what Hirschi (1969) describes as youth becoming committed and involved in conventional activities because they are engaging with the mentors through positive interactions through sport or social outings on a consistent basis.

Mentors were inclined to follow a developmental versus a prescriptive approach. Within a developmental approach, goals are decided together between the mentor and mentee for a negotiation to take place where both parties have a say in what they want to do (Bill, p. 8). Mentors are expected to “listen and respect the views points and thoughts of youth and focus on their strengths” (Big Brothers Big Sisters of Canada, 2011). You want the mentee to make

decisions on what they want to do to learn and make changes in their life (Brandie, p. 10). It was also described as a learning experience for the mentors as they have grown from the relationship with their mentees (Bill, Norm, & Brandie). There are many teachable moments, but you must address their needs and see them as individuals, not a statistic (Carmen, p. 6). Mentees need “to know that they matter and are important. Know that they have a voice and [...] that they’re good enough” (Carmen, p. 8). This can be done through the mentors’ approach in offering help and letting mentees come up with solutions to problems because they’re intelligent and know what they want. It requires time in “getting to know each other or learning something new about each other every week” (Emily, p. 14). Most mentors mentioned that they treated their mentees like family and had welcomed them into their social environment to make them feel happy (Bill; Norm; Brandie; Carmen).

Parental involvement is essential to mentoring relationships because you need the support of parents to ensure they’re able to reinforce environmental changes and that the bonds between mentees and parents improve. By maintaining active communication with the parent, mentors can effectively schedule outings with the mentee (Norm, p. 9). By collaborating with parents, they can help mediate certain situations and have a circle of support. The trust of parents is important for the mentee to feel safe and engaged in the program for success (Emily, p. 14). “I think open communication with the family is what would actually help” (Brandie, p. 15). By speaking with parents, they can play a role in the relationship and provide the mentor with information on their situation. Mentors can also encourage the parents to go back to school or work, and the organization can also advocate on their behalf (Carmen, p. 9). Some of the mothers or fathers need encouragement and support as well, which the caseworkers can provide. “If the parents aren’t engaged the matches will close. It is just the research says it” (Emily, p. 14). The

parents are the gatekeepers of the youth, and their support helps to make the match better.

However, if parents are not organized, it is unlikely that they will connect with the organization.

Mentors also mentioned that they were only able to be as much as a friend for the mentees and would seek outside support if they needed professional help (Bill, p. 12). By connecting mentees with outside resources, their specialized needs could be cared for by professionals and reinforced by the mentors (DuBois et al., 2002). One example discussed by Norm was that his mentee was having trouble in school with math, so the organization set him up with a tutor (p. 4). By providing a specialized person who was able to help the mentee with math skills, he began to do better in the subject and have more confidence. However, although the mentors are encouraged to connect mentees with resources, the organization wants to remain informed about any referrals because they have the community connections and channels of support. “They want you to inform them. They don’t want you to run out and get him help without knowing. They want to be informed and have all those questions” (Norm, p. 11). Brandie looked into other programs to help her mentee such as connecting her with a program called ‘Go Girls’ which is about positive reinforcement, self-worth and healthy eating (p. 6). Brandie also contacted Sudbury Action Centre for Youth to inquire about their programs. Overall “we are a firm believer that it takes a community to raise kids. So for us, if another agency can help or better prepare that person, or that child or that parent we will go that route” (Carmen, p. 31). The organization has connections through Children’s Aid, counseling in the schools, child and family centres, and other through the city social services.

Lastly, guidance is essential for the relationship bonding process because it ensures that mentees increase their socio-emotional skills. Emotional support in mentoring programs has shown large effects on youth behaviour (Tolan et al., 2014). Norm said, “my little brother sees

that if I work hard and try to teach them an ethic, that they don't have to be stuck in a rut, maybe their family has been in their whole life" (p. 1). Norm owns his own business and tries to pass on knowledge to his little brother. Norm has avoided violence and illegal activities, doing drugs or drinking heavily. He also attended school to become a mechanic and continues to respect others and work hard to build a life. He also tries to teach his mentee right from wrong, that being proper behaviour through soft discipline (Norm, p. 5). It can be as simple as guiding the mentees to see poor decisions and where a path can lead (Bill, p. 2). Bill said he would reward the mentees for good behaviour to show him the positives of being pro-social (p. 22). In guiding mentees, it was also mentioned to be included in that circle of support and be available to share your experiences or other situations with solutions. "I feel like it almost gives her hope that there is ... more to life than all this negativity ... and maybe seeing more healthy relationships" (Brandie, p. 14). Much of the guidance is driven by listening and encouraging the mentee to make positive choices to reach their full potential for academic and job success (Emily, p. 11).

Carmen said,

"I remember one youth telling me that he was just going to be a bum. And I said well you know what buddy that sucks. I talk to him straight up. I said it sucks because I see more potential in you than you see in yourself. And I looked in my rearview, and I see he had a tear coming down his eye. And I knew I struck a chord that I could still reach him. Obviously, he had been in that cycle where nobody dreamed of education or nobody thought that they could" (p. 5).

Once the mentee can have their needs addressed, they are better able to perform and make better choices. Crime prevention is about making different choices through discussions with others (Emily, p. 2). This guidance relates to what Hirschi (1969) described as the bond of belief because the mentees are learning about certain ethical behaviours to engage in and being pro-social through values of respect, helping and giving to others, working hard, following the law, and abiding by the rules of the social contract.

Challenges of Mentoring High-Risk Youth

Mentors discussed challenges when mentoring high-risk youth particularly the difficulty relating to mentees who come from deprived circumstances and are going through many challenges. Bill stated that, “it is kind of hard being 22 relating a lot to someone who is nine years old. But you can kind of grasp at a few things and build part of the relationship in that” (p. 3). Brandie felt similar in that she was not exposed to the same things her mentee was going through because she grew up in a middle class family with a mother and father (p. 2). Sometimes the mentees will be asked difficult questions where the mentor is unable to answer them (Norm, p. 7). It becomes hard for mentors to give advice when they didn’t have similar experiences, but they were able to seek support from Big Brother Big Sisters caseworkers.

Another challenge is setting boundaries to ensure mentees are aware of what is acceptable and unacceptable behaviour. Bill talked about the line of appropriate conversation he tries to instill in his relationship with his mentee because if he does not have boundaries, his mentee will talk about inappropriate subjects (p. 10). “I mean they’re kids and ... are going to test your limits” (Norm, p. 7). You have to be firm with them, while also ensuring you’re supportive. Brandie discussed how it was hard for her to be included in her mentees circle of care because of the family keeping information from her (p. 14). Her boundaries were constrained as a mentor, yet she wanted to help and be more involved in the mentee’s life.

Mentors also mentioned that they lacked the time and skills to deal with the multiple risk factors mentees were experiencing. Bill stated, “I almost feel like there is not enough intervention on my part. If I could be there more, I would be there 100%” (p. 12). The philosophy of mentoring is about listening, doing activities and being available for that person. Brandie felt she is lacking the skills needed to deal with the high-risk situations her mentees were experiencing and that her time was limited (p. 9). “I feel like I can only do so much [...], I am not

the one there with her 24/7 disciplining her, guiding her, and I don't know. I feel like I am just a fraction of the piece" (Brandie, p. 15). Carmen said that they are not always able to address everything but "if you're doing it from the heart and doing it for the best interest of that child. If you can list and really listen, listen to hear not listen to respond. Sometimes that is the best impact you can have" (p. 17). Through further training of mentors, they could develop more skills. Most of the youth mentors were unaware of the evidence-based practices and lacked the training (Bill, Norm, & Brandie). These are the people dealing with some of the most vulnerable people in our communities without much training. "There is so many touchy situations where how do you like express, how do you correctly and sensitively express your concern" (Brandie, p. 18). Training mentors in best practices for mentoring at-risk youth would help in addressing some of the inabilities and awareness of tools.

The mentors also mentioned that the Big Brothers Big Sisters Organization lacked funding to be able to supply more caseworkers and recruit more male and female mentors. The long waiting list for male mentors is due to the inability to focus as much as is needed on recruitment and promotion (Norm, p. 16; Carmen, p. 8). Without the resources, the organization is unable to provide more training or resources for outings and events. Limited staff limits the number of kids that can participate in the program (Norm, p. 6). The staff members are doing as much as they can, but they need more funding and resources to be able to provide more of the one-to-one mentoring service and outreach to high-risk youth (Brandie, p. 18). The organization receives many referrals from parents and community partners/agencies. However, some parents are not involved enough to have their child enrolled in the program, so they are not reaching all high-risk youth (Carmen, p. 8). It is difficult arrive at these individuals, because they are not reaching out through door-to-door canvassing. "I don't know if BBBS would have those

resources to get to those people” (Brandie, p. 18). Many of the connections to high-risk families are through involvement with police and social agencies. Emily mentioned that it is important to get the youth at a young age, to intervene before their lives become more disrupted (p. 8).

Prevention of Crime and Violence

The impact of mentoring on high-risk youth was determined through the mentor’s perception on how their relationship influenced the prevention of crime and violence. Bill stated that he believed he had a bearing on his mentees involvement in crime because he had less exposure to negative influences with his guidance and was less likely explore alone with his thoughts (p. 23). Bill described that he was the intervener that interrupted the negative path his mentees was going down in hopes that he would not engage in crime in the future. He believed that by helping his mentee make healthy choices and keeping him busy, it kept him away from violent crime. This relates to what Hirschi (1969) states in his theory of crime that the likelihood of youth delinquency would be reduced by keeping youth involved in conventional activities and hobbies. The more time youth are unsupervised, the more likely they are to engage in problematic behaviours.

Wayne believed he had an impact on his mentees because when he used soft discipline techniques their behaviour changed. “You have to try to show him. You explain the law to him and explain what is going on and try to help him in life. Maybe he didn’t know before” (p. 5). The mentees also felt a sense of responsibility when they broke the law and never wanted to disappoint their mentors. Brandie reinforced that she was giving her mentee good values and positive memories to reflect back on in the future (p. 13). “I feel like that almost gives her hope that there is ... more to life than all this negatively. You know and maybe seeing more healthy relationships could also kind of play a role with that” (Brandie, p. 14). Much of the criminal behaviour is in response to the conditions these youth experience.

