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ABSTRACT

‘THE REHABILITATION LOTTERY’: EXPLORING DELIVERY AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS NON-
ACCREDITED PROGRAMMES IN A PRIVATE PRISON USING A CASE STUDY APPROACH

Gina Fox

The ‘What works’ literature has revealed valuable information over the years regarding
the effectiveness of prison programmes; however, the prison population and rate of re-
 offending within the United Kingdom still remains significantly high. The cost of re-
 offending to the taxpayer is estimated to be £9.5-13 billion per annum. Much research
has been carried out on Offending Behaviour Programmes, which have obtained
‘Accreditation’ status from the Correctional Panel of Accreditation and as a result are
implemented and delivered in many prisons throughout the country. The majority of
these programmes mirror those created by the Canadian School of clinical and
correctional psychologists in the 1980s, yet over 30 years later only minor alterations
have been made while the prison population continues to grow.

This doctoral research takes a step away from accredited programmes and instead
considers interventions that are more up-to-date, less structured and lacking the
‘accreditation’ status. It draws on empirical research and takes a closer look at ‘non-
accredited’ programmes in particular. It applies a qualitative approach in exploring the
views and opinions of those directly involved in the selection, facilitation and
participation of these programmes. It outlines some of the key findings, which relate to
the design and delivery of prison interventions and highlights the need for range,
innovation and flexibility in the delivery of programmes, from one prison to another. It
also discusses the areas that programme participants feel are most important in
obtaining positive outcomes. Within the methodology section, the thesis takes into
consideration the ‘overly complex’ process researchers face when attempting to gain
access to establishments to carry out essential prison research. These time-consuming
procedures and ‘hoops’ researchers have to go through put many PhD theses and other
prison studies in jeopardy. Questions arise, then, about the need for so much ‘red tape’
and the reasons behind gatekeeper’s denial of access.

The thesis concludes by arguing that where a prisoner is sent, what programmes are on
offer, along with the motivations of the facilitators and the atmosphere created, are
factors which significantly contribute to an offender’s journey towards rehabilitation
and desistance from crime. It concludes that prison programme provision is a
‘Rehabilitation Lottery’.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Although only my name can be found on the cover of this thesis, by no means am I the sole contributor to this piece of work. Instead there are a number of people who worked ‘behind the scenes’ and deserve to be acknowledged. To include a list thanking everyone, however, would make for some lengthy reading so I will begin by giving an extended thanks to all of you, including those reading this now for the first time.

I would like to thank the participants who gave up their valuable time to help with this research: the Manager of Reducing Re-offending (who was my final resort and my saving grace), the other managerial prison staff and programme facilitators and the twenty incarcerated men along with those who previously served time inside. Without your willingness to contribute your views and experiences no data would have been obtained and no conclusions could have been drawn.

My supervisors, Yvonne and Rob. I owe you both a huge ‘thank you’ for all your support and guidance especially when things were not going to plan and rejection seemed to become a reoccurring theme. A plan D, E or F was always drawn up to ensure that I would eventually get to this point. Thank you for all your encouragement and patience.

To my Mam, Edel and my Dad, Eugene, thank you so much for your continuous belief that I could actually do this. Your sacrifices and support throughout the years have made all of this possible. Your determination and work ethic has inspired me to keep going. To my sisters: Aishling, Emma, Cathy and Lorna, for always being on the other end of the phone and for also believing that one day I would complete this piece of work. To my friends, thank you for the useful advice, for sticking by me throughout the years, for understanding when I locked myself away, and for distracting me when I needed to let off some steam! To Craig, a special thank you for always being there, for your patience, for putting up with me through the tears and victory dances but most importantly for being my ‘walking-talking thesaurus’, even when the football was on.

Thank you all so much.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLES AND FIGURES</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER ONE DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN OF OFFENDING BEHAVIOUR PROGRAMMES</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Brutality to Humanity: Historical Context</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1.1: Influential Events and Reformers - The Rehabilitation Map</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation: New Principles and Practice</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinson (1974) and 'Nothing Works'</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancements in Rehabilitation and the Development of OBPs</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk, Needs, Individuality and OASys</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Works: Accredited and Non-Accredited Programmes</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1.2: Accredited and Non-Accredited Programmes delivered in Category B and C</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Institutions within the West Midlands</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Outcomes through Innovation and Creativity</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion: The Rehabilitation Lottery</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER TWO CONDITIONS FOR DELIVERY OF OFFENDING BEHAVIOUR PROGRAMMES</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Importance of Delivery – Who?</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Importance of Setting – Where?</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Importance of Techniques – How?</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Importance of Participant Motivations – Why?</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion: The Rehabilitation Lottery</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER THREE METHODOLOGY: THE PROCESS</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection: Programmes and Prisons</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of Research Design</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Approach</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic Research</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Groups</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured Interviews</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sample</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.1: Managers/Prison Staff</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.2: Semi-Structured Interviews</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# TABLES AND FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table/Fig. No</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 1.1</td>
<td>Influential Events and Reformers – The Rehabilitation Map</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1.2</td>
<td>Accredited and Non-Accredited Programmes delivered in Category B and C Male Institutions within the West Midlands</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.1</td>
<td>Managers/Prison Staff</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3.2</td>
<td>Programme Facilitators</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.3</td>
<td>Sample of Facilitators</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.4</td>
<td>Sample Group 3a: Current Prisoners</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.5</td>
<td>Sample Group 3b: Ex-Prisoners</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.6</td>
<td>Summary of Participants</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.1</td>
<td>Procedure for Approval of Regime Interventions</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5.2</td>
<td>Prisoners’ Motivations for Engaging in Programmes</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.1</td>
<td>Serving Prisoners definition of the term ‘Accreditation’</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.2</td>
<td>‘Accredited’ courses completed by Group 3(a): Current Prisoners and 3(b): Ex-prisoners</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6.3</td>
<td>‘Non-Accredited’ courses completed by Group 3(a): Current Prisoners and 3(b): Ex-Prisoners</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 9.1</td>
<td>Key Contributing Factors to the Production and Procurement of Positive Outcomes and Reduced Recidivism</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Alcohol Anonymous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>Accredited Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALM</td>
<td>Controlling Anger and Learning to Manage it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Current Prisoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSAP</td>
<td>Correctional Services Accreditation Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DART</td>
<td>Drug and Alcohol Recovery Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCMF</td>
<td>Design, Construct, Manage and Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>Enhanced Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>Ex-Prisoner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>Focus on Resettlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLPR</td>
<td>Howard League for Penal Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMP</td>
<td>Her Majesty’s Prison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HoRR</td>
<td>Head of Reducing Re-offending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>Information Communication Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEP</td>
<td>Incentives and Earned Privileges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IM</td>
<td>Interventions Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT</td>
<td>Intensive Matched probation After Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAS</td>
<td>Integrated Research Application System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRP</td>
<td>Inclusive Recovery Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPI</td>
<td>Key Performance Indications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPT</td>
<td>Key Performance Targets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSI</td>
<td>Level of Service Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOJ</td>
<td>Ministry of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoRR</td>
<td>Manager of Reducing Re-offending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MQPL</td>
<td>Measuring Quality of Prison Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-AP</td>
<td>Non-accredited Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOMS</td>
<td>National Offender Management Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>National Research Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASys</td>
<td>Offender Assessment System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBP</td>
<td>Offender Behaviour Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-ASRO</td>
<td>Prison: Addressing Substance Related Offending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFI</td>
<td>Private Finance Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PFI</td>
<td>Private Finance Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRT</td>
<td>Prison Reform Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSO</td>
<td>Prison Service Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;R</td>
<td>Reasoning and Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RNR</td>
<td>‘Risk – Need – Responsivity’ assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Short Duration Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLAS</td>
<td>Working in prisons with the EUREKA Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORI</td>
<td>Supporting Offenders through Restoration Inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOTP</td>
<td>Sex Offender Treatment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOP</td>
<td>Straight Thinking on Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Think First</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP</td>
<td>Thinking Skills Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOI</td>
<td>Youth Offenders Institution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

The notion of ‘rehabilitation’ is complex and can refer to a range of different interventions and settings. Some researchers argue that rehabilitation has two meanings: (i) it is a general objective or end-goal; and (ii) it is a process or set of practices (Rotman, 1990). Others simply refer to it as the destruction or ‘undoing’ of a criminal conviction (Garland, 1985). However, for the purpose of this thesis, rehabilitation will refer to the processes an offender goes through in prison in an attempt to improve their behaviour and produce positive outcomes (Robinson and Crow, 2009). Such positive outcomes include: increased self-esteem, self-confidence and/or self-motivation, development of basic skills, a positive change in attitude and behaviour, a position of ‘readiness to learn’, participation in other programmes and courses, learning something new, obtaining a sense of achievement and self-worth, recognition of the ability to achieve something, improved discipline records, reflection on one’s life and existence, development of creativity, improved personal competences and concentration levels, increased social skills and interaction with others, development of relationships, improved parenting and reduced rates of recidivism (Prison Reform Trust, 2003; Prisoner Learning Alliance, 2013).

There are many different interventions delivered in prisons, which attempt to improve offenders’ behaviour and develop their abilities to make better choices upon release. These interventions include educational courses, vocational training, medical treatment and cognitive-behavioural therapy in the form of Offending Behaviour Programmes (OBPs). The range of interventions on offer to offenders differ from one establishment
to the next, yet particular programmes\(^1\) are found by certain individuals to be more useful/effective than others depending on a wide range of factors. These factors include the way in which the programme is designed, its content, its delivery, who the facilitator(s) delivering the programme is, their role within the prison, the level of innovation and creativity afforded to the programme, the amount of resources available and many more. These elements contribute to an offender’s willingness to participate, engage and complete a programme.