Wayne mentioned that early intervention with youth is essential to prevent crime because providing them with resources from a young age will provide them with the support system needed to engage in positive behaviour. Some examples are being respectful to others, working hard, learning new things, being proactive, involved in the community, and having meaningful relationships. Carmen stated that the prevention of youth engaging in crime was the result of youth going onto post-secondary school and pursuing careers they desire through feelings of self-confidence (p. 5). These meaningful opportunities serve as a deterrent for youth. “The programs are working if we’re working with at-risk youth and the amount of our youth that are actually in trouble with the law is very minimal [...] than that shows you that mentoring works” (Carmen, p. 23). She also stated that in her 15 years with the BBBS Organization, none of the kids have gone to jail. Emily mentioned that one of her mentees was almost recruited into a prostitution ring, but she was able to identify the signs and show the mentee what was happening. The mentee was able to escape, with help from the Big Brothers Big Sisters organization. Evidently, involvement in criminal activity is not always a choice, and vulnerable people can be coerced into problematic situations.

Aspects of social bonding theory evident in the BBBS CBM program

From the five interviews with mentors, it was evident that Hirschi’s bonding theory provided a lens to understand the mentoring relationship between big brothers/sisters and mentees. Attachment was frequently mentioned as the emotional connections and friendship created between mentors and mentees. Mentors were actively engaged with mentees by helping them to understand and navigate challenges in their daily lives through guidance, role modelling, and support. However, the extent to which the quality of the mentoring was improved by following the components of the theory was unknown.

Commitment was relevant in that mentees were engaging in prosocial activities with their mentors on a weekly basis and set appropriate goals. Mentors believed that their mentees were invested in the relationship and did not want to disappoint them because they cared about the effects of their actions on others.

Involvement was the most frequently discussed, because the mentors and mentees were invested in one another's lives through the BBBS program. Mentors kept mentees occupied through conversations, sports, learning, eating together, and other community activities. By keeping the mentees busy, mentors believed they were less likely to engage in negative behaviours or be influenced by peers. The involvement was also consistent over a significant period of time (at least one year) to build the trust and have a positive influence on attitudes and behaviours.

Belief was the most unclear, because mentees could be influenced by the role modelling of their mentors but their value system may have not been established enough to restrain behaviours. The BBBS organization does have clear values and goals that they aim to maintain, which is primarily around the care and well-being of young people and to improve their quality of life through mentorship. The values are likely maintained by the mentors and may have some influence on mentees social values and self-confidence. It was mentioned that trust and being comfortable were more relevant to the bonds and having a sense of belonging.

Mentors were likely bonding with youth, but their ability to bond mentees with parents and schools would require further resources, training, and time. A few of the mentors discussed trying to keep in contact with the mentees parents to ensure they were aware of the activities taking place during their visits, but acknowledged that their home lives were difficult. Although

it was unclear whether the mentors were able to help in strengthening the attachment of mentees to their parents, they were informed about the match and involved in the BBBS organization.

Mentors stated that they were always willing to help mentees with homework, but were less involved with the school due to their voluntary role within the BBBS organization. Some mentors mentioned how they provided as many opportunities for their mentees in order for them to have access to any training, education, and community services.

Therefore, future research should test the effects of youth mentoring programs on the key tenets of the social bond theory, their ability to reduce risk factors and so prevent offending through program components/practices.

Conclusion

This chapter discussed the research findings from five qualitative interviews with two Big Brothers and three Big Sisters from the municipalities of Sudbury and Ottawa, Ontario who work with high-risk male and female youth between the ages of 12-17 years old in the community-based mentoring program. It was evident that the methods of the mentoring programs in the community require sound practices led by Big Brothers Big Sisters Organization, for the matches between mentors and mentees to likely have an impact on youth crime and violence. The organizational procedures require screening, training, matching, professional oversight, and the support system for the mentoring relationships to take place. Secondly, the risk factors of youth involved in the program were discussed as the individual and environmental backgrounds, which affect the thinking and behaviour patterns of high-risk youth. These include family breakdown, poverty, mental health, violence, peer influence and trouble in school. Mentoring is one component for improving socio-emotional relationships to help youth with multiple vulnerabilities, in tandem with other services and supports from parents, schools, and social services. Thirdly, the process of relationship bonding between mentors and mentees occurs

through consistency, activities, developmental approach, parental involvement, connecting to community resources, and guidance. These processes develop through a strong bond provided by mentors to dissuade mentees from engaging in crime. Fourthly, the challenges of mentoring high-risk youth were the lack of mentors finding relatable experiences to mentees, setting boundaries, lack of time and skills, and the lack of funding. Lastly, the perceived impact on the prevention of crime and violence has been positive. All the mentors believed they were having an impact on youth by lowering their exposure to harmful influences, enabling better decision-making, discipline, and being provided resources through support.

Chapter 7: Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter brings together the findings from each chapter to answer the central research question: Is youth mentoring a viable crime prevention strategy for Ontario? The thesis provides valuable insights to understand the risk factors for youth crime and social bonding theory in relation to youth mentoring, the effectiveness of youth mentoring programs and some best practices to prevent crime, government policy framework and reports on crime prevention through social development in Ontario, and the methods used by youth mentors from Big Brother Big Sisters for reflection.

Conclusions

Chapter one confirmed that despite declines in police recorded crime and victimization rates from their peaks in Canada, there is still a significant amount of harm and conflict. This does an estimated \$55 billion in harm to victims. The costs of policing have increased significantly in the last 15 years to \$14 billion, which with costs of courts and corrections, is close to \$20 billion annually.

The solution to be explored was crime prevention through social development as a way to reduce victimization and crime by addressing the root causes. The primary focus was youth mentoring, which was selected as a promising way to deal with these issues and positively impact the lives of young people through relationship building.

Chapter two discussed the conceptual issues of the thesis to ensure the accuracy of the terminology. It also explained the literature collected and used throughout the thesis to arrive at a set of conclusions. Qualitative research methodology was used to gather data through semi-structured interviews with mentors and a thematic analysis to code the themes. Lastly, the strengths/limitation of the thesis explored the justifications for why I conducted this study.

Does evidence on risk factors for youth crime and social bonding theory help explain the contribution of youth mentoring in relation to crime prevention?

Chapter three explored the risk factors as the underlying issues that lead youth into engaging in a crime, which crime prevention initiatives should address. Life-course and developmental criminology have shown that negative life experiences such as family conditions, poverty, lack of education, behavioural problems in school, lack of social cohesion, substance misuse, and abuse correlated with later persistent criminal offending.

Social bonding theory provided a lens to understand the contribution of mentoring in relation to crime prevention through attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief. The theory suggests that weak bonds between young men and conventional parents and the school results in a higher likelihood of criminal behaviour.

Risk factors and social bonding theory confirmed the demographic and characteristics of youth, which are amenable. Youth mentoring is likely to impact some of these life circumstances to prevent crime and improve social well-being.

What is the evidence that mentoring youth is effective in preventing crime?

Chapter four focused on the effectiveness of four programs that involved mentoring – Big Brothers Big Sisters of America, Youth Inclusion Program, Mentoring Plus, and Quantum Opportunities Program. Research has shown some positive impacts on the risk factors for crime and reductions in youth offending. The social return on investment for all programs was not evaluated, but a study of the Big Brothers Big Sisters program showed an \$18 return for every dollar invested.

Research on mentoring relationships showed that when mentors focus on the assets of the youth, role modeling, maintaining strong commitment, and ensuring the duration of the

relationship, they could foster a lasting emotional bond with youth. The best practice for an effective youth mentoring program included: outreaching to disadvantaged youth, involving parents, screening and training mentors, matching mentors based on shared interest and background, integrating mentoring programs with other supports, mentoring should be a holistic developmental approach, and robust implementation of developed standards.

The evidence shows that some mentoring programs have addressed amenable risk factors and reduced offending. Relationship development and best practices provides some insights into considerations for future programs.

Is Ontario committed to investing in evidence-based crime prevention through social development and would this embrace mentoring?

Chapter five discussed the history of Canadian crime prevention policy from the Horner committee recommendations in 1993, the National Crime Prevention Council and Centre, and the Canadian Forum for Crime Prevention, which has influenced government decisions to invest in CPSD.

It analyzed the current crime prevention policy frameworks and reports in the Province of Ontario to confirm their knowledge of CPSD, the availability of funding, public opinion, and the interest in developing community safety and well-being planning framework. Ontario's policy frameworks are consistent with the literature on risk factors and effectiveness of social development strategies that can prevent crime. However, there was no recognition of the influence of youth mentoring programs and limited commitment of funding to initiatives.

Policy frameworks in Ontario justify investment in effective social development strategies and so logically would include mentoring. However, this commitment will require

significant investment and political support in CPSD to reduce crime and improve social well-being.

What are the methods used by youth mentors in the Big Brothers Big Sisters community-based mentoring program to prevent crime?

Chapter six explored the findings and analysis from five qualitative interviews with two Big Brothers, two Big Sisters, and one staff member from Sudbury or Ottawa, Ontario. It was evident that the methods of the mentors required sound practices led by the Big Brothers Big Sisters organization for the matches between mentors and mentees to have an impact on risk factors and youth crime. The organizational procedures require screening, training, matching, professional oversight, and the support system for the mentoring relationships to take place. Secondly, the risk factors identified by the interviewees of the youth involved in the program included family breakdown, poverty, mental health, violence, peer influence, and trouble in school. The respondents identified mentoring as an effective program that helps improve youth's socio-emotional relationships. Mentoring in combination with other services and supports from parents, schools, and social services were conceptualized as impactful. Thirdly, the process of relationship bonding between mentors and mentees occurs through consistency, activities, a developmental approach, parental involvement, connecting with community resources, and guidance. These processes develop through a strong bond provided by mentors to dissuade mentees from engaging in crime. Fourthly, the challenges of mentoring high-risk youth incorporated the lack of relatable experiences mentors had with mentees, setting boundaries, lack of time and skills, and the lack of funding for the program. Lastly, the perceived impact mentors had on the prevention of crime and violence was positive. All of the mentors believed they were having an impact on their mentees involvement in crime because the relationship had lowered

mentees' exposure to negative influences, were making better choices, had better discipline, and were provided with resources through support. Selection and training of mentors makes social bonding with them likely, but for social bonding with parents and schools it will require additional training and resources.