The ‘Rehabilitation Lottery’ is a term that emerged during the development of my methodology for this thesis. Originally, I was interested in researching programmes that had been accredited by the Correctional Service Accreditation Panel following interviews I conducted with prisoners as part of an MSc dissertation. That project was titled ‘Does Prison Work?’ and obtained the views of prisoners in relation to the type(s) of help (mainly what they considered useful in preventing them from re-offending) that was on offer to them. It was overwhelming how many participants criticized the accredited programmes on offer (such as Enhanced Thinking Skills) stating that such programmes were in existence for reasons other than to actually rehabilitate them. Following this piece of research, I became increasingly curious about the design and delivery of accredited programmes and wanted to know more. However, these

\(^1\) McGuire (2001) provides three definitions for the term ‘programme’; (1) ‘a planned sequence of learning opportunities’, (2) a word to describe initiatives such as mentoring and (3) all criminal justice interventions. The term ‘programme’ will be used interchangeably with the words ‘course’ and ‘intervention’ for the purpose of this thesis.
programmes are copyright protected and therefore I was unable to obtain permission to observe them being delivered. Non-accredited programmes, on the other hand, were accessible insofar as they were not protected. However, discovering which establishment delivered which programmes, whether or not I would obtain ethical approval from the National Offender Management Service and then ultimately access from the gatekeeper felt like a lottery – with the ‘jackpot’ being the opportunity to carry out research in this area.

As the research progressed, it became clear that the notion of a ‘Rehabilitation Lottery’ extends further and is present at three different theoretical levels. At the macro-level, the highs and lows of penal policy affect the prominence placed on rehabilitation, at the meso-level, recent developments in penal practice impact on the bifurcation of prison interventions, and at the micro-level, specifically focusing on non-accredited programmes, who delivers a programme, how they deliver it and where it is delivered are all something of a lottery. This concept of a lottery is even more multifaceted when varying levels of commitment and engagement of those involved (offenders, ex-prisoners, managers and programme facilitators) are taken into consideration. The concept of a ‘rehabilitation lottery’ conspires to offer some prisoners better opportunities of a ‘pay-out’ or ‘jackpot’ in the form of positive outcomes than others. The term ‘rehabilitation lottery’ will be explored in greater detail throughout the thesis.

In order to explore the micro-level further and investigate the delivery and attitudes towards non-accredited programmes in particular, this thesis focuses on three main research areas:
1) the motivations of staff behind the selection and implementation of certain non-accredited programmes in a prison;

2) the views and opinions of prison staff and managers, programme facilitators, participating offenders and ex-prisoners towards the range, purpose and delivery of interventions;

3) the significance of innovative and imaginative approaches to rehabilitation on offenders’ participation, engagement, completion and the achieving of positive outcomes.

The thesis is divided into nine main chapters that are structured as follows:

Chapter One begins by revealing the discourses surrounding imprisonment, punishment and rehabilitation. It notes important prison reformers, dominant paradigms, underpinning theories, influential research and legislation/policy developments that led to the demise of casual brutality in prisons and progressed towards more humanitarian approaches of rehabilitation. The chapter narrows the scope of literature by focusing on the work of Martinson (1974) and what resulted in the ‘Nothing works/‘What works’ debate and ultimately the conclusion that programmes consisting of a cognitive-behavioural element were more effective in producing positive outcomes. From here, the development and design of Offending Behaviour Programmes (OBPs) are explored along with the components that make accredited and non-accredited programmes distinct from one another. This chapter illustrates how rehabilitation is something of a lottery at a macro-level by considering historical policy change.
Chapter Two develops the key themes introduced in Chapter One and also explores how social learning theory links both cognitive and behavioural theoretical concepts together. In doing so it considers the meso-level of the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ where there is a division of prison-based interventions into ‘accredited’ and ‘non-accredited’ programmes. The former is supported by theory and evidence and offers a greater likelihood of rehabilitation whilst the latter remains underdeveloped and unproven. This chapter highlights how contemporary research focuses more specifically on accredited programmes and introduces the gaps this research will fill through exploring non-accredited programmes at the micro-level.

Chapter Three provides an explanation of the methodology used to explore the delivery and attitudes towards non-accredited programmes. It begins by outlining the approach that was taken in order to carry out the research in the selected prison and why that establishment resulted in being the ‘research site’. The research design and methods utilised are then considered before introducing the reader to the sample and target populations. This chapter identifies the approach I took in order to analyse my findings. Finally, ethical and practical factors are considered by taking into account some important factors in relation to confidentiality and informed consent. Chapter Four develops the analysis in Chapter Three, but from a more reflective perspective. There are three main reasons for the inclusion of another methodology chapter: (1) methodological refinement; (2) a political statement; and (3) a research plea. Therefore, this chapter takes a different approach to the rest of the thesis as it aims to provide an honest and philosophical account of the journey that it was necessary to take in order to complete this piece of research.
Chapter Five is the first of the ‘findings’ chapters to illustrate the different dimensions and complexities of the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ at the micro-level. It addresses the first main research area by detailing the motivations behind the selection and delivery of certain non-accredited programmes. It explores the procedure for the approval of regime interventions currently in place and notes the lack of literature outlining the selection and delivery of accredited and non-accredited programmes. The chapter details prisoner eligibility requirements for programme participation from interviews conducted with prison managers and programme facilitators and highlights some flaws in relation to subjectivity and potential bias. Findings from interviews and focus groups with prisoners and ex-prisoners also demonstrate the rationale behind prisoner participation in both accredited and non-accredited programmes.

Chapter Six considers the design of a programme in more detail and draws attention to prisoners’ and ex-prisoners’ understandings of the differences between accredited and non-accredited programmes. The findings suggest that an offender’s understanding of the label ‘accredited’ or ‘non-accredited’ impacts greatly on their reasons for participating, engaging and completing a programme. This chapter also explores the importance of innovation and creativity, the several issues with flexibility and the impact of prison culture on prisoners’ decisions to engage with rehabilitation.

Chapter Seven uses the findings from each sample group to consider the importance of the delivery on the production of positive outcomes. Factors such as, who the facilitator is, the level of training they receive, the teaching techniques they use, where the
programme is delivered and the barriers that affect the successful delivery of a programme are explored. The chapter proposes elements that need to be taken into account in order for the delivery of successful rehabilitation and to decrease the chances of a ‘rehabilitation lottery’.

Chapter Eight puts forward the argument that rehabilitation is viewed by many as a game and each of the sample groups engage in this game at various levels. The findings show that often prison managers and facilitators are too focused on meeting strict and rigid targets at the expense of meeting offenders’ needs. Prisoners are seen to have ulterior motives when participating in a programme rather than solely to learn new skills or change their behaviour. The significance of the courts in their role of allocating offenders to prisons is often overlooked, yet it plays a crucial part in providing an offender with the best chance of becoming rehabilitated. This chapter considers how each of the target groups plays a role in bending the rules in order to benefit themselves or the institution. It illustrates how the micro-level ‘rehabilitation lottery’ becomes even more complicated based on how and to what extent each sample groups engages with the ‘rehabilitation game’.

Chapter Nine uses the research findings and overall experience to propose ways in which research and policy could be developed in order to reduce the weaknesses identified using the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ concept at the macro-, meso- and micro-levels. It outlines the difficulties involved in attempting to conduct prison research in times when such research is essential. It highlights the need for research to be conducted with (rather than on) prisoners and ex-prisoners in order for the co-production of knowledge
to take place. It demonstrates how effective this approach has been in capturing and understanding the lived experiences of prison rehabilitation. In particular, the fieldwork experience indicated the importance of using a ‘softer’ methodological approach, which factors in observations and focus groups, allowing informal conversations to take place in a comfortable environment.

Chapter Nine also considers the implications of this research for practitioner practice. The study illustrates the need to have each of the four crucial components (an appropriate prison establishment, a relevant programme, a particular facilitator and a prisoner who is ready to change) in place before positive outcomes can be achieved and the ‘rehabilitation jackpot’ won. Finally, it points out the need to develop more effective ways of promoting the work of prison researchers alongside practitioners. A greater understanding of each other’s world would improve working relations and ensure that areas of concern are investigated leading to useful and valuable findings. Practitioners often see researchers as a threat (Crew, 2009), rather than a valuable opportunity to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of probation providers and prison services. The chapter highlights the need for less formalities, which hinders and damages research opportunities, and instead to support researchers within the field.
CHAPTER ONE
DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN OF OFFENDING BEHAVIOUR PROGRAMMES

Introduction

The treatment and rehabilitation of offenders has only become established gradually over time in an often ‘uneven, messy, chaotic process of transformation’ (Wilson, 2014: 13). This process of transformation dates back as far as the Penitentiary Act in 1779 (Crow, 2001). The success of rehabilitation in prison has varied within this lengthy timeframe but regardless of its long and chequered history, rehabilitation still plays a central role in the success of the criminal justice system and the reduction of recidivism rates today (Crow, 2001; Robinson and Crow, 2009; Cullen and Gilbert, 2012). However, this was not the case in the early 1700s and 1800s when the standard of living in prisons was deplorable, resulting in many prisoners dying from starvation, disease and torture (Shaw, 1946). At this time society regarded prisons as places of punishment where criminals deserved everything they received (Vito and Maah, 2011; Wilson, 2014). Reformers, such as John Howard (1726-1790), Elizabeth Fry (1780-1845) and Sir Robert Peel (1788-1850), however, believed in more humane treatment of prisoners and alternative forms of punishment.

This chapter begins by providing a brief overview of the impact influential prison reformers (dating as far back as the 1700s) had on imprisonment, which led to the era of ‘Nothing works’ and beyond. It includes some of the milestones that resulted in radical prison progressions and which have contributed to and inevitably affected the level and type of rehabilitation offered and delivered in prisons today. (The
‘Rehabilitation Map’ (Table 1.1) can be used as a guide throughout the chapter. It shows that the problems faced many years ago, such as the increasing prison population, prison overcrowding and issues surrounding the characteristics of those in prison are still evident in establishments today. These problems along with many others continue to impact on the quality of prisoners’ lives and the value and range of rehabilitation offered to those incarcerated. The chapter explores the macro-level of the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ by demonstrating the influence reformers had on rehabilitation before discussing how their theories and concepts relate to the Measuring Quality of Prison Life (MQPL)² survey in which all prisons in England and Wales are now evaluated. It briefly refers to the Theory of Change approach before moving on to consider the ‘Nothing works’ era in more detail and the development of Offending Behaviour Programmes. From here, the Offender Assessment System (OASys) and the use of the risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model are discussed along with the need for prisoner individuality and the role of the Correctional Service Accreditation Panel (CSAP). The impact of accreditation along with other factors are explored in relation to the motivations of offenders to participate in programmes. Finally, the chapter concludes that ‘luck’ plays a role in rehabilitation at a macro-level, as penal policy conspires to offer some offenders a greater opportunity of winning the ‘jackpot’ and achieving positive outcomes depending on the value placed on rehabilitation at a certain time.