In sum, the Ontario government's reports are consistent with the need to reduce harm to victims and control rising costs of the criminal justice system. The reports are consistent with evidence on risk factors and social bonding theory, as well as the effectiveness of crime prevention through social development. Therefore, youth mentoring is a crime prevention strategy that could be viable in Ontario. Commentators argue that if Ontario wants to reduce crime through CPSD it must provide an implementation strategy, sustainable funding, continued research and evaluation, and an office for the prevention of crime to lead its success.

Recommendations

The Government of Ontario has talked about releasing its framework and practical toolkit on community safety and well-being planning. I believe, based on the evidence, that this document should include information on how municipalities can support youth mentoring programs by increasing their capacity to address known risk factors. Also to promote social bonding theory through a crime prevention lens to help connect young people with parents and communities.

Through a collaborative approach, services in municipalities could work together to support more community-based mentoring programs or increase the capacity of Big Brother Big Sisters with the support of other services. This could be facilitated by municipalities through existing situational tables/hubs, but would require focusing on upstream prevention versus waiting for high-risk situations. The multi-sectoral tables could plan to set up more mentoring schemes with the involvement of police, schools, parents, mental health, and community

members to ensure all pressing issues or problems can be addressed through a multi-sectoral approach. Municipalities should make sure BBBS is sitting on their situation tables to get more referrals and play a role in the prevention of youth crime.

Moreover, the Government of Ontario must put substantial funding into youth mentoring as a social development program, if they want it to impact crime and improve community safety. According to the literature, this would require at least 5% of the existing budget going into reacting to crime through police, courts, and prisons by matching that amount for upstream social crime prevention. For the funding to be sustainable for social development programs like BBBS mentoring, it should be legislated to deal with crime and community safety in the province. Having a crime and community safety act, would ensure that a new or existing office could lead the community safety and well-being strategy and that the funding would not disappear when a new government takes power.

Local organizations could continue facilitating the mentoring programs, but would require further resources to outreach to vulnerable high-risk youth, engage in advocacy to government and the public, and expand with more professional staff to recruit more at-risk youth.

Ontario also needs an office for the prevention of crime and community safety to lead and facilitate research, policy advice, political pressure through consultation with communities and politicians, educational promotion for the public, managing grants for social development programs, ensuring the strategy is implemented and meets set goals through measuring outcomes (evaluations). The office would be responsible for coordinated actions of different ministries, practitioners and all levels of government to gain support. The office would break down silos,

reduce duplication and create cooperation between ministries with a mandate to coordinate action on crime prevention at the provincial level.

If Big Brothers Big Sisters wants to be involved in crime prevention, they will need to put substantial resources into professional training for their mentors about upstream social crime prevention techniques based on research and program structures that are likely to work. These mechanisms will assist them in developing standards to deal with high-risk youth who are on the fringe of criminal involvement and those who have started to cause harm to society. They will also need the financial means to help high-risk youth with their diverse needs. This would require further outreach to youth and families in need through social media campaigns, door-to-door recruitment, and referrals from social services.

For youth mentoring to have an impact on crime, it must be centred on youth and focused on the various needs and vulnerabilities identified by youth, families, professionals, communities, schools, and government agencies. Through early intervention, social services and families must work together to outreach to these youth with support from all levels of government.

Many types of mentoring relationships are either formal or informal, but require an individual who is open to establishing a supportive social bond with another person and someone who is aware of personal circumstances. Youth come from a variety of diverse backgrounds defined by different traits, but are often symptoms of social and structural inequalities based on their race, class, gender, and ethnicity. Thus, the historical, social, economic, and cultural contexts must be considered when developing programs and ensure no unintended consequences occur. In particular, at-risk youth must be treated fairly under any categorization to avoid stigmatization.

This thesis concludes that youth mentoring programs must connect with youth in high need to have promising impacts on crime rates and to improve their opportunities for better futures with meaningful relationships. Canada needs to use more proactive measures to address social problems and move away from focusing on reactive response to crime, as the adversarial justice system has become an industry. The federal government should consider setting national goals to reduce immediate harm and violence in all communities, implement effective solutions, and measure those results through evaluations to ensure promising results.

Based on the findings of this thesis, a practical prevention framework using the principles of social bonding theory (attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief) is likely to impact the root causes of crime. In order for youth mentoring programs to facilitate positive human connections, it will require core values to be established, while remaining flexible to the needs of young people and recognizing the societal contexts. The fundamental principles of social bonding theory could facilitate inclusive interactions between young people, communities, and the state through a collective identity, which may lead to feelings of hope and belonging.

Future Research

In the future, program evaluations should be done in Canada to test the effects of youth mentoring programs to understand the specific results various theories and implementation practices have on the outcomes. Future studies could focus on the quality of the mentoring relationship with youth at-risk, the extent to which the mentoring relationship contributes to attachment to parents, schools and jobs, and the relative contribution of these to reductions in persistent offending. Social bonding theory ought to be used as a framework to understand concepts like attachment and involvement of young people to communities in order to see how it can increase or decrease their abilities to succeed and feel a sense of belonging.

For programs like Big Brothers Big Sisters to continue and ensure they are positively assisting young people, they have to evaluate all programs in some capacity. Mixed method evaluations through in-depth interviews with mentees and outcome evaluations could help determine best practices for existing and developing mentoring programs or strategies. These types of studies will also generate the discovery of innovative methods to reach positive results.

It is also essential that research dealing with varying demographics of youth acknowledge the systemic factors contributing to their experiences such as power, wealth, and privilege. Analyses that focus on deficits fail to problematize the conditions under which crime and victimization rates are taking place. Research should shift towards collaborative, action-based methodologies that address circumstances in communities to eradicate crime.

References

- Agnew, R. (1985). Social control theory and delinquency: A longitudinal test. *Criminology*, 23(1), 47-61.
- Akers, R. (1990). Rational choice, deterrence, and social learning theory in criminology: The path not taken. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology (1973-)*, 81(3), 653–676.
- Akers, R., & Sellers, C. (2013). *Criminological theories: Introduction, evaluation, and application* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Alam, S. (2015). Youth court statistics in Canada, 2013/2014. *Juristat. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Cat. No. 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14224-eng.pdf>
- Albright, J., Hurd, N., & Hussain, S. (2017). Applying a social justice lens to youth mentoring: A review of the literature and recommendations for practice. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 59(3-4), 363-381.
- Allen, M., Bevan, V., Chrystal, F., Dewar, M., Kanellakos, S., Legendre, J., McInnes, B., Mills, R., Paré, D., Rachlis, L., St-Éloi, L., Turgeon, C., & Waller, I. (2004). *Community crime prevention: Investing for a safer Ottawa*. Retrieved from http://www.crimepreventionottawa.ca/uploads/files/Crime_Prevention_e.pdf
- Allen, M., & Superle, T. (2015). Youth Crime in Canada, 2014. *Juristat. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Cat. No. 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2016001/article/14309-eng.htm>
- Allen, M. (2016). Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2015. *Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Cat. No. 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2016001/article/14642-eng.htm>
- Anderson, B., Beinart, S., Farrington, D., Langman, J., Stugis, P. & Utting, D. (2005). *Risk and protective factors*. Youth Justice Board Summary. Retrieved from http://www.crim.cam.ac.uk/people/academic_research/david_farrington/riskprot.pdf
- Andresen, M. A., & Jenion, G. W. (2008). Crime Prevention and the science of where people are. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 19(2), 164-180.
- Aos, S., Lieb, R., Mayfield, J, Miller, M., & Pennucci, A. (2004). *Benefits and costs of prevention and early intervention programs for youth*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Retrieved from http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/881/Wsipp_Benefits-and-Costs-of-Prevention-and-Early-Intervention-Programs-for-Youth_Summary-Report.pdf

- Bania, M., & Chase, V. (2016). Toolkit on effective mentoring for youth facing barriers to success. *Ontario Mentoring Coalition*. Retrieved from <http://ontariomentoringcoalition.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/OMC-Toolkit.pdf>
- Baker, S. (2016). How can we help? An educator's perspective on the Situation Table Model in Ontario. *Journal of Community Safety & Well-Being* 1(20), 16-20. Retrieved from <https://journalcswb.ca/index.php/cswb/article/view/7>
- Big Brothers Big Sisters of Canada. (2017). *About us*. Retrieved from <http://www.bigbrothersbigsisters.ca/en/home/aboutbbbsc/default.aspx>
- Big Brothers Big Sisters of Canada. (2011). An orientation to mentoring at Big Brothers Big Sisters. *National Learning Centre*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbbsc.ca/members/training/course.asp?ID=volunteer>
- Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development. (2017). *About us*. Retrieved from <http://www.blueprintsprograms.com/about>
- Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development. (2016). *Eisenhower Quantum Opportunities Program*. Retrieved from <http://www.blueprintsprograms.com/factsheet/eisenhower-quantum-opportunities-program>
- Blyth, M., & Soloman, E. (Eds.). (2009). *Prevention and youth crime: Is early intervention working?* Policy Press at the University of Bristol.
- Boyce, J. (2015). Police-reported crime statistic in Canada, 2014. *Juristat. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Cat. No. 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14211-eng.htm>
- Bradley, J., & Sidhu, M. (2016). *Ottawa graduate students meet with Naqvi to discuss crime prevention and community safety*. Retrieved from <https://criminologyca.wordpress.com/2016/08/11/time-to-take-action-on-reducing-crime-and-victimization-in-ontario/>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brantingham, P. J., & Faust, F. L. (1976). A conceptual model of crime prevention. *Crime & Delinquency*, 22(3), 284.
- Britner, P. A., Balcazar, F. E., Blechman, E. A., Blinn-Pike, L., & Larose, S. (2006). Mentoring special youth populations. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 34(6), 747-763.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. *International Encyclopedia of Education* 3(2), 37-43.

- Burrows, J. (2003). *Evaluation of the youth inclusion programme: End of phase one report*. London: Youth Justice Board. Retrieved from <http://yjbpublications.justice.gov.uk/Resources/Downloads/YIP-Evaluation03.pdf>
- Burrows, J., Mackie, A., & Hubbard, R. (2008). *Evaluation of the youth inclusion programme, Phase 2*. London: Youth Justice Board Retrieved from <http://yjbpublications.justice.gov.uk/en-gb/scripts/prodView.asp?idproduct=473&eP>
- Butera, J. (2014). Effective youth mentoring: Best practices. *Crime Prevention Ottawa Research paper*. Retrieved from <http://www.crimepreventionottawa.ca/Media/Content/files/Publications/Youth/Effective%20Youth%20Mentoring-final%20July%2008%202014.pdf>
- Carrington, P. J., Matarazzo, A., & deSouza, P. (2005). *Court careers of a Canadian birth cohort*. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada (Crime and Justice Research Paper No. 7). Retrieved from <http://publications.gc.ca/Collection/Statcan/85-561-MIE/85-561-MIE2005006.pdf>
- Case, S. (2006). Young people “at risk” of what? Challenging risk-focused early intervention as crime prevention. *Youth Justice*, 6(3), 171-179.
- Case, S., & Haines, K. (2007). Offending by young people: A further risk factor analysis. *Security Journal*, 20(2), 96-110.
- Cavell, T., & Elledge, C. (2014). Mentoring and prevention Science. In D. DuBois & M. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (2nd ed.) (pp. 29-42). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cavell, T., DuBois, D., Karcher, M., Keller, T., & Rhodes, J. (2009). *Policy brief: Strengthening mentoring opportunities for at-risk youth*. Portland, OR: National Mentoring Center.
- Centre for Disease Control and Prevention. (2015). *The social-ecological model: A framework for prevention*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/overview/social-ecologicalmodel.html>
- Chan, W. I., & Henry, D. B. (2014). Juvenile offenders. In D. DuBois & M. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (2nd ed.) (pp. 315-324). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Child Trends. (2011). Program – Big Brothers/Big Sisters Community-Based Mentoring. Retrieved from <https://www.childtrends.org/programs/big-brothersbig-sisters-community-based-mentoring/>
- Cohen, L., Chavez, V., & Chehimi, S. (2010). *Prevention is primary: Strategies for community well-being*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Cohen, M., & Piquero, A. (2009). New Evidence on the monetary value of saving a high risk youth. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 25(1), 25-49.
- Cohen, S. (1996). Crime and politics: Spot the difference. *British Journal of Sociology*, 47(1), 1-21.
- Correctional Services of Canada. (2010). *Section 3: Federal corrections and the criminal justice system*. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-ccc.gc.ca/text/pblct/sb-go/pdf/3-eng.pdf>
- Correctional Services Program. (2015). Youth correctional statistics in Canada, 2013/2014. *Juristat. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Cat. No. 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14164-eng.htm>
- Correctional Services Program. (2016). Trends in the use of remand in Canada, 2004/2005 to 2014/2015. *Juristat. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Cat. No. 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/14691-eng.htm>
- Crawley, M. (2017, February 7). Policing in Ontario face its biggest reform in a generation. *CBC News Toronto*. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/police-services-act-reform-strategy-for-safer-ontario-1.3969134>
- Currie, E. (2016). *The roots of danger: Violence crime in global perspective*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Currie, E. (1996). Missing pieces: Notes on crime, poverty, and social policy. *Critical Criminology*, 7(1), 37-52.
- Curtis, A., & Bandy, T. (2016). *The quantum opportunities program: A randomized control evaluation* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: The Eisenhower Foundation.
- Dahlberg, LL., & Krug, E. (2002). Violence-a global public problem/Youth Violence. In E. G. Krug, L. L. Dahlberg, J. A. Mercy, A. B. Zwi, & R. Lozano (Eds.), *World Report on Violence and Health* (pp. 1-56). Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization.
- Darling, N., Bogat, G. A., Cavell, T. A., Murphy, S. E., & Sánchez, B. (2006). Gender, ethnicity, development, and risk: Mentoring and the consideration of individual differences. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 34(6), 765-779.
- Day, D. M., Koegl, C. J., Rossman, L., & Oziel, S. (2016). The monetary cost of criminal trajectories for an Ontario sample of offenders. *Public Safety Canada Research Report*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/mntry-cst-crmnl-trjctrs/report-en.pdf>

- Deshman, A & Myers, N. (2014). Set up to fail: Bail and the revolving door of pre-trial detention. *Canadian Civil Liberties Association and Education Trust*. Retrieved from <https://ccla.org/canadian-civil-liberties-association-releases-report/>
- Department of Justice Canada. (2013). *The youth criminal justice act: Summary and background*. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/cj-jp/yj-jj/tools-outils/pdf/back-hist.pdf>
- Deutsch, N., & Spencer, R. (2009). Capturing the magic: Assessing the quality of youth mentoring relationships. *New Directions for Youth Development*, (121), 47-70.
- Development Services Group, Inc. (2011). "Mentoring." Literature Review. Washington, DC.: *Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. Retrieved from <http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Mentoring.pdf>
- Dickson-Gilmore, J. (2007). Aboriginal communities and crime prevention: Confronting the challenges of organized crime. *IPC Review*, 1, 89-110.
- De Wit, D. J., Lipman, E., Manzano-Munguia, M., Bisanz, J., Graham, K., Offord, D. R., O'Neill, E., Pepler, D., & Shaver, K. (2007). Feasibility of a randomized controlled trial for evaluating the effectiveness of the Big Brothers Big Sisters community match program at the national level. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 29(3), 383–404.
- Dolan, P., & Brady, B. (2012). *A guide to youth mentoring: Providing effective social support*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- DuBois, D. (2002). Life imitates (and informs) meta-analysis: A participatory approach to increasing understanding of effective youth mentoring practices (pp. 3-15). In L. London (ed.), *Community interventions to create change in children*. Binghamton, NY: The Haworth Press Inc.
- DuBois, D. L., Holloway, B. E., Valentine, J. C., & Cooper, H. (2002). Effectiveness of mentoring programs for youth: A meta-analytic review. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 30(2), 157–197.
- DuBois, D., & Rhodes, J. (2006). Introduction to the special issue: Youth mentoring: Bridging science with practice. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 34(6), 647-655.
- DuBois, D., Portillo, N., Rhodes, J., Silverthorn, N., & Valentine, J. (2011). How effective are mentoring programs for youth? A systematic assessment of the evidence. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 12(2), 57-91.
- Easton, S., Furness, H., & Brantingham, P. (2014). The cost of crime in Canada. *Fraser Institute*. Retrieved from <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/sites/default/files/cost-of-crime-in-canada.pdf>

- Elliott, D. S. (1997). Implementing and evaluating crime prevention and control programs and policies. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, 28(3-4), 287–310.
- EKO's Politics. (2010, April 19). *A harder outlook on crime but prevention still more important*. Retrieved from <http://www.ekospolitics.com/index.php/2010/04/a-harder-outlook-on-crime-april-19-2010/>
- European Forum for Urban Safety, Federation of Canadian Municipalities and United States Conference of Mayors. (1989). *Agenda for safer cities: Final declaration*. European And North American Conference on Urban Safety and Crime Prevention, October 10-13, 1989, Montreal.
- Evans, K. (2011). *Crime prevention: a critical introduction*. Los Angeles: Sage Pub.
- Ezzy, D. (2002). Rigour and ethics. In *Qualitative Analysis: Practice and innovation* (pp. 50-57). Victoria: Routledge.
- Farrell, G., & Brantingham, P. J. (2013). The crime drop and the general social survey. *Canadian Public Policy*, 34(4), 559-580.
- Farrell, G., Tilley, N., & Tseloni, A. (2014). Why the crime drop? *Crime and Justice*, 43(1), 421-490.
- Farrington, D. P. (2017). *Transitions from juvenile delinquency to young adult offending: A review of Canadian and international evidence*. In press.
- Farrington, D. P. (2015). Prospective longitudinal research on the development of offending. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 48(3), 314-335.
- Farrington, D. P. (2003). Developmental and life-course criminology: Key theoretical and empirical issues. *Criminology* 41(2), 221-255.
- Farrington, D. P., & Welsh, B. C. (2007). *Saving children from a life of crime: Early risk factors and effective interventions*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Farruggia, S., Bullen, P., Solomon, F., Collins, E., & Dunphy, A. (2011). Examining the cultural context of youth mentoring: A systematic review. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 32(5-6), 237–251.
- Federation of Canadian Municipalities. (2017). *Emergency preparedness and response*. Retrieved from <http://www.fcm.ca/home/issues/emergency-preparedness-and-response.htm>
- Ferdinand, J., Pearson, G., Rowe, M., & Worthington, D. (2007). A different kind of ethics. *Ethnography* 8(4), 519-543.