From Brutality to Humanity: Historical Context

Table 1.1: Influential Events and Reformers - The Rehabilitation Map

² The MQPL survey was first adopted for use by HM Prison Service Standards Audit Union in 2004. NOMS has since endorsed it in routine performance and audit measurements of all prison establishments in England and Wales. The survey is also used to assess the quality of prison establishments abroad.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Era/Date</th>
<th>Reformer/Event</th>
<th>Outcomes/Impact on prison establishments</th>
<th>Impact on prisoners</th>
<th>Focus on Rehabilitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1726-1760</td>
<td>John Howard</td>
<td>Improved living conditions</td>
<td>Increase in suicides</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Use of solitary confinement</td>
<td>Increase in mental health issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strict belief in religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780-1845</td>
<td>Elizabeth Fry</td>
<td>Introduced teaching reading, sewing,</td>
<td>Improved living conditions for women</td>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>spinning and knitting to children and</td>
<td>Increased humanity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>women</td>
<td>Introduced purposeful activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Influenced Sir Robert Peel</td>
<td>Encouraged learning new skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788-1850</td>
<td>Sir Robert Peel</td>
<td>Introduced the Parliamentary Goal</td>
<td>Improved prisoners’ education</td>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Act 1823</td>
<td>Improving prison conditions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Instructed that prisoners would be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taught to read in all prisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>The Gladstone Committee Report</td>
<td>Awakening of the Rehabilitative ideal</td>
<td>Abolished purposeless activities</td>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of a new Prison Act 1898</td>
<td>Greater display of humanity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author/Study</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910-11</td>
<td>Home Secretary, Winston Churchill</td>
<td>Reduced the use of solitary confinement, Delivery of lectures, Supply of books, Development of the ‘treatment and rehabilitation’ model</td>
<td>Rehabilitation seen as a concept in its own right, Further improvements to prisoners’ education, Need to identify the root causes of offending</td>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>Martinson (1974)</td>
<td>Subtle and nuanced findings that ‘Nothing works’ and other approaches should be explored, Greater public interest led to conclusion that rehabilitation was ineffective</td>
<td>Prisoners incapacitated for longer, Rehabilitative approaches disregarded</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-</td>
<td>IMPACT study</td>
<td>‘What works’ Some interventions worked for some offenders, Interventions with a cognitive-behavioural element were more successful</td>
<td>Reduction in recidivism for some offenders</td>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970s-1990s</td>
<td>Cognitive-Behavioural Interventions</td>
<td>Canadian School Development of R&amp;R, Trying alternative approaches to rehabilitation</td>
<td>Improving offender’s cognitive skills, Change their lives and encouraged better decision-making</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Individuality and OASys Assessment of offenders’ risk and needs</td>
<td>Offenders receive offence focused treatment</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CSAP Accreditation of interventions that produced evidence of effectiveness</td>
<td>Participating on programmes that ‘work’</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-2014</td>
<td>Measuring Quality of Prison Life Survey (Liebling, Hulley and Crewe, 2011) The better the prisoner’s quality of life in prison the more likely one is to engage with interventions</td>
<td>Improved living conditions Improved prisoner/staff relationships Participation in more interventions</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010s - present</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Revolution (Kenneth Clarke) Queens Speech – May 2016 Prisons: ‘Places of hard work’ Enforcement of reparation Introduction of payment-by-results Increase in competition Governors at six ‘reform prisons’ in England will be given direct control (which compliments this thesis – need for flexibility, autonomy and innovation).</td>
<td>Lack of access on to courses Lack of resources Lack of creativity and innovation Greater powers given to Governors to set their own rules and budgets Decide how to rehabilitate prisoners</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The information outlined in this map is a compilation of the material explored within this chapter).
The most well-known and influential prison reformer was John Howard (1726-1790) whose impact on the management and treatment of prisoners is still being felt today. His innovative ideas mirrored those of George Fox, a Quaker, who believed prisons were schools of crime. Howard (1777) stated that the cure for communal squalor was the solitary confinement of prisoners in single cells. His benign approach required the relocation of prisons from town and city centres to the open countryside. Although Howard attempted to improve the standard of living for prisoners by relocating them, the outcome of the strict policy of seclusion, isolation and the firm belief in religion, in the form of frequent visits to the church, regular repentance of sins and ministers exercising their powers to ‘preach prisoners out of their evil courses’ (Griffiths, 1875: 205) was the growth in the number of suicides, attempted suicides and insane and disheartened prisoners (Blom-Cooper, 1987; Jewkes, 2007). Howard’s ideas highlighted the need for relationships and interactions by inadvertently demonstrating the severe consequences if these elements were absent.

Elizabeth Fry (1780-1845) worked towards improving the lives of female offenders in prison. Her approaches to prison reform could be described as softer than most reformers as she opposed the strict punitive prison discipline, which was seen from the 1820s onwards in the form of the pointless activity such as the ‘handcrank’ and the treadmill used for ‘grinding the air’\(^3\), the bread-and-water diets and the rules of strict silence. Blom-Cooper (1987: 287) concurred with her theories pointing out that ‘grinding the air’ and other forms of pointless work in prison destroyed what needed to

\(^3\) The crank and treadmill were instruments which involved strenuous labour for pointless outcomes other than psychological and physical punishment (Gascoigne, 2002).
be preserved: ‘loyalty, respect, self-esteem, the desire to work, even the ability to work’. Instead, Fry supported the ideas of prisoner classification (by character rather than offence), productive work in prisons and the maintenance of healthy prison conditions (Cooper, 1981). She believed that some instances of real reform were demonstrated as a result of mere ‘kindness accompanied by instruction and employment’ (Fry, 1818: n.p).

In 1817, she developed a scheme, which provided prisoners with purposeful jobs in sewing, spinning and knitting and set up a school aimed at teaching prisoners and their children how to read the Bible. She also accumulated information highlighting the dreadful prison conditions and presented this as evidence to the House of Commons. Indeed, Fry’s beliefs directly influenced the then Home Secretary Sir Robert Peel (1788-1850), resulting in the Parliamentary Goal Act 1823, which aimed to reform prison conditions and instructed that reading and writing would be taught in all prisons. The 1823 Act also drew attention to the importance of prisoner education and identified the need to rehabilitate offenders.

The involvement of these reformers influenced the development of rehabilitation and the quality of life prisoners experience while incarcerated today. Howard impacted on the lives of those imprisoned by enforcing silence, isolation and solitary confinement. In his attempts to reduce the spread of disease he took away prisoners’ opportunities to build relationships and develop through interactions. Since then, communication, association and the formation of relationships have been recognised as essential elements in working towards change, personal development, rehabilitation and thus a reduction in re-offending (Hulley, Liebling and Crewe, 2011; Crewe, Liebling and Hulley, 2011; Rex and Hosking, 2013). Hulley et al (2011) found that such elements contribute
to a more positive experience in prison. Their study led to an exploration of the quality of prison life in order to better understand imprisonment and its effects (Liebling, 2012). The Measuring Quality of Prison Life (MQPL) (sometimes referred to as prison quality or ‘moral performance’) survey was developed over a period of thirteen years (2001-2014) and takes into account ‘hard to measure’ aspects of prison performance (Liebling et al 2011: 1) and ‘things that matter’ in prison (Liebling and Arnold, 2002: 1).

The survey consists of a number of empirical conceptual dimensions, such as ‘respect’, ‘staff-prisoner relationships’, ‘humanity’, ‘fairness’, ‘staff professionalism’, ‘organisation and consistency’, ‘policing and security’, ‘personal development’ and ‘well-being’, which reflect aspects of prison life that vary significantly, and that matter most to prisoners. (Liebling, 2012:3)

Research into these areas revealed that the better the quality of life in prison the more likely a prisoner is to engage positively with staff and with prison interventions (Liebling, Hulley and Crewe, 2011). Positive relationships lead to effective communication and an increase in trust, and those officers who were confident, knowledgeable, displayed levels of care and humanity to prisoners instilled prisoners with motivation to change and develop personally (Liebling et al 2011; Warr, 2012). Lack of comprehension of, or empathy for, the effects of power on a prisoner can have significant consequences and make some resentful and bitter (Warr, 2012). Many of these elements had been previously noted by Fry when she identified the need for respect, humanity and well-being. Sir Robert Peel also touched on some of the dimensions later outlined in the MQPL survey, such as ‘personal development’, when he championed education for prisoners. These early reformers and many others since continue in their efforts to improve the quality of life in prison and develop theories of change. These contributions
are evident in prison rehabilitation today and play a significant role in underpinning all aspects associated with the design of an intervention, from who the programme will target and the type of change desired, to the activities that will be delivered in order to achieve the anticipated outcomes (Clinks, 2014). Throughout this thesis, many timeless elements that link the ‘classic’ prison reformers to dimensions of the contemporary MQPL survey and current prison rehabilitation are explored.

Rehabilitation: New Principles and Practice

In the 1890s, it became clear that the incarceration of offenders in cramped conditions or in solitary confinement failed to show positive effects on the attitudes and behaviour of offenders upon release and in deterring future offending (Sutherland, 1939; Wilson, 2014). The report from the Departmental Committee on Prisons in 1895, known as the Gladstone Committee, marked a period of realization and change in Government attitudes towards imprisonment and its main purpose (Wilson, 2014). It explored alternative approaches to delivering the service and treating offenders by introducing rehabilitation or reformation as one of the primary aims in prisons. The report stated:

The system should be made more elastic, more capable of being adapted to the special cases of individual prisoners; that prison discipline should be more effectually designed to maintain, stimulate or awaken the higher susceptibilities of prisoners to develop their moral instincts, to train them in orderly and industrial habits and whenever possible to turn them out of prison better men and women, both physically and morally than when they came in. (Prisons Committee, 1895, para. 25)

The Gladstone Committee Report (1895) thus signalled the awakening of the rehabilitative ideal (Robinson and Crow, 2009). A new Prison Act was introduced in 1898,
which abolished the crank and treadwheel, improved educational facilities and made changes to prisoners’ diets (Wilson, 2014). This development was based on deterrence combined with rehabilitation upon realisation that a greater display of humanity (put forward earlier by Fry (1818)) led to calmer and more settled prisoners (Blom-Cooper, 1987). In 1910-11, Winston Churchill was appointed as Home Secretary, and he emphasized the new found prominence of rehabilitation by reducing the period of solitary confinement permissible, obtaining a grant from the Treasury to pay for the delivery of lectures and concerts in prisons and supplying books to prisoners (Wilson, 2014). This marked the rise of aspirations in rehabilitation as for the first time it was seen as a concept in itself rather than an element associated with punishment. This led to the development of the ‘treatment and rehabilitation’ model\textsuperscript{4} based on the work of many reformers including Sutherland (1939). Sutherland (1939) suggested the need to find solutions to the root cause of criminality in order to effectively rehabilitate offenders. He believed more contact and relationship building was necessary to assist offenders in reconnecting with society rather than isolating themselves. This point was taken into consideration through correctional policies that favoured ex-prisoners having more contact with community workers, which resulted in the establishment of the probation service and put forward the possibility of rehabilitating all offenders with the objective of finding ‘good’ in everyone (Robinson et al 2009). The Positivist approach

\textsuperscript{4} There are a range of different theories, which consider why some people offend and others refrain from carrying out criminal activities (classicism, positivism, those concerned with the nature of society etc). These theories led to an increase in hypotheses relating to reducing and preventing criminality within society. One approach to reducing offending with its roots in positivism, is the treating or curing of a ‘dysfunctional’ law-breaking individual (Crow, 2001). As a result of growing science- based theories on crime, in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the treatment paradigm emerged. Some of the interventions belonging to this paradigm are medical or quasi-medical in nature; therefore, the broad heading of ‘treatment and rehabilitation’ has been adopted in order to cover all types of interventions.
underpinning the ‘treatment and rehabilitation’ model views offenders as helpless victims of factors outside of their control, which forces them to commit offences. It recognises that the offender holds some degree of responsibility for their actions, but proposes that the factors leading them to offend can be tackled or amended to prevent recidivism (Robinson et al 2009). This can be achieved by identifying the root cause of their offending and then introducing an intervention, which can eradicate the external or internal force. Allen (1959) referred to the concept of curing the causes of criminality as the ‘rehabilitative ideal’.

Some continuities can be seen from the Gladstone Report in 1895 and current penal thinking dating around the ‘Rehabilitation Revolution’ in 2010 as inconsistencies and contradictions continue to play a role in discussions about the primary aim of imprisonment (i.e. punishment, deterrence or rehabilitation). What these discussions highlight is the ‘inability to find a coherent and sustainable set of principles to guide what prisons are for’ (Scott, 2007: 68). It is also problematic when the aims of imprisonment are ranked differently from one source to the next and sentences prioritise different goals subject to the circumstances. Rehabilitation is also prioritised differently from one establishment to the next depending on a range of factors including prison culture, prison type, prison population, prisoner characteristics and the amount of resources afforded to an establishment. As a result, the emphasis placed on prisoner rehabilitation continues to echo the past, and budget cuts affect the quality and quantity of courses offered and number of staff available to deliver them. This is reflected in changes of government and the introduction of new policies. In 2010, the then Justice Secretary Kenneth Clarke published a green paper: *Breaking the Cycle*, which proposed
a ‘Rehabilitation Revolution’. The central aims were to make prisons ‘places of hard work’ through the means of regular working hours and to force offenders to make amends with their victims. The more controversial objective was to bring about an increased focus on rehabilitation through the use of payment-by-results. This method aimed to open the market and allow for a more diverse range of providers to bid for contracts to run and manage a prison. It was hoped that this would allow for innovation and increase value for money and ultimately reduce re-offending. However, although the objectives attempted to bring about positive social change, ultimately prisoners watched T.V. in their cells whilst waiting for the revolution to occur (HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2015b).

**Martinson (1974) and ‘Nothing Works’**

The generalised confidence in rehabilitation was shattered in 1974, which later became known as the ‘Nothing works’ era. Gendreau, French and Gionet (2004: 4) state that ‘it is doubtful that any single criminal justice issue has attracted as much attention during the past thirty years as has the ‘Nothing works’ debate’. ‘Nothing works/’What works’ came about following constant conflicting ideals of punishment and rehabilitation in the mid-1970s and 1980s. This debate underlines much of this thesis as research into rehabilitation constantly questions ‘what works’, what constitutes effectiveness and how it should be evaluated. However, the most influential research that started the debate and focused on the ‘treatment and rehabilitation’ model was that carried out by Martinson - ‘What Works? Questions and Answers about Prison Reform’ (1974) - and soon referred to as the ‘Nothing works’ doctrine. The study evaluated the effectiveness of prison reforms, specifically those relating to the rehabilitating of offenders and the
reducing of recidivism. This was accomplished by analysing 231 studies, which were reported between 1945 and 1967 across North America. The findings were bleak and the overall conclusion drawn by others (i.e. mainstream politicians, which will be discussed later) was that ‘Nothing works’. This became the turning point for the treatment and rehabilitation approach as Martinson instead strongly recommended that a different approach be adopted although recognised that more research into the efficiency of this strategy was needed. Martinson’s (1974) and Lipton, Martinson, and Wilks’ (1975) research succinctly questioned whether or not rehabilitating offenders and reducing re-offending was at all possible. His message was more positive than this though. A Liberal, Martinson, found the idea 'Nothing works' attractive because it could be employed to support a reduction in the use of imprisonment. However, it was co-opted by conservatives, who used Martinson's findings to support their calls for longer sentences, more brutal regimes and capital punishment.

Martinson’s essay was criticised on several grounds, one criticism being that it did not take into consideration the extent of impact that interventions had on offenders (Bailey, 1966; Robinson and Smith, 1971; Gendreau and Ross, 1979). For example, the study looked at whether or not reconviction occurred without taking into account if a reconviction was for a lesser crime than the original conviction or the period of non-offending after release (Gendreau et al 1979). Other flaws included the programmes Martinson used in his study being those with limited funding, the failure to define the terminology used within the study such as ‘success’ and ‘failure’ and the minimal testing for ‘programme integrity’ (Palmer, 1975; Andrews, Bonta and Hodge, 1990; Travers, Wakeling, Mann and Hollin, 2011). The findings from the research led to mainstream
politicians instigating even more severe and harsher forms of punishment under the premise that ‘nothing worked’\textsuperscript{5}, therefore offenders should be locked up with little attempts to rehabilitate them.

In 1975, Lipton et al (1975: 627) stated that ‘the field of corrections has not as yet found satisfactory ways to reduce recidivism by significant amounts’. This conclusion allowed for optimism in the rehabilitative approach and was assessed by a Panel on Research on Rehabilitative Techniques, which found the research to be accurate and fair (Sarre, 1999). However, Martinson’s earlier article appealed to many researchers and policy makers opting for penal punitiveness thus having a dramatic negative effect on rehabilitation. Although his findings were subtle and more nuanced than they are often given credit for, they obtained greater public interest and attention than the more refined conclusions arrived at by other researchers in the following years (Palmer, 1975; Gendreau et al 1979; Andrews et al 1990). This debate is central to rehabilitation and questions surrounding the effectiveness of interventions. From this literature, certain areas were outlined as significant in evaluating the benefits of rehabilitative interventions. Areas such as the need for clear and concise definitions of terminology, consideration of progressive steps and succinct assessment for programme integrity were seen as vague and lacking necessary deliberation.

\textsuperscript{5} McGuire and Priestly (1995) comment that Martinson’s findings came to light when controversies over the treatment of offenders in the United Kingdom reached a state of extreme despair. As punitive punishments proved to have little effect on the escalating prison numbers and rate of recidivism, the recurring question was ‘What works?’
The negativity surrounding the effectiveness of rehabilitative interventions impacted greatly on the ‘treatment and rehabilitation’ model. Due to the extensive support for Martinson’s work and lack of opposing research at the time, confidence and belief in the effectiveness of rehabilitative interventions began to fade, which resulted in a new era of research emerging. This became known as the ‘What works’ era. It was within this period, that Martinson reconsidered his bold and exaggerated doctrine of ‘Nothing works’ upon realising his findings had been interpreted in a negative way leading to the harsher treatment of offenders. Martinson recanted his statement in an article entitled ‘New Findings, New Views: A Note of Caution Regarding Sentencing Reform’, which was published in 1979. Martinson admitted that ‘some programs are indeed beneficial; of equal or greater significance, some programs are harmful’ depending on the conditions in which the programme is delivered (Martinson, 1979: 244) (see Chapter Two for a more in-depth discussion into the conditions and delivery of programmes).

Subsequent research began to consider these elements in order to provide a more comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness of rehabilitative interventions (Brody, 1976; Gendreau et al 1979). Gendreau et al (1979) examined a range of interventions under several headings and concluded that there were other outcomes rather than just recidivism, which needed to be taken into account; treatment which adopted a combination of techniques were more successful than single-method treatments; the setting for the treatment can have a significant impact on its effectiveness; and prisoners need to be treated individually (Crow, 2001).
Martinson’s research highlighted areas that lacked clarity at a time when prison numbers were mushrooming out of control. These areas such as the extent of impact an intervention has on an offender, the amount of funding afforded to the design and delivery of an intervention⁶, the definition of terminology and the importance of programme integrity are still important areas requiring much attention today. Consideration must be given to interventions, which promote progressive steps in the attempt to ultimately lead to reductions in offending. These progressive steps (such as increased self-esteem and confidence) are considered in more detail towards the end of this chapter. Resources available to an establishment can have a detrimental impact on the quantity and quality of the design and delivery of an intervention and are explored throughout this thesis.