- Canadian Forum for Crime Prevention (2003). *Agenda for a safer Canada: Final Declaration of the First Forum on Evidence-based Crime Prevention for Canada*. Kingston: Author. Retrieved from <http://preventingcrime.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/2003-ForumAgenda1.pdf>
- Foster, L. (2001). Effectiveness of mentoring programs: Review of the Literature from 1995 to 2000. *California Research Bureau*. Retrieved from <https://www.library.ca.gov/crb/01/04/01-004.pdf>
- Gagnon, N., & Duncan, L. (2014). Youth inclusion program evaluation: final report. *Public Safety Canada*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/2015-r047/index-en.aspx>
- Gallant, J. (Dec. 1, 2016). Ontario to tackle court delays by hiring more judges, prosecutors. *The Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com/news/queenspark/2016/12/01/ontario-to-tackle-court-delays-by-hiring-more-judges-prosecutors.html>
- Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society*. Oxford: The University of Chicago Press.
- Garland, D. (1996). The limits of the sovereign state: Strategies of crime control in contemporary society. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 36(4), 445-471.
- Gettings, P., & Wilson, S. (2014). Examining commitment and relational maintenance in formal youth mentoring relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 31(8), 1089–1115.
- Gilling, D. (1997). *Crime Prevention: Theory, policy and politics*. London, UK: UCL Press.
- Gillis, W. (2016, June 6). How Ontario's community safety minister plans to bring policing into the 21st century. *Toronto Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com/news/crime/2016/06/06/proactive-policing-will-build-trust-cut-costs-minister-says.html>
- Charron, M. (2011). Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime in Toronto: Additional analysis on youth crime. *Statistics Canada Crime and Justice Research Paper*. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-561-m/85-561-m2011022-eng.pdf>
- Glasgow. (2016). *Violence Reduction Unit*. Retrieved from <http://www.actiononviolence.org.uk/>
- Goddard, T. (2012). Post-welfarist risk managers? Risk, crime prevention and the responsabilization of community-based organizations. *Theoretical Criminology*, 16(3), 347-363.
- Gottfredson, M., & Hirschi, Travis. (1990). *A general theory of crime*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.

- Government of Canada. (2016). Rights and freedoms in Canada. *Department of Justice*. Retrieved from <http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/csj-sjc/just/06.html>
- Gov.uk. (2016). *Youth Justice Board*. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/youth-justice-board-for-england-and-wales>
- Grbich, C. (2004). The position of the researcher. In *New Approaches in Social Research* (pp. 67-79). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Greenberg, D. (1999). The weak strength of social control theory. *Crime and Delinquency*, 45(1), 66-81.
- Greenland, J. & Alam, S. (2017). Police resources in Canada, 2016. *Juristat. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Cat. No. 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/14777-eng.htm>
- Grossman, J., & Tierney, J. (1998). Does mentoring work? An impact study of the Big Brothers Big Sisters program. *Evaluation Review*, 22(3), 403-426.
- Grossman, J., Tierney, J., & Resch, N. (2000). Making a difference: An impact study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters (re-issue of 1995 study). *Public/Private Ventures*.
- Grossman, J. & Garry, E. (1997). Mentoring- a proven delinquency prevention strategy. *U.S. Department of Justice- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/164834.pdf>
- Hagan, F. (2014). *Research methods in criminal justice and criminology* (9th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Harrell, M., & Bradley, M. (2009). Data collection methods: Semi-structured interviews and focus groups. *RAND National Defense Research Institute*. Retrieved from http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2009/RAND_TR718.pdf
- Hastings, R., & Melchers, R. (1990). Municipal government involvement in crime prevention in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 32 (1), 107-123.
- Hastings, R. (2005). Perspectives on crime prevention: Issues and challenges. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 47(2), 209-219.
- Herrera, C., Grossman, J. B., Kauh, T. J., & McMaken, J. (2011). Mentoring in schools: An impact study of Big Brothers Big Sisters school-based mentoring. *Child Development*, 82(1), 346-361.

- Higley, E., Walker, S. C., Bishop, A. S., & Fritz, C. (2014). Achieving high quality and long-lasting matches in youth mentoring programmes: A case study of 4Results mentoring. *Child & Family Social Work, 21*(2), 240–248.
- Hirschi, T. (2004). Self-control and Crime. In R. F. Buameister & K.D. Vohns (Eds.), *Handbook of Self-regulation: Research, Theory and Applications* (pp. 537-522). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, T., & Selvin, H. C. (1967). *Delinquency research: An appraisal of analytic methods*. New York: Free Press.
- Institute for the Prevention of Crime. (2007). *International Strategies and Practices* (Making cities safer; no. 1). Ottawa, ON: Institute for the Prevention of Crime.
- Institute for the Prevention of Crime. (2008). *Canadian Strategies and Practices* (Making cities safer; no. 2). Ottawa, ON: Institute for the Prevention of Crime.
- Institute for the Prevention of Crime. (2009). *Action Briefs for Municipal Stakeholders* (Making cities safer; no. 3). Ottawa, ON: Institute for the Prevention of Crime.
- Jeffrey, N., Therien, A., Bali, V. (2017). Youth criminal justice in Canada. *Family Counselling and Support Services & Canadian Families and Corrections Network*. Retrieved from https://atrium.lib.uoguelph.ca/xmlui/bitstream/handle/10214/10256/Jeffrey_etal_YouthCriminalJusticeInCanada_Infographic_2017.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y
- Jekielek, S. M, Moore. K. A., Hair, E. C., & Scarupa, H. J. (2002). *Mentoring: A promising strategy for youth development*. Washington, DC: Child Trends Research Brief. Retrieved from <https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2002/02/MentoringRB.pdf>
- Johnston-Way, S., & O’Sullivan, S. (2016). Recognizing the role of victim supports in building and maintaining healthy and safe communities. *Journal of Community Safety & Well-Being, 1*(2), 12-15.
- Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2008). The influence of mentoring on reoffending. *Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention*. Retrieved from http://www.crim.cam.ac.uk/people/academic_research/david_farrington/mentorsw.pdf
- Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2007). A rapid evidence assessment of the impact of mentoring on re-offending: a summary. *Home Office Online Report 11/07*. Retrieved from http://www.youthmentoring.org.nz/content/docs/Home_Office_Impact_of_mentoring.pdf
- Jones-Brown, D., & Henriques, Z. (1997). Promises and pitfalls of mentoring as a juvenile justice strategy. *Social Justice, 24*(4), 212-233.

- Jones-Brown, D., & Henriques, Z. (2001). Promises and pitfall of mentoring as a juvenile justice strategy. In R. C. Smandych (Ed.), *Youth Crime Varieties, Theories and Prevention* (pp. 292-309). Toronto: Harcourt Canada.
- Junger-Tas, J. (1992). An empirical test of social control theory. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 8(1), 9-28.
- Justice Education Society. (2017). *Lesson1: Introduction to Criminal Law*. Topic 1: Definition and Principles of Crime. Retrieved from <http://www.lawlessons.ca/lesson-plans/2.1.definition-and-principles>
- Keating, L. M., Tomishima, M. A., Foster, S., & Alessandri, M. (2002). The effects of a mentoring program on at-risk youth. *Adolescence*, 37(148), 717.
- Keighley, K. (2017). Police-reported crime statistics in Canada, 2016. *Juristat* 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/54842-eng.htm>
- Keller, T. (2005). A systemic model of the youth mentoring intervention. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 26(2), 169–188.
- Kelley, T. (1996). A critique of social bonding and control theory of delinquency using the principles of psychology of mind. *Adolescence*, 31(122), 321-337.
- Kelly, K. D., Caputo, T., & Jamieson, W. (2005). Reconsidering sustainability: some implications for community-based crime prevention. *Critical Social Policy* 25(3), 306-324.
- Kempf-Leonard, K., & Morris, N. (2012). *Social control theory* (Oxford bibliographies. Criminology). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kempf, K. (1993). The empirical status of Hirschi's control theory. In F. Alder & W. S. Laufer (Eds.), *New directions in criminological theory: Advances in criminological theory* (Vol. 4) (pp. 143-185). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Kieselbach, B., & Butchart, A. (2015). Preventing youth violence: an overview of the evidence. *World Health Organization*. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/youth/youth_violence/en/
- Knepper, P. (2007). *Criminology and social policy*. Los Angeles, Calif; London: SAGE.
- Krohn, M. D. & Massey, J. L. (1980). Social control and delinquent behaviour: An examination of the elements of the social bond. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 21(4), 529-543.
- Lab, S. P. (2004). Crime prevention, politics, and the art of going nowhere fast. *JQ: Justice Quarterly*, 21(4), 681–692.

- Lab, S. (2010). *Crime prevention: Approaches, practices, and evaluations* (7th ed.). New Providence, NJ: LexisNexis Group.
- Lakind, D., Atkins, M., & Eddy, M. (2015). Youth mentoring relationships in context: Mentor perceptions of youth, environment, and the mentor role. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 53, 52-60.
- Lakind, D., Eddy, M., & Zell, A. (2014). Mentoring youth at high risk: The perspectives of professional mentors. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 43, 705-727.
- Léonard, L., Rosario, G., Scott, C., & Bressan, J. (2005). Building safer communities: Lessons learned from Canada's national strategy. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 47(2), 233-250.
- Leonard, S. & Jeffersons, E. (February 3, 2017). Community safety and well-being. Presentation to: Canadian Municipal network on Crime Prevention [Powerpoint slides]. *Ministry of Community Safety & Correctional Services Public Safety Division*.
- Lerner, R., Napolitano, C., Boyd, M., Mueller, M., & Callina, K. (2014). Mentoring and positive youth development. In D. DuBois & M. Karcher (Eds.), *Handbook of youth mentoring* (2nd ed.) (pp. 17-27). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Lilly, J., Cullen, F., & Ball, R. (2007). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications.
- Lilly, J., Cullen, F., & Ball, R. (2005). *Criminological theory: Context and consequences* (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE Publications.
- Linden, R. (2000). Primer on municipal crime prevention. *Federation of Canadian Municipalities*. Retrieved from https://fcm.ca/Documents/reports/Primer_on_Municipal_Crime_Prevention_EN.pdf
- Linden, R. (2011). Chapter 3: An evidence-based approach to community safety. In M. Vallee & T. Caputo (Eds.), *Crime prevention and community safety for children and youth in Canada* (pp. 53-78). Victoria, BC: University of Victoria.
- Linden, R. & Koenig, D. J. (2012). Deterrence, routine activity, and rational choice theories. In R. Linden (Ed.), *Criminology a Canadian perspective* (7th ed.) (pp. 463-490). Toronto, Ont: Nelson.
- Lipsey, M. W., & Landenberger, N. D. (2006). Cognitive-behavioral interventions. In B. C. Welsh & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), *Preventing crime: what works for children, offenders, victims and places* (pp. 57-71). Bodmin, Cornwall: Springer.
- Malakieh, J. (2017). *Youth correctional statistics in Canada, 2016/2016*. *Juristat*. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Cat. No. 85-002-X.

- Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/14702-eng.htm>
- Merriam-Webster. (2016). Viable. Retrieved from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/viable>
- Mihalín, S., Fagan, A., Irwim, K., Ballard, D., & Elliott, D. (2004). Blueprints for violence prevention. *Center for Study and Prevention of Violence University of Colorado- Boulder*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojdp/204274.pdf>
- Miller, M., Barnes, C., Miller, H., McKinnon, L. (2013). Exploring the link between mentoring program structures & success rates: Results form a national study. *AM J Crim Just*, 38, 439-456.
- Minaker, J., & Hogeveen, B. (2008). *Youth, crime, and society: Issues of power and justice*. Toronto: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- Ministry of Children and Youth Services. (2013). Review of the Roots of Youth Violence: Literature Reviews *Volume 5, Mentoring Strategies*. Retrieved May 10, 2016 from http://www.children.gov.on.ca/htdocs/English/professionals/oyap/roots/volume5/preventing09_mentoring.aspx
- Ministry of Children and Youth Services. (2013). Review of the roots of violence: Literature reviews *Volume 4, Chapter 12*. Retrieved from http://www.children.gov.on.ca/htdocs/English/professionals/oyap/roots/volume5/chapter12_social_control.aspx
- Monchalin, L. (2016). *The colonial problem: An indigenous perspective on crime and injustice in Canada*. Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.
- Moore, A. K. (2006). Defining the term “at risk”. Research to Results Brief, *Child Trends*. Retrieved from <https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2006/01/DefiningAtRisk1.pdf>
- Murray, J., & Farrington, D. (2010). Risk factors for conduct disorder and delinquency: Key findings from longitudinal studies. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 55(10), 633-642.
- National Crime Prevention Centre. (2008). Promising and model crime prevention programs. *Public Safety Canada*. Retrieved from <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/prmsng-mdl-vlm1/prmsng-mdl-vlm1-eng.pdf>
- National Crime Prevention Centre. (2011). Promising and model crime prevention programs volume II. *Public Safety Canada*. Retrieved from <http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/prmsng-mdl-vlm2/prmsng-mdl-vlm2-eng.pdf>

- National Institute of Justice. (2016). Practice profile: Mentoring. *Office of Justice Programs, Crime Solutions.gov*. Retrieved from <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/PracticeDetails.aspx?ID=15>
- National Institute of Justice. (2015). Program profile: Eisenhower quantum opportunities. *Office of Justice Programs, Crime Solutions.gov*. Retrieved from <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=426>
- National Institute of Justice. (2011). Program profile: Big Brothers Big Sisters (BBBS) community-based mentoring (CBM) program. *Office of Justice Programs, Crime Solutions.gov*. Retrieved from <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/ProgramDetails.aspx?ID=112>
- Neuman, W., & Robson, K. (2015). *Basics of social research: Qualitative and quantitative approaches* (3rd ed.). Don Mills, Ontario: Pearson Inc.
- Newburn, T. & Shiner, M. (2005). *Dealing with disaffection: Young people, mentoring and social inclusion*. Portland, Oregon: Willan Publishing.
- Ng, S. & Nerad, S. (2015). *Evaluation of the FOCUS Rexdale pilot project*. Delivered to the City of Toronto and Toronto Police Service. Toronto, Ontario: Vision & Results Inc. & SN Management. Retrieved from https://www.usask.ca/cfbsjs/research/pdf/research_reports/EvaluationoftheFOCUSRexdalePilotProject.pdf
- Nilson, C. (2016). Canada's hub model: Calling for perceptions and feedback from those clients at the focus of collaborative risk-driven intervention. *Journal of Community Safety & Well-Being*, 1(3), 58-60.
- Ombudsman Ontario. (April, 2017). *Out of oversight, out of mind*. Retrieved from https://www.ombudsman.on.ca/Files/sitemedia/Documents/Resources/Reports/SORT/Out_of_Oversight-EN-accessible.pdf
- Ontario. (2016a). *Strategy for a safer Ontario: Public discussion paper*. Retrieved from <https://www.ontario.ca/page/strategy-safer-ontario-public-discussion-paper>
- Ontario. (2016b). Grants and initiatives. *Ministry of Community Safety & Correctional Services*. Retrieved from <https://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/english/Policing/ProgramDevelopment/PSDGrantsandInitiatives.html>
- Ontario. (2016c, March 30). New release- Ontario investing \$3.7 million in grants to enhance community safety. *Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services*. Retrieved from <https://news.ontario.ca/mcscs/en/2016/03/ontario-investing-37-million-in-grants-to-enhance-community-safety.html>

- Ontario. (2015, March 28). Speech- strategy for a safer Ontario. *Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services*. Retrieved from <https://news.ontario.ca/mcscs/en/2015/8/strategy-for-a-safer-ontario.html>
- Ontario & Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police. (2012). *Crime prevention in Ontario: A framework for action*. Retrieved from <http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/stellent/groups/public/@mcscs/@www/@com/documents/webasset/ec157730.pdf>
- Ontario & Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police. (2015). *Community safety and well-being in Ontario*. Retrieved from: <http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/stellent/groups/public/@mcscs/@www/@com/documents/webasset/ec167634.pdf>
- Ozbay, O., & Ozcan, Y. (2006). A test of Hirschi's social bonding theory: Juvenile delinquency in the high schools of Ankara, Turkey. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 50(6), 711-726.
- Pagliari, J. (June 30, 2016). Mayor Tory announces \$800,000 for violence response and prevention measures. *Toronto Star*. Retrieved from https://www.thestar.com/news/city_hall/2016/06/30/mayor-tory-announces-800000-for-violence-response-and-prevention-measures.html
- Parliament of Canada. (1993). Crime prevention in Canada: Toward a national strategy. *Standing Committee on Justice and the Solicitor General*, Twelve report. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Queen's Printer for Canada. Retrieved from <http://preventingcrime.ca/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/HornerReport1993.pdf>
- Palys, T. (2008). Purposive sampling. In L. M. Given (Ed.), *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods* (Vol.2). Sage: Los Angeles, pp. 697-8.
- Pedersen, P., Woolum, S., Gagne, B., & Coleman, M. (2009). Beyond the norm: Extraordinary relationships in youth mentoring. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(12), 1307-1313.
- Perkel, C. (2016, April 1). Policing costs across Canada rising despite sinking crime rate. *Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/police-costs-across-canada-rising-despite-sinking-crime-rate/article29491395/>
- Perreault, S. (2015). Criminal victimization in Canada, 2014. *Juristat. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Cat. No. 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2015001/article/14241-eng.htm>
- Perrin, B. (2017). *Victim law: The law of victims of crime in Canada*. Toronto, ON: Thomson Reuters Canada.

- Petrocelli, M., & Petrocelli, J. (2005). School performance and crime: Theoretical and empirical links. *The Southwest Journal of Criminal Justice*, 2(2), 119-131.
- Piché, J., Kleuskens, S., & Walby, K. (2017). The front and back stages of carceral expansion marketing in Canada. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 20(1), 26-50.
- Piper, H., & Piper, J. (2000). Disaffected young people as the problem. Mentoring as the solution. Education and work as the goal. *Journal of Education and Work*, 13(1), 77-94.
- Polonsky, M., & Waller, D. S. (2015). *Designing and managing a research project: A business student's guide* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications Inc.
- Pratt, T., Gau, J., & Franklin, T. (2011). Chapter five: Key idea: Hirschi's social bond/social control theory. In *Key ideas in criminology and criminal justice*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Promising Practices Network. (2010). Quantum Opportunity Program (QOP). *Programs that work*. Retrieved from <http://www.promisingpractices.net/program.asp?programid=27>
- Public Safety Canada. (2009). *Supporting the successful implementation of the national crime prevention strategy*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/spprtng-mplmtn/spprtng-mplmtn-eng.pdf>
- Public Safety Canada. (2012). A statistical snapshot of youth at risk and youth offending in Canada. *National Crime Prevention Centre*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/ststclsnpsht-yth/ssyr-eng.pdf>
- Public Safety Canada. (2013). Results from the youth inclusion program- Atlantic Canada. *Evaluation Summaries ES-2013-34*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/rslts-yth-nclsn-prgrm/index-en.aspx>
- Public Safety Canada. (2016a). *Tyler's troubled life: The story of one young man's path towards a life of crime*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/2016-r005/2016-r005-en.pdf>
- Public Safety Canada. (2016b). *Corrections and conditional release statistical overview*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/ccrso-2015/ccrso-2015-en.pdf>
- Public Safety Canada. (2016c). *Reports on plans and priorities 2016-2017*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/rprt-plns-prrts-2016-17/rprt-plns-prrts-2016-17-en.pdf>
- Reitano, J. (2017). Adult correctional statistics in Canada, 2015/2016. *Juristat*. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. Ottawa, ON: Minister of Industry. Cat. No. 85-002-X. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2017001/article/14700-eng.htm>