Advancements in Rehabilitation and the Development of OBPs

Advancement in research during the ‘What works’ era began to give hope to a future of rehabilitation. The IMPACT study (Intensive Matched Probation After-Care and Treatment) was one such study carried out by the Home Office Research Unit in 1976, which closely coincided with the publication of Martinson’s work and impacted upon the credibility of probation. It evaluated the effectiveness of UK probation interventions concerned with reducing re-offending and the results were consistent with Martinson’s conclusion, i.e. none of the interventions worked across the board; however, some interventions affected some offenders differently. The Brody (1976) study, again funded

⁶ The quality of both the design and delivery of a programme makes a significant difference to the outcomes achieved (Dowden and Andrews, 2004; McGuire, 1995, 2002, 2010). Most attention has been given to design issues which will be considered in more detail when discussing accreditation and the role of the Correctional Service Accreditation Panel on pages 32 onwards (Maguire et al, 2010).
by the Home Office, focused more specifically on sentencing policy rather than different forms of treatment interventions; however, it was similar to Martinson’s study in that it involved the exploration of a number of the same studies. Brody (1976) too supported the broad doctrine of ‘Nothing works’; however, he also recognised that some forms of intervention, such as supervision, reduced recidivism rates for certain offenders. This reiterated the importance outlined in the IMPACT study (1976) and an earlier study carried out by Palmer (1975) of matching the right type of treatment with the right type of offender (the development of offence-focused cognitive-behavioural programmes are discussed in detail later in this chapter).

The effectiveness of the rehabilitative interventions delivered in prisons was also evaluated by Garrett (1985), but focused on studies between 1960 and 1983 and offenders under 21 years of age. He identified four main categories of treatment (behavioural treatment, psychodynamic, life skills and other) and came to the conclusion that treatments supporting a cognitive-behavioural element were more successful than interventions which did not. Izzo and Ross (1990) echo Garrett’s (1985) conclusion in that these types of programmes were much more effective in reducing re-offending than those programmes lacking a cognitive component.

Much of the research conducted in the latter decades of the twentieth century retained a flicker of hope for the effectiveness of cognitive-behavioural interventions. This became an area of significant importance as it is based on the main theories of crime emerging from psychology and has its roots in the belief that like all other behaviours,
criminal behaviour is learned and so offenders can be taught and can learn to stop re-offending (Gendreau et al 1979; Garrett, 1985; Crow, 2001).

Cognitive-behavioural interventions stem from the discipline of psychology and in particular the behavioural and cognitive schools (Crow, 2001; Robinson et al 2009). This was an area of rehabilitation that was given great consideration in the late 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. Behavioural theories emphasise the influence the external environment, such as rewards and punishments, can have over a person’s behaviour. It suggests that one learns how to behave appropriately based on positive and negative reinforcements. The more positive the reinforcement, the more likely the behaviour will be repeated. The less positive the reinforcement, the less likely the behaviour will be repeated (Robinson et al 2009).

The social learning theory links both cognitive and behavioural theoretical concepts together as it suggests that rewards or punishments are not entirely necessary (McGuire, 2006). In fact, observational learning through peer groups, family and other symbolic characters is sufficient in shaping one’s behaviour and learning at a cognitive level. Some studies have found that offenders believe that they are controlled by external factors (Garett, 1985; Maruna, 2000), therefore failing to possess control over

---

7 If there were no limits on time or word counts then many other theories, such as desistance theory, could have been included here. However, due to the many restrictions only the theories deemed most relevant were included. Social learning theory links the two most important theories together (i.e. cognitive and behavioural theoretical concepts) as this thesis focuses primarily on Offender Behaviour Programmes delivered in a particular prison at a particular time in an attempt to produce positive outcomes. The cessation of offending post release from incarceration was not the main focus and therefore was not included within this thesis.
their own actions. Some people react differently depending on how they understand or view their own situation and behaviour, Maruna (2000) refers to this as different types of narrative, some supporting future offending and others supporting desistance. Maguire and Raynor (2006: 24) point out that ‘a key element of desistance narratives was a belief by the offender that s/he had begun to take control his or her own life’ whereas active offenders failed to possess any ability to predict what the future may or may not hold. The external locus of control impacts an individual’s ability to make the ‘right’ choices. The cognitive theory which supports the view that behaviour is influenced by thinking (Hollin, 1996) reflects the fact that we all react differently to different situations according to our beliefs. Therefore, together these theories of crime attempt to reduce recidivism through cognitive-behavioural techniques and interventions aimed at targeting offenders’ cognitive deficits (such as the inability to think before acting or impulsivity) and providing the offender with the ability to control his/her own behaviour (Garrett, 1985). It also takes into account the importance of treating offenders as individuals, each with their own particular and individual needs (this is discussed in more detail later in this chapter).

During the 1980s, the ‘Canadian School’ of clinical and correctional psychologists, developed and delivered a new and innovative range of cognitive-behavioural programmes. These are more commonly known as Offender Behaviour Programmes (OBPs) and are still in operation throughout prisons in England and Wales today. Ross, Fabiano and Ewles (1988) introduced a programme called Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R) for Canadian offenders, which aimed to help offenders acquire thinking skills. The programme provided a new approach to dealing with and helping offenders and it
included a variety of innovative teaching methods and techniques such as role-playing and cognitive puzzles (Crow, 2001). An evaluation of the programme’s effectiveness showed that only 18% of those who completed the course had been reconvicted in comparison to a reconviction rate of 70% of those who had not taken part in the course (Ross et al 1988).

However, again there was a lack of information concerning the sample’s participation in other courses at the time the research was carried out, along with details concerning their roles and responsibilities within the prison. Nevertheless, following its success, many countries around the world took an interest in the Canadian developed R&R programme. The UK adapted a shorter version of the R&R programme and named it *Straight Thinking on Probation (STOP)* (Raynor and Vanstone, 1992). This adaption marked a radical development in prison rehabilitation in England and Wales, as it allowed the focus to be placed on a specific type of rehabilitative intervention aimed at improving the offender’s cognitive skills, which in turn led to the development of short courses on employment, alcohol and drug treatment (Robinson et al 2009). The introduction of this programme within the UK identified the need to try alternative approaches to reduce the level of re-offending through the examination of offenders’ values and the teaching of appropriate behaviours.\(^8\)

---

\(^8\) There are some strengths and weaknesses to Offender Behaviour Programme evaluation techniques. For example, although Hollis’ (2007) evaluative study produces indicative evidence, the numbers within this study are small and therefore not representative. Another area for concern relates to the level of proof of effectiveness that is required and how exactly this is measured (Maguire et al, 2010).
Other general OBPs included *Enhanced Thinking Skills* (ETS) and *Think First* (TF). ETS was developed by the England and Wales Prison Service and was similar to R&R in that it too targeted cognitive behaviour. TF was the third cognitive programme to be developed in the UK. The overall objectives of the programme are similar to that of R&R and ETS but this programme differs slightly in that the main focus is on offending behaviour. TF uses different techniques and works to help the offender analyse specific offences they have carried out and learn new ways to prevent relapses. All three programmes (R&R, ETS and TF) were designed to assist the offender in bringing change into their lives; this change (such as learning how to control their temper or control impulsivity) was then thought to increase the likelihood of the offender reducing their criminal behaviour and preventing re-offending by making better choices (Murray, 2002; Hollin and Palmer, 2006). These programmes are seen as ‘general OBPs’ due to the fact that they are designed for all types of individuals, prolific and/or for a range of different offences (Robinson et al 2009). The generalised nature of these interventions resulted in a gap, which was the absence of programmes targeting the actual offence carried out by an individual offender (McGuire and Priestley, 1985).

**Risk, Needs, Individuality and OASys**

Following the widespread implementation of R&R, further offence-focused, cognitive-behavioural programmes were introduced in the early 1990s. The first of these individualised programmes designed for those who had carried out (a) sexual offence(s) was *Sex Offender Treatment Programme (SOTP)*. It aims to examine the thoughts and perceptions formed by sex offenders in order to rationalise their actions (Crow, 2001). The programme was innovative in the sense that it was the first of many (*SOTP Adapted*...
that took into consideration the importance of tackling the attitudes of the specific offenders for excusing their particular offence through specialised cognitive treatment. These types of programmes focused primarily on reforming the mental state of a particular group of offenders based on their risk level, needs and responsivity.

It marked the beginning of the individualised approach to rehabilitative interventions as researchers, programme facilitators and managers began to realise that ‘successful’ rehabilitation programmes needed to treat offenders according to their individual needs. This meant that their personal characteristics needed to be taken into consideration. The characteristics of the prison population have remained similar throughout the years with much of it consisting of economically marginalised men with little or no education (Maguire, 2006; Comack, 2008; Hanks, 2008). In 2014/15, 47% of prisoners said they had no qualifications at all (Prison Reform Trust, 2014); 46% of prisoners are at or below the education level expected of an 11-year-old and 40% had the equivalent level of numeracy skills (Prisoners’ Education Trust, 2015). Research also shows that half of all prisoners lack the necessary skills for 96% of jobs and only one out of five offenders have the ability to complete a job application form (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002; Irwin, 2009). In 2012, the Ministry of Justice found that 29% of its sample of offenders had experienced emotional, sexual, or physical abuse as a child; 37% of those had a family member who has been convicted or a non-motoring criminal offence; 15% were homeless before they were incarcerated and 71% reported using drugs in the year prior to custody.
Individualisation is therefore essential and requires consideration of certain principles in order for rehabilitation to be successful (Andrews et al 1990). These were as follows:

1) the risk principle, which matched the level of treatment needed by offenders with their risk of re-offending; 2) the needs principle, which considered the criminogenic needs (such as a problem which may lead to criminality, i.e. drugs) and the non-criminogenic needs (such as low self-esteem) of offenders and worked to address these individual needs; 3) the responsiveness principle, which related to the offender’s ability to participate effectively in programmes; 4) the discretion of staff, which considered the staff’s ability to deal with different situations and; 5) programme integrity, which took into account the implementation, delivery, facilitators, content and the duration of the course (Andrews et al 1990). Andrew, Zinger, Hodge, Bonta, Gendreau and Cullen (1990) also highlighted the need to assess the offenders risk, need and responsivity before the application of interventions in order for an effect of recidivism to be seen. This led to the development of the Offender Assessment System (OASys),\(^9\) which was rolled out in 2003.

OASys is an IT based Offender Assessment System which works towards ‘ensuring security and control through the identification and management of risk’ (Prison Service Order 2205, 2005: 6). The aim of this assessment is to establish why an individual offends and what can be done in order to reduce or end their offending behaviour. It

---

\(^9\) The Level of Service Inventory (LSI – Andrews, 1982) was an extension of the criminogenic needs principle. It included both static (i.e. past criminal convictions and previous substance misuse issues) and dynamic risk items (pro-criminal attitude, current alcohol/drug abuse). The most well-known version of the LSI, the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (Andrews and Bonta, 1995), includes 54 static and dynamic items. The UK version is known as the Offender Assessment System (OASys) and has many features similar to the LSI-R.
also identifies whether or not the individual is likely to harm themselves or others around them and therefore examines levels of risk. Once the assessment is carried out a sentence plan is drawn up according to the offender’s levels of risk and need. These plans consist of a range of goals that the offender will be expected to achieve while inside prison and/or later whilst on licence (applicable to sentences more than one year) (Prison Reform Trust, 2012). The completion of certain educational classes, vocational training and/or offending behaviour programmes may be part of an offender’s plan. When a prisoner applies for parole, the prison will put together a file outlining what they have done whilst incarcerated and what they plan to do on release. The parole board then studies the file and decides whether or not they should be released (Ministry of Justice, 2014a).

**What Works: Accredited and Non-Accredited Programmes**

The development of cognitive-based interventions, general behavioural and offence-focused programmes seen in the 1980s and early 1990s disproved the doctrine of ‘Nothing works’ and instead offered evidence demonstrating that some interventions were effective and important, which began to ‘reaffirm rehabilitation’ (Cullen and Gilbert, 1982). This led to the categorisation of programmes based on their relevance to the ‘What works’ literature. The ‘system of accreditation’ was introduced by the Prison Service in 1996 and in 1999 the Joint Prison/Probation Accreditation Panel was created to advise the Home Secretary on the accreditation of programmes aimed at reducing re-offending (PSO 4360), later referred to as the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel (CSAP). This panel is currently a non-statutory body of the Ministry of Justice (since May 2008) (Maguire, Rubin, Losel and Raynor, 2010) and is supported and audited by the
National Offender Management Service (NOMS) Interventions Unit (Ministry of Justice, 2015a) and Prison Service Order 4360\textsuperscript{10}. Its purpose is to allow for the regulating and monitoring\textsuperscript{11} of certain rehabilitative interventions by ensuring that programmes are based on sound techniques, are consistent with the ‘What works’ literature, produce evidence of effectiveness and a clear model of how the programme will bring about change to an offender and continue to produce effective outcomes throughout their existence (Clarke, Simmons and Wydall, 2004). Its establishment and growth is the result of increasing emphasis placed by governments since the 1980s on the need to demonstrate ‘effectiveness’ and ‘value for money’ in the public sector (Maguire et al, 2010).

Programmes satisfying the criteria set out in PSO 4360 are referred to as ‘accredited programmes’ and are defined as a ‘systematic and manualised series of activities that are evidence-based and congruent with the ‘What works’ literature’ (MOJ, 2014d: 4). Accredited Programmes have been researched thoroughly at a national and international level in order to support their effectiveness (Ministry of Justice, 2012).

\textsuperscript{10} According to the PSO 4360 (2004: n.p) ‘The CSAP consists of a Chair, independent experts, and representatives of the Prison Service, the National Probation Service, and the Home Office. Appointments are made in accordance with the code of Practice on Public Appointments...Its principal functions are: recommending and reviewing programme and integrated system design and delivery criteria; accrediting individual programme and integrated system designs; authorising procedures for audit of programme delivery; authorising an annual assessment of quality of delivery; conducting an annual review of developments in the evidence base and advising on curriculum development; advising on training; and receiving reports on impact and effectiveness and advising on the implications’.

\textsuperscript{11} Some interventions require evidence in order to ensure that staff are performing effectively. This is referred to in the PSO 4360. Here it outlines the measures used to monitor, maintain and develop staff performance. It states the following; ‘Where required, treatment managers ensure that all programme sessions are videoed or recorded in alternative specified method. Where required, treatment managers review video or alternative specified observation of tutors prior to each supervision session’.
The Correctional Accredited Panel Report 2009-2010, outlines the criteria that must be met for a programme to become accredited. They include; ‘A clear model of change; Selection of Offenders; Targeting a range of dynamic risk factors; Effective methods; Skills orientated; Sequencing, intensity and duration; Engagement and motivation; Continuity of Programmes and Services; Process Evaluation and Maintaining Integrity; On-going Evaluation’ (Ministry of Justice, 2010a: 59). There is also a scoring system in place, which determines whether or not the programme will be granted accreditation. A programme must score between 18 and 20 (with two points being awarded for each of the ten criterion fully satisfied) in order to be awarded the status. It takes into account the re-conviction rate for those who have completed the course and for programmes which are new and cannot provide such information, the panel requires sufficient evidence to support the approach proposed (Ministry of Justice, 2010a; Maguire et al, 2010). Once accreditation has been granted, the programme is delivered for five years before the panel reviews the accreditation status. These interventions are treated as ‘replicable techniques which can be developed, evaluated and certified according to defined quality standards’ (Maguire et al, 2010: 40). However, as noted by Maguire et al (2010: 40), this does not mean that they should be delivered in a ‘rigidly prescribed and mechanical fashion’ instead they should ensure ‘responsivity’.

Examples of ‘gold standard’ (Maguire et al, 2010) accredited programmes include Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS), Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R), Controlling Anger and Learning to Manage it (CALM); Prison: Addressing Substance Related Offending (P-ASRO); Focus on Resettlement (FOR); Think First (TF) and Short Duration Programme
The Ministry of Justice (2014b) outline 47 accredited programmes on its website and only one non-accredited. It is worth noting that the PSO 4350 Effective Regime Interventions states that, ‘Priority must continue to be given to delivery of interventions which are accredited by the CSAP and external bodies’ (HM Prison Service, 2002: 2). As a result of this, accredited programmes are found on prisoners’ sentence plans and at least one is delivered in most establishment. Table 1.2 on page 37 provides an example of the type, range and number of programmes delivered in category B and C establishments within a particular geographical location, in this case, the West Midlands.

The other type of Offending Behaviour Programme is referred to as ‘non-accredited’ (again for further information see Table 1.2 on page 36). A non-accredited programme has been approved, validated and in some cases commissioned through the Effective Regime Intervention (Prison Service Order 4350). These programmes aim to change prisoners’ behaviours and attitudes by applying the ‘What works’ principles; however, they have not attained the ‘accreditation’ status due to the fact that they are currently not evidence-based (i.e. lacking evidence of effectiveness) and/or consistent with the ‘What works’ literature. Non-accredited programmes come in a range of different forms and focus on different categories of offenders. Some randomly selected examples of

---

12 The West Midlands was the chosen example due to the fact that this study was conducted in a prison within the West Midlands region. Offenders receiving a custodial sentence within this geographical location will most likely be sent to one of these five prisons depending on the offence they have committed therefore this aims to highlight the range of opportunities available to them and furthermore the concept of the ‘Rehabilitation Lottery’. Please see Chapter Three for more information on the limitations associated with conducting research in only one establishment.

Although these programmes do not possess accreditation status, they have been implemented in a range of prisons throughout England and Wales. Research into these programmes is sparse; consequently, there is currently little understanding of non-accredited programmes and their place within prison regime. There is also a lack of research regarding their role in prisoners’ sentence plans, levels of detainment when a participant is faced with a transfer to another establishment prior to the completion of a non-accredited programme, and whether or not a prisoner is given the choice to participate or if it is a requirement. This thesis aims to explore this area in more detail. What is evident from the development of prison programmes and the existing research is that attempts to rehabilitate offenders through non-accredited programmes are varied, innovative and novel in their approach (Brookes, Barrett, Netten and Knapp, 2013) and the thesis takes this positive interpretation as its starting point.
Table 1.2: Accredited and Non-Accredited Programmes delivered in Category B and C Male Institutions within the West Midlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accredited Programmes</th>
<th>HMP Dovegate (Cat C)</th>
<th>HMP Featherstone (Cat C)</th>
<th>HMP Hewell (Cat B)</th>
<th>HMP Oakwood (Cat C)</th>
<th>HMP Stafford (Cat C)</th>
<th>HMP Birmingham (Local B and C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CALM</td>
<td>CALM</td>
<td>Anger Control Training ETS</td>
<td>CALM</td>
<td>TSP</td>
<td>ETS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSP</td>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>Alcohol Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td>P-ASRO</td>
<td>SDP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic Communities</td>
<td>Alcohol Awareness</td>
<td>Anger Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>SOTP- Core Sex Offender Treatment Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive Skills Booster Programme</td>
<td>Drug Awareness/Communicable Diseases</td>
<td></td>
<td>SOTP – Rolling Sex Offenders’ Treatment Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coping Skills Programme</td>
<td>P-ASRO Relapse Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drug Awareness/Communicable Diseases</td>
<td>GEESE Re-Connect TRIP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total APs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Accredited Programmes</td>
<td>None on offer</td>
<td>SORI- Victims</td>
<td>SORI- Victims Anger-Control Training Restorative Justice-Victim Awareness</td>
<td>SORI- Victims Changes- Mental Health and Well-being</td>
<td>Anti-Social Behaviour</td>
<td>Drug Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SORI- Victims Anger-Control Training Restorative Justice-Victim Awareness</td>
<td>The HorseCourse Chrysalis Restorative Justice Toolkit – Victim Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restorative Justice-Victim Awareness</td>
<td>Victim Awareness Victim Awareness-Restorative Justice (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Sycamore Tree Programme – Victims SOLAS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total N-APs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Taken from *Inside Times* (2014). The rest of the information included was obtained from the Ministry of Justice through a Freedom of Information request, an emerging valuable social science research approach utilised by other researchers, such as Lewis and Meek (2012) and Meek (2014)).
Table 1.2 demonstrates the types of programmes delivered in category B and C institutions within the west midlands. Evidently, there is a lack of consistency between programme types (accredited/non-accredited), range and focus from one establishment to another. The concept of the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ can be seen here as some courses may be beneficial to some offenders yet depending on where they are sent they may never get the opportunity to find out.