- Russell, H. C., & Taylor, N. E. (April, 2014). Framework for planning...community safety and well-being. *Ontario Working Group on Collaborative, Risk-driven, Community Safety, Ontario Association of Chiefs of Police*. Retrieved from <http://www.oacp.on.ca/Userfiles/StandingCommittees/CommunityPolicing/ResourceDocs/1%20-%20Framework%20for%20Community%20Safety%20PlanningJune20.pdf>
- Roberts, J., & Grossman, M. (1990). Crime prevention and public opinion. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 32(1), 75-90.
- Roberts, J., & Hastings, R. (2007). Public opinion and crime prevention: A review of the international findings. *IPC Review*, 1(1), 193-218.
- Roberts, J. V., & Hough, M. J. (2005). *Understanding public attitudes to criminal justice*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press McCraw-Hill.
- Roberts, H., Liabo, K., Lucas, P., DuBois, D., & Sheldon, T. (2004). Mentoring to reduce antisocial behaviour in childhood. *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 328(7438), 512-514. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41706972>
- Rhodes, J. E. (2008). Improving youth mentoring interventions through research-based practice. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 41(1-2), 35-42.
- Rhodes, J., & DuBois, D. (2008). Mentoring relationships and programs for youth. *Association for Psychological Science*, 17 (4), 254-258.
- Rhodes, J., Liang, B., & Spencer, R. (2009). First do no harm: Ethical principles for youth mentoring relationships. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 40(5), 452-458.
- Root Cause. (2015). *Mentoring: An investment in reducing youth violence*. Retrieved from <http://www.mentoring.org/new-site/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Youth-Violence-Report-Online.pdf>
- Rutters, M. (1987). Psychosocial resilience and protective mechanisms. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 57(3), 316-331.
- Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (2005). A life-course view of the development of crime. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 602(1), 12-45.
- Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (1993). Turning points in the life course: Why change matters to the study of crime. *Criminology* 31. 301-325.
- Savignac, J. & Dunbar, L. (2015). Guide on the implementation of evidence-based programs: What do we know so far? National Crime Prevention Centre, *Public Safety Canada*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/gd-mplmnttn-vdnc-prgrms/gd-mplmnttn-vdnc-prgrms-en.pdf>

- Savoie, J. (2007). Youth self-reported delinquency, Toronto, 2006. *Juristat. Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics*. Cat. No. 85-002-XPE, Vol. 28, no.6. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/85-002-x2007006-eng.pdf>
- Savoie, J. (2008). Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime: Edmonton, Halifax, and Thunder Bay. *Statistics Canada*. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-561-m/85-561-m2008010-eng.htm>
- Schirm, A., Rodriguez-Planas, N., Maxfield, M. & Tuttle, C. (2003). The quantum opportunity program demonstration: Short-term impacts. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
- Schirm, A., Stuart, E., & McKie, A. (2006). The quantum opportunity program demonstration: Final impacts. *Mathematica Policy Research Inc*. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED498110.pdf>
- Schneider, S. (2015). *Crime prevention: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Schreck, C. (2002). How do social bonds restrain crime? A study of the mechanisms. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 25(2), 1-21.
- Scott, H. (2016). *Victimology: Canadians in context* (2nd ed.). Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Shader, M. (2004). Risk factors for delinquency: An overview. *U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/frd030127.pdf>
- Shaw, M. (2017). The politics of crime prevention. In J. A. Winterdyk (Ed.), *Crime Prevention: International Perspectives, Issues, and Trends* (pp. 427-447). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Shaw, M. (2001). *The role of local government in community safety*. Montreal: International Centre for the Prevention of Crime. Retrieved from http://www.crime-preventionintl.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Evenements/20 ans du CIPC/Role of Gov in Comm Safety 2001.pdf
- Shiner, M., Young, T., Newburn, T., & Groben, S. (2004). Mentoring disaffected young people: an evaluation of 'Mentoring Plus'. *Joseph Rowntree Foundation*. Retrieved from <https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/mentoring-disaffected-young-people-evaluation-mentoring-plus>
- Sherman, L., Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P. and Brushway, S. (1998). *Preventing crime: What works, what doesn't, what's promising*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/171676.PDF>

- Smandych, R. (2001). *Youth crime: Varieties, theories, and prevention*. Toronto: Harcourt Canada.
- Smandych, R., & Winterdyk, J. (2012). *Youth at risk and youth justice: A Canadian overview*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, R. (2006). Actuarialism and early intervention in contemporary youth justice. In B. Goldson & J. Muncie (Eds.), *Youth, crime and justice: critical issues* (pp. 92-109). London: Sage.
- Spencer, R., & Cochran, Sam V. (2007). "I just feel safe with him": Emotional closeness in male youth mentoring relationships. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 8(3), 185-198.
- Spencer, R., & Liang, B. (2009). "She gives me a break from the world": Formal youth mentoring relationships between adolescent girls and adult women. *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 30(2), 109-130.
- Spencer, R., & Basualdo-Delmonico. (2014). Family involvement in the youth mentoring process: A focus group study with program staff. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 41, 75-82.
- Stake, R. E. (2010). *Qualitative Research: Studying How Things Work*. New York, NY: Guildford Press.
- Story, R., & Yalkin, T. R. (2013). *Expenditure analysis of criminal justice in Canada*. Ottawa: Office of the Parliamentary Officer. Retrieved from http://www.pbo-dpb.gc.ca/web/default/files/files/Files/Files/Crime_Cost_EN.pdf
- Sutton, A., Cherney, A., & White, R. (2014). *Crime prevention: Principles, perspectives and practices (2nd ed.)*. Port Melbourne, Australia: Cambridge University Press.
- Tanner-Smith, E., Wilson S., Lipsey, M. (2012). Risk factors and crime. In F. Cullen & P. Wilcox (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of criminological theory*. Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, T. (2014). Youth violence prevention. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 37(1), 1-4.
- The Environics Institute. (2013, October). Crime and justice. *Focus Canada 2013 Public Opinion Poll*. Retrieved from <http://www.environicsinstitute.org/uploads/news/environics%20institute%20-%20focus%20canada%202013%20-%20crime%20and%20justice%20-%20banner%20tables%20-%20nov%205-2013.pdf>

- Thompson, L. A., & Kelly-Vance, L. (2011). The impact of mentoring on academic achievement of at-risk youth. *Children and Youth Services Review, 23*(3), 227–242.
- Tierney, J. P., Grossman, J. B., & Resch, N. L. (1995). *Making a difference: An impact study of Big Brothers/Big Sisters*. Philadelphia: Public/Private Ventures.
- Tolan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M., Lovegrove, P., & Nichols, E. (2014). Mentoring programs to affect delinquency and associated outcomes of youth at risk: A comprehensive meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 10*(2), 179–206.
- Tolan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M., & Bass, A. (2008). Mentoring interventions to affect juvenile delinquency and associated problems. *Campbell Collaboration Systematic Reviews*.
- Tolan, P., Henry, D., Schoeny, M., Bass, A., Lovegrove, P., & Nichols, E. (2013). Mentoring interventions to affect juvenile delinquency and associated problems: A systematic Review. *Campbell Collaboration Systematic Reviews*.
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2017). *What do we mean by “youth”?*. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/youth/youth-definition/>
- Upstream. (2017). *Stopping crime upstream: The social determinants of justice*. Retrieved from http://www.thinkupstream.net/sdoh_justice
- Valleé, M. (2010). A historical overview of crime prevention initiatives in Canada. *International Journal of child, youth & family studies, 1* (1), 21-51.
- Van den Hoonaard, D. (2014). *Qualitative research in action: A Canadian primer* (2nd ed.). Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press Canada.
- Van Dijk, J., & De Waard, J. (1991). A two-dimensional typology of crime prevention projects: With a bibliography. *Criminal Justice Abstracts, 23*, 483-503.
- Ververi, E. (March 7, 2017). Event report/analysis for the Canadian Municipal Network on Crime Prevention regional meeting/Toronto. *Greater City of Toronto*.
- Wainwright, L. (2014). The good lives model – new directions for preventative practice with children?, *20*(2), 166–182.
- Waldrop, D. (2004). Ethical issues in qualitative research with high-risk populations. In D. K. Padgett (Ed.), *The Qualitative Research Experience* (pp. 240-253). Toronto, ON: Nelson.
- Waller, I. (2006). *Less law, more order: The truth about reducing crime*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger.

- Waller, I. (2011). *Rights for victims of crime: Rebalancing justice*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Waller, I. (2014). *Smarter crime control: A guide to safer futures for citizens, communities, and politicians*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Waller, I., Bradley, J., & Murrizi, S. (2016). Recent development in effective crime prevention (action briefs 2016 no.0-4). *University of Ottawa*. Retrieved from <http://safercities.ca/evidence-on-crime-prevention/>
- Waller, I., & Martinez-Solares, V. (2017). Smarter crime control: Putting prevention knowledge into practice. In J. A. Winterdyk (Eds.), *Crime Prevention: International Perspectives, Issues, and Trends* (pp. 449-476). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Waller, I. & Weiler, D. (1985). Crime prevention through social development: An overview with sources. *Canadian Council on Social Development*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/103113NCJRS.pdf>
- Washington State Institute for Public Policy. (2017). *Mentoring for students: Community-based (with volunteer costs)*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/BenefitCost/Program/367>
- Waterloo Crime Prevention Council. (2012). *Root causes of crime*. Research and planning sheet. Retrieved from <http://preventingcrime.ca/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/RootCauses.pdf>
- Weiler, L., Haddock, S., Zimmerman, T., Henry, K., Krafchick, J., & Youngblade, L. (2015). Time-limited, structured youth mentoring and adolescent problem behaviors. *Applied Developmental Science, 19*(4), 196-205.
- Welsh, B. C. (2007). Evidence-based crime prevention: Scientific basis, trends, results and implications for Canada. *Public Safety Canada: National Crime Prevention Centre*. Ottawa, ON. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/vdnc-prvntn/vdnc-prvntn-eng.pdf>
- Welsh, B. C. & Pfeffer, R. D. (2013). Reclaiming crime prevention in an age of punishment: An American history. *Punishment & Society, 15*(5), 534–553.
- Welsh, B. & Farrington, D. (2010). *The future of crime prevention: Developmental and situational strategies*. Prepared for National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from http://www.crim.cam.ac.uk/people/academic_research/david_farrington/nijprev.pdf
- Welsh, B. C. & Farrington, D. P. (2012). Science, politics, and crime prevention: Toward a new crime policy. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 40*(2), 128–133.
- Wemmers, J. (2017). *Victimology: A Canadian perspective*. University of Toronto Press.