**Positive Outcomes through Innovation and Creativity**

The work of Martinson (1974) focused primarily on the reduction of recidivism; however, it did acknowledge that some programmes demonstrated positive results, such as the programme studied by Sullivan in 1967 and Bersten in 1961. Shelley and Johnson (1961) found that although it was difficult to measure the impact a casework programme had on recidivism, what could be seen was that the programme impacted positively on attitudes of the participants. Here an appreciation was given to other measures of success such as improved perceptions, participation in more rehabilitative programmes and/or increased self-confidence (Murray, 2002; Vennard and Pearce, 2004; Clarke et al 2004). Other research has shown that a number of positive steps can result from non-accredited interventions also (Natale, 2010; GHK, 2011). Their effectiveness may relate back to the views of Blom-Cooper (1987) in that boredom and idleness destroys self-esteem and the desire to work, while innovation and creativity can preserve and encourage the motivation to work and learn. It was found that participation in these types of interventions also acted as a doorway to the involvement of other educational and rehabilitative programmes (Bamford and Skipper, 2007; Langelid, Maki, Raudnipp and Svenson, 2009) due to increased self-esteem and the
development of basic communication skills which, in turn, leads offenders to a state of ‘readiness to learn’ (GHK, 2011).

An early example of this kind of positivity can be seen in the Good Vibrations Project. Here prisoners were taught how to play a percussion instrument, which was viewed by many of the participants as an exciting opportunity to learn something new. This study found that due to the sense of achievement participants felt at the end of the programme, they were more inclined to try another programme upon realising that they had the ability to achieve something and this feeling was enjoyable (Caulfield, Wilson and Wilkinson, 2009). An increase in confidence and self-esteem enhanced their attitudes and motivated them towards other forms of education and rehabilitation.

These types of programmes can also impact upon the actions and behaviours of offenders involved. In HMP Albany, research revealed that participants improved their discipline records and began to reflect on their lives and their existence (Hughes, 2005; Bamford and Skipper, 2007). It has also been found that arts and cultural activities can impact upon offender’s creativity, personal competences and concentration levels (Hughes, 2005). Thus, as a result of learning new skills and enhancing existing skills, offenders have the opportunity to develop their own ideas and execute them from the start of a project right through to the end. This allows for ownership and control over the project and as a result of the completed project, it encourages a sense of accomplishment and self-worth (Hughes, 2005).
Arts in prisons can have positive impact on controlling and managing offenders (Cheliotis, 2012) These types of programmes can also have practical benefits for prisoners as specific skills can be learned such as photography, design, ceramics and pottery, which can then lead to the option of self-employment once released (Burton-Smith and Hopkins, 2014). Interaction with visiting artists and other real life models can ‘bring to life’ the reality of such a possibility post-incarceration. This eagerness to learn more can be strengthened by the visiting artist’s motivation and enthusiasm which, along with the technical skills being taught, can result in the creation of the perfect atmosphere for working and learning (GHK, 2011) (Chapter Two explores the impact outsiders coming into the establishment can have on the atmosphere and engagement of participants during a programme). Art programmes can also assist in rebuilding the offender’s relationship with society as their perceptions and new sense of fulfilment can begin to develop along with their ability to channel positive and negative feelings found through participation in these programmes (Grove, 2009). This mirrors the early work of Sutherland (1939) who opposed Howard’s approach of solitary confinement and instead believed that prisoners required contact with society in order for relationships and bonds to be created resulting in reduced recidivism. Here the MQPL survey is also of relevance as it highlights the importance of well-being, personal development and the building of relationships, as previously discussed.

The charity Safe Ground deliver courses including ‘Family Man’ and ‘Fathers Inside’ and uses drama to teach prisoners how to improve their parenting and personal skills. ‘Getting Our Act Together’ introduced by a unit for Arts and Offenders between 1999 and 2002 again uses drama to assist offenders, but also integrates literacy and numeracy
in order to develop basic skills. Rehabilitation through innovation and creativity can be a powerful means of developing relationships, increasing self-esteem and improving discipline – elements similar to the non-criminogenic needs outlined by Andrews et al (1990) found to have reduced recidivism (Ministry of Justice, 2011). These factors also reflect dimensions within the MQPL Survey. Allowing prisoners to express themselves creatively whilst taking control of a skills-enhancing project can prove to be an innovative and effective technique in reducing re-offending. Yet while there are many programmes that demonstrate improvement through innovative approaches to learning, there has been very little academic research that directly examines and explores such programmes. Instead, in many cases the existing information derives from the founders, the charities, or the parties in association with the courses themselves.

**Conclusion: The Rehabilitation Lottery**

This chapter shows how at a macro-level penal policy from the eighteenth century to the present day unfolds in an uneven way where the competing claims of rehabilitation are sometimes prominent and at other times under-valued. The rehabilitation ethic emerges with Fry and Howard but practice changed only modestly, until late nineteenth century policy (The Gladstone Report) emphasised both deterrence and rehabilitation. The latter became more prominent until the seminal change of ‘nothing works’ in the 1970s (as a result of Martinson’s work) leading to a resurgence in retribution (now cloaked in the guise of just deserts) and a new emphasis on incapacitation. In turn this gave way to the so-called ‘rehabilitation revolution’ where ‘what works’ became more evidence based (CSAP) leading to the emphasis on accredited programmes. This chapter
has shown how the ups’ and downs of the changing fortunes of penal policy, which can be viewed as something of a lottery.

The following chapter explores the way in which recent and current developments in penal practice in prisons can also use the orienting device of the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ with coherence and profit. Here the conditions for delivery, the design of programmes, the importance of these areas along with what is actually understood by accredited and non-accredited programmes is explored in order to obtain a greater understanding of the research area. The concept of the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ plays a role throughout as opportunities to obtain positive outcomes through participation on certain interventions is outside a prisoner’s control yet may significantly impact on their chances of rehabilitation.
CHAPTER TWO

CONDITIONS FOR DELIVERY OF OFFENDING BEHAVIOUR PROGRAMMES

Introduction

Martinson (1979: 244) claimed that ‘some programs are indeed beneficial; of equal or greater significance, some programs are harmful’ depending on the conditions in which the programme was delivered. His work therefore emphasised the need to explore the impact of such conditions on reducing the rate of recidivism in greater detail. This chapter takes the point further and examines the significance of three main areas in particular: (1) who the facilitator is; (2) where the programme is delivered; and (3) the influence different teaching styles and techniques can have on the overall learning experience and procurement of positive outcomes. While considering the delivery of a programme (mainly accredited due to the lacking research considering non-accredited programmes), issues such as attitudes, relationships, trust, legitimacy and association with the prison establishment are explored (which relates back to Chapter One and specifically the MQPL survey). In relation to ‘where’ the programme is delivered attention is given to the setting and layout of the room along with the type of establishment and the impact transfers and overcrowding can have on where an intervention is delivered. The teaching styles and amount of flexibility afforded to a facilitator is also discussed. Here issues concerning power, control and prison culture are explored as these elements can impact on how a facilitator delivers a programme. The rationale behind prisoner participation is also reviewed as this provides an understanding as to what affects participation and engagement with interventions. The chapter then identifies the current gaps in literature, expands on the concept of a
‘rehabilitation lottery’ and finally outlines the questions which remain unanswered, but are explored at the micro-level as this thesis progresses.

The Importance of Delivery – Who?

As discussed in Chapter One, the majority of the prison population consists of economically and socially marginalised men (Comack, 2008 and Hanks, 2008). Consequently, it is essential that prison rehabilitative interventions cater for offenders with a range of educational, social, physical and emotional needs if success and positive outcomes are to be achieved (Andrews, Bonta and Hodge, 1990). In order for a prisoner’s needs to be met an appropriate facilitator is required with the necessary skills. The skill-set of a facilitator not only needs to be ‘authentic’ (thus approachable, empathic and non-judgemental) but it is also vital that they have the ability to create and develop trusting relationships with participants of the programme (Day, Casey, Ward, Howells and Vess, 2004; Dowden and Andrews, 2004). It was noted in Chapter One that prisoners must be given the opportunity along with sufficient time to associate with others in order to build relationship and thus develop personally (Fry, 1818; Sutherland, 1938; Hulley, Liebling and Crewe, 2011; the MQPL (Liebling, 2012); Rex and Hosking, 2013). This level of development extends to programme facilitators and therefore it is necessary that the appropriate person is delivering the programme in order for relationships to develop and trust to grow. Time to listen and help prisoners are elements Warr (2012) also refers to as significant in attracting participants on to a course and obtaining respect from prisoners.
Other research goes further and explores the importance of staff-prisoner relationships in particular. Low levels of trust between staff and prisoners can impact on ‘information flow’, the ability to ‘distinguish trustworthiness from untrustworthiness’ and can cause issues with legitimacy (Liebling, Arnold and Straub, 2011; Warr, 2012). Liebling et al (2011: 121) states that ‘trust operates as a ‘lubricant of social co-operation’ but is also necessary for individual mental health’ (Liebling, assisted by Arnold 2004: 243). They report that trust could be affected by many complex factors such as a change in conditions and terms of imprisonment, population characteristics and relationships, and official priorities’ (ibid: 121). A ‘culture of distrust’ had often developed over time and in some cases where trust had been previously destroyed by other prisoners or workers within the Criminal Justice System, which resulted in ‘disengagement, frustration and bitterness’. Liebling et al (2011: 122) include a quote taken from a prisoner: ‘You’ve got to trust the system to work with it’. Their research explained that if trust existed at all, it tended to be pragmatic and was referred to as a ‘working trust’, rather than a ‘personal trust’. This meant that prisoners trusted staff to carry out their formal roles and fellow inmates to return borrowed items and not to steal their belongings.

Liebling’s research has also found that high levels of trust, respect, legitimacy and appreciation were reserved for ‘specialist staff’ such as teachers or other non-uniformed staff as they were there specifically to help offenders (ibid). However, it was also noted that these ‘specialist staff’ needed to prove themselves by means of professionalism and knowledge. A lack of confidence and skill impacted on levels of trust and respect and thus the quality of a relationship. However, facilitators that had the ability to make prisoners feel a level of self-worth, treated participants with respect and genuinely
believed in rehabilitation could have a profound impact on prisoners by taking a personal interest in their lives which participants valued and respected (Warr, 2012).