- White, H. (2014). The effectiveness of youth mentoring in a criminal justice context. *Internet Journal of Criminology*. Retrieved from http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/white_the_effectiveness_of_youth_mentoring_in_a_criminal_justice_context_ijc_jan_2014.pdf
- Whittaker, E. (2005). Adjusting entitlements: The emerging discourses of research ethics boards. *Health, 9*(4): 513-535.
- Williamson, H. (2009). Integrated or targeted youth support services: An essay on 'prevention'. In M. Blyth & E. Solomon (Eds), *Prevention and youth crime: Is early intervention working?* (pp. 9-19). Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Winterdyk, J. (2017). *Crime prevention: International perspectives, issues, and trends*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.
- Wolfgang, M., Figlio, R., & Thorsten, S. (1972). *Delinquency in a birth cohort* (Studies in crime and justice). Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- World Health Organization. (2002). *World report on violence and health*. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/en/summary_en.pdf
- World Health Organization. (2010). Violence prevention the evidence. *Centre for Public Health*. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/4th_milestones_meeting/publications/en/
- World Health Organization. (2017). The ecological framework. *Violence Prevention Alliance*. Retrieved from <http://www.who.int/violenceprevention/approach/ecology/en/>
- Yessine, A. (2011). Risk factors for delinquency among Canadian youth: Current knowledge and future directions. *Public Safety Canada*. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsracs/pblctns/fctrs-dlnqnc/index-en.aspx>
- Youth Justice Board. (2008). Evaluation of the youth inclusion programme (phase 2). *Youth Justice Board*. Retrieved from [http://yjbpublications.justice.gov.uk/Resources/Downloads/Evaluation%20of%20the%20Youth%20Inclusion%20Programme%20-%20Phase%202%20\(Summary\).pdf](http://yjbpublications.justice.gov.uk/Resources/Downloads/Evaluation%20of%20the%20Youth%20Inclusion%20Programme%20-%20Phase%202%20(Summary).pdf)
- Zhang, T. (2011). Costs of crime in Canada, 2008. *Department of Justice Canada*. Retrieved from http://www.justice.gc.ca/eng/rp-pr/csj-sjc/crime/rr10_5/rr10_5.pdf

Appendices:

Appendix A: Interview Guide

1. What does your organization aim to do for at-risk youth?

Probe: What are the goals and directives of your community-based youth mentoring program?

What do you think prevents youth from engaging in crime?

2. Can you please tell me about your experience as a youth mentor?

Probe: How long have you been a youth mentor and what qualifies you to be a volunteer in your community-based program?

3. What are the types of mentee you deal with and their risk level?

Probe: What makes them high risk? What types of risk factors do they experience?

What are their needs?

Are you able to address these people or others missing?

*Caution to not inadvertently provide any possible identifiers of the youth you have worked with.

4. Have any of your mentees shown or been involved in criminal behaviour?

Probe: What was problematic about that behaviour or thinking? How did you have an impact on preventing the mentees involvement in crime?

5. How often do you meet with your mentee and what types of activities do you engage in together?

Probe: What does your typical day or session look like with the mentee?

Did your interaction change and what led to that?

Do you have enough time or skills to deal with the multiple risk factors mentees have?

6. What are your implementation strategies used to develop a social bond and caring relationship with the mentee?

Probe: Can you give me an example of a time you used this strategy? And what was the result?

Can you describe the type of relationship or how it was formed?

7. What types of training protocols do you have as a mentor?

Probe: Do you follow manuals or standards given by your organization or is it up to your discretion?

Do you follow evidence-based practices?

8. How have your interests, skills, and world-view impacted the relationship and activities between you and the mentee?

Probe: Does cultural sensitivity, gender identity, race, class, and ethnicity play a factor?
Can you give an example?

9. Have you ever intervened with the mentees school, parents, or health sector?

Probe: Can you describe an example?

Have you connected the mentee with other community resources?

10. In your opinion, how could youth mentoring be used as a crime prevention strategy in Ontario?

Probe: Do you see your work as a prevention strategy to reduce youth crime and violence?

11. What types of best practices shared by your mentoring organization do you exercise to ensure effectiveness?

Probes: Can you expand on that? What does that entail as a frontline worker? Why does it work and based on what?

I am open to the idea that unexpected information could formulate. These questions are limited to the literature that is available on youth mentoring and crime prevention.

Appendix B: Ethics Approval

File Number: 09-16-04

Date (mm/dd/yyyy): 10/27/2016



Université d'Ottawa
Bureau d'éthique et d'intégrité de la recherche

University of Ottawa
Office of Research Ethics and Integrity

Ethics Approval Notice Social Sciences and Humanities REB

Principal Investigator / Supervisor / Co-investigator(s) / Student(s)

<u>First Name</u>	<u>Last Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>	<u>Role</u>
Irvin	Waller	Social Sciences / Criminology	Supervisor
Jeffrey	Bradley	Social Sciences / Criminology	Student Researcher

File Number: 09-16-04

Type of Project: Master's Thesis

Title: Youth Mentoring as a viable crime prevention strategy for Ontario Municipalities

Approval Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Expiry Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Approval Type
10/27/2016	10/26/2017	Approved

Special Conditions / Comments:
N/A

Appendix C: Recruitment Poster

Would you like to take part in a study on the effectiveness of youth mentoring as a crime prevention strategy for Ontario municipalities?

Research

I am conducting a research study that is gathering perspectives of community-based youth mentors about how their implementation strategies can prevent crime and foster social bonds with at-risk youth.

Number of Participants

A maximum of 6 participants

Eligibility

You are eligible for this study if:

1. You are a youth mentor in a community-based mentoring program in either Ottawa or Sudbury, Ontario
2. You have been a mentor for 3 years or more
3. You are over the age of 18 years old
4. You work with high-risk youth between the ages of 12-17 years old

What you need to do?

You will be asked to participate in a semi-structured face-to-face interview at your earliest convenience. The interview will be audio recorded to ensure accuracy. There are no incentives for participation.

Duration of Interview

1 hour to 1.5 hour

Confidentiality

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time, without any consequence. Pseudonyms will be used to protect your identity. Any data collected up to the time of withdrawal will be promptly secured and destroyed.

If you wish to participate in this study, please contact Jeffrey Bradley, the principal investigator.

Thank you!

Appendix D: Recruitment Script

Hello,

My name is Jeffrey Bradley and I am a graduate student from the Department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa. I would like to invite you to participate in my qualitative research study for my master's thesis, which will analyze how youth mentoring can be used as a viable crime prevention strategy for Ontario municipalities. You may participate if you are a youth mentor in a community-based mentoring program in either Ottawa or Sudbury, Ontario, have been a mentor for 3 years or more, are over the age of 18, and work with high-risk youth between the ages of 12 to 17 years old. Please do not participate if you are under the age of 18 years old, only work with moderately risky youth, and are not an adult mentor in a community-based youth mentoring program. Please note that only English speaking participants are eligible.

I am seeking a maximum of 6 participants to be involved in a 1 to 1.5 hour interview to discuss and answer questions in relation to their experiences and perceptions as mentors working with youth who are at high risk of committing a crime in the future. Mentors will be asked about the evidence-based practices they use and their views on how their implementation strategies could be effective in preventing crime and fostering social bonds with mentees. Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time, without any consequences. Participation is on a first-come, first serve basis, taking gender into account. I will use pseudonyms to protect the confidentiality and identity of participants and change any locations discussed throughout the interview. None of the participant's answers will be shared with the organization. Any data collected up to the time of withdrawal will be promptly secured and destroyed.

If you would like to participate in this research study, please contact the principal researcher Jeffrey Bradley.

Appendix E: Letter from the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services

Thank you for your e-mail of May 23, 2016, regarding crime prevention policies in Ontario. I am pleased to respond.

To meet the challenges we face in today's world of limited budgets, changing demographics, rapid technological innovation and ever-changing demands for police services, the province is developing the Strategy for a Safer Ontario (Strategy). The Strategy will take our approach to community safety and well-being and make it a truly collaborative effort on the part of all sectors – public and community-based – that have a role to play in service delivery.

The cornerstone of the Strategy is the Provincial Approach to Community Safety and Well-Being (Provincial Approach). The Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services (Ministry) has been working with its inter-ministerial, policing and community partners to develop the Provincial Approach, which has three phases.

The first phase, which began in 2009, involved raising awareness, creating dialogue and promoting the benefits of crime prevention to Ontario communities. As a result of phase one, the *Crime Prevention in Ontario: A Framework for Action* booklet was developed and released broadly in 2012. This booklet sets the stage for how the province sees effective crime prevention and community safety and well-being. This first booklet can be found at the following

link: <http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/stellent/groups/public/@mcscs/@www/@com/documents/webasset/ec157730.pdf>

For your reference, traditionally the terminology “crime prevention” has been seen as mainly a police responsibility. But it is clear that Ontario communities recognize the need for a wide variety of sectors to collaborate and play a part in making our communities safer. While the policing sector tends to focus on “crime prevention”, educators may use the phrase “safe schools”, and health professionals may focus on “wellness” or the “social determinants of health”. What these sectors are all referring to, in their own way, is community safety and well-being. As a result, the provincial dialogue has now shifted from “crime prevention” to “community safety and well-being”.

The second phase of the Provincial Approach involved the strategic engagement of various stakeholders across the province, including the public, through over 30 community engagement sessions. This phase concluded in November 2014, with the release of the *Community Safety and Well-Being in Ontario: A Snapshot of Local Voices* booklet, which highlights feedback from the engagement sessions regarding locally-identified community safety and well-being challenges and promising practices. This second booklet can be found at the following

link: <http://www.mcscs.jus.gov.on.ca/stellent/groups/public/@mcscs/@www/@com/documents/webasset/ec167634.pdf>

The third and final phase involves the development of the Community Safety and Well-Being Planning Framework (Framework) and toolkit of practical guidance (toolkit), which will assist communities in engaging in collaborative community safety and well-being planning and service delivery at the local level to respond to crime and complex social issues on a sustainable basis. The Framework encourages communities to work collaboratively across sectors to identify local risks to safety and well-being and implement evidence-based collaborative strategies to address these risks, with a focus on prevention and social development. This will involve focusing on key risks and needs of the community, and creating an environment that promotes meaningful collaboration, information and data sharing, and holistic, outcomes-based performance measurement. The Framework and toolkit have been piloted in various Ontario communities to ensure that feedback from local practitioners has been incorporated, prior to its provincial release targeted for 2016.

Sincerely,
Manager
Program Development Section
External Relations Branch