The majority of the prisoners in Wolds Prison valued their relationships with staff and recognised staff efforts in spending time talking and listening to them (Bottomley, James, Clare and Liebling, 1997). Here 74% acknowledged the respect the staff showed towards them, which resulted in prisoners praising the living conditions which positively impacted upon their prison experience at Wolds. Engagement, interactions, fairness and respect shown towards prisoners by facilitators are invaluable elements to rehabilitating and reforming offenders (Liebling, 2001). Facilitators’ self-motivation should not be undervalued when considering key elements in producing positive outcomes (Ward, Day, Howells and Brigden, 2004; Clarke et al 2004).

This point extends to the wider prison staff and the impact their views and opinions can have on the prison culture and thus the effectiveness of rehabilitative interventions. The thoughts and perceptions officers hold in relation to prisoners and punishment can impact on the way they use their authority (which is discussed later on) and the way they treat prisoners (Crewe, Liebling and Hulley, 2011). The issue of poor officer attitudes was discussed in the All-Party Parliamentary Report (2004) and, although it referred to education, its findings are still relevant as it found that many prisoners were aware of how prison staff viewed rehabilitation as a low-priority. Often prisoners are aware of negative prison staff attitudes towards education and research found that many prisoners felt officers deliberately disrupted educational opportunities by being late or slow to escort them to class (Braggins and Talbot, 2006).
Prison officer attitudes can significantly influence prisoner learning by, for example, failing to provide prisoners with sufficient information regarding the amount and level of educational opportunities available to them (Braggins and Talbot, 2003). This lack of support can have a knock-on effect on the participants of the programmes as highlighted in the NOMS Rehabilitation Services Specification (2015), which states that successful rehabilitation requires a certain type of environment that is 'largely determined by the attitudes and skills of staff’ (NOMS, 2015: 9). It then goes further to say that all staff must truly believe in the power of rehabilitation and have confidence in the ability of offenders to change and desist from crime to allow for the creation of an appropriate environment.

However, an increasing prison population coupled with budget cuts and austerity places pressure on the number of specialised and motivated programme facilitators available to deliver programmes and courses, which maintain high quality standards. It consequently puts a strain on staff-prisoner relationships as security and safety become a greater priority (Howard League for Penal Reform, 2011). Negativity of the environment which becomes concerned mainly with meeting targets rather than offering a way out through education means that participation in courses is merely a ‘lip service’ (Warr, 2012: 21). Once again, the state of prisons today mirrors the situation in the past, as discussed in Chapter One, where the aims of imprisonment (punishment, rehabilitation or deterrence) shift from one establishment to the next. A recent example of this can be seen in the HM Chief Inspector of Prisons report (2015a) regarding the conditions in HMP Leicester. Here high assault rates against staff was detected along
with over half of prisoners feeling unsafe within the establishment therefore the priority was placed on safety and security rather than rehabilitation.

**The Importance of Setting – Where?**

The setting of a prison rehabilitation programme is the next point that needs to be considered. As previously mentioned, Martinson (1974) referred to the location and conditions under which an intervention is delivered:

> One must add that it is impossible to tell whether this failure [to reduce recidivism rates] lay in the program itself or in the conditions under which it was administered. (Martinson, 1974: 26)

The delivery of a programme, in terms of the setting can have a significant impact on the success of that programme and the interaction and involvement of participants (Hurry, Brazier, Snapes and Wilson, 2005). Providers of education need to make a conscious effort to reduce similarities between basic skills delivered in prisons and formal education delivered in the community such as schools (ibid). This is due to the fact that many offenders associate formal education with negative past experiences (Ministry of Justice, 2010b; Bracken, 2011; Hawley, Murphy and Souto-Otero, 2013). A friendly and informal environment can be achieved through innovative approaches to rehabilitation thus affecting the conditions under which the programme is delivered.

Research from an environmental psychology perspective suggests that social interaction, behaviours and experiences can be affected by the design and architecture of a building (Sommer, 1969; Gifford, 2007). This can then extend to the social interactions that take place between prison staff and prisoners within prison
establishments (Beijersbergen, Dirkzwager, van der Laan and Nieuwbeerta, 2014) and can influence culture, behaviours and the way in which people treat each other (Fairweather, 2000; Wener, 2000; Jewkes and Johnston, 2006; Hancock and Jewkes, 2011). Prisons have been described as ‘fear-suffused’ environments and ‘hell-holes’, which can be violent, dangerous and psychologically damaging (Hassine, 2011; Jewkes, 2015). Ulrich’s (1991) Theory of Supportive Design is relevant here as it posits the idea that buildings can reduce stress and increase wellness among its users if it is designed in a way that promotes social interactions. However, HM Prisons are forced to comply with Service Orders that stipulate the specifications of prison accommodation and thus in most cases prisons tend to be bland, uniform, constructed with cheap materials, lacking personality and decoration and with limited inclusion of natural light (Jewkes, 2013; Moran, Jewkes and Turner, 2015). A project team in Iceland designed an establishment that focused on natural light, open spaces and the inclusion of natural greenery (bid). The incorporation of these elements were found to stimulate personal creativity, innovation and a sense of ease (Hancock and Jewkes, 2011).

Interior designs in the form of colour schemes and the maximisation of natural light were documented by Irwin (2008) who stated that learning spaces needed to be bright and cheerful in order to mediate learning. She discussed how students from the decorating and painting workshops came to redecorate the grey concrete walls and brighten the room up to provide the tutor with better opportunities to engage with prisoners. This research also emphasised the value prisoners placed on the use of non-traditional teaching environments and informal settings. It discussed learning on the wing and stated that for many tutors this environment contained many ‘blind spots’ and therefore
was viewed as dangerous. As a result, often ‘teaching on the wings’ became ‘teaching in the cells’, which inevitably resulted in intimate spaces and intense learning places. It was reported that these types of environments strengthened tutor-learner relationships as learners felt more comfortable within their own personal spaces to open up and put trust in the tutor.

Finally, Irwin considered the use of education blocks and sites of learning and pointed out the detrimental impact the location and environment has on an offender’s learning (see also Braggins, 2004; Braggins et al 2006). It refers to proposals made to develop ‘educational wings’ but re-emphasises the advantages of learning on the wing and its impact on the development of tutor-learner relationships. Crewe (2009: 119) similarly finds that prisoners 'found sanctuary from the stresses of life on the wings and from the normal terms on which staff-prisoner relations were founded', and that prisoners highlighted the education block as one of the few areas that did not ‘feel like prison’ but felt more like attending an education college. The Ministry of Justice from 2015 to 2016, Michael Gove, put forward the idea of reproducing academic schools in an attempt to increase prison autonomy and good practice (Hutton, 2015). This might be viewed as a reintroduction of the Rehabilitation Revolution as his aims are focused on improving education and rehabilitation and reducing the ‘idleness and futility of prisons life’ (BBC, 2015). This thesis considers the importance of delivering an intervention in an appropriate setting. The findings obtained in relation to classroom design, location and conditions for delivery are discussed in Chapter Seven.
Prisoners face many barriers that impact on rehabilitation and the production of positive outcomes. One relates to the increasing prison population, which inevitably affects programme settings by limiting the amount of classroom and workshop spaces available to deliver the necessary rehabilitation. As a result, many offenders are registered on waiting lists until a place becomes available for them on a course (Prison Reform Trust, 2003). The increase in population also puts a strain on security and safety of those within the prison, which ultimately leads to the delivery of fewer courses in order for safety to be assured (Ministry of Justice, 2010c). When prisons are overcrowded, the frequency of prisoner transferrals is often higher than normal in order to make places available for those offenders who have just been sentenced by the courts (Criminal Justice Alliance, 2012). This impacts on their rehabilitation and programme participation as offenders may not be enrolled on a course because they will be moving to another prison in the near future. As a result, this so-called ‘churn’ disrupts daily routines, activities and treatment of offenders (Criminal Justice Alliance, 2012). In some cases, certain prisoners carry out their entire sentence in a local prison, which has a huge impact on the opportunities available to them, as many local prisons offer a limited range of courses and programmes to offenders (National Audit Office, 2005). The aim of local prisons is not to provide rehabilitative programmes but to hold sentenced and remand prisoners until they are sentence or transferred elsewhere. Such objectives are especially problematic for short-term sentenced offenders (i.e. those serving sentences less than 12 months) as often they serve their entire sentence here without completing any programmes due to waiting lists and course lengths (National Audit Office, 2005).
Often prisoners are transferred to another establishment during their sentence irrespective of their participation in (a) rehabilitative intervention(s). This makes prison rehabilitation seem almost like a transitional element of prison life, which was never expected to be taken seriously or courses to be completed. It questions why prisoners should become persistently motivated and involved in rehabilitation when the penal system seems to dismiss its commitment to its goal of reducing re-offending when necessary or convenient. As Clarke, Simmonds and Wydall (2004: ii) point out ‘where there is a lack of support for programmes at an operation and/or cultural level this can affect the programme delivery and have a negative impact on treatment efficacy’. A third of prison courses are not completed, half of which are a direct result of the release or transfer of prisoners (Natale, 2010).

Another issue arising from the transfer of prisoners is the lack of consideration given to the prisoner’s learning records, files and documentation outlining their progress and development (National Skills Forum, 2010). Two thirds of education managers never receive prisoners’ records following a transfer (Prison Reform Trust, 2004). This means that when they arrive at a new prison they have to re-enrol and begin the programme from the start (or halfway through) rather than continuing and progressing further. Abrupt transfers, and the expectation of prison staff and parole boards that the prisoner will begin a new course, can be met with lack of motivation, frustration, disappointment and anger (Tickle, 2013). It is also important to consider that an induction takes a couple of weeks and needs to be completed once an offender has been transferred to a new prison, thus using up valuable time (especially for those carrying out a short sentence), which could have spent more productively. This normally results in offenders failing to
participate or joining a class that has already started, causing further issues in relation to their understanding, engagement, confidence and progress.

**The Importance of Techniques – How?**

Many areas such as the setting and location, the atmosphere, the facilitators, and the teaching methods and techniques are absent from the studies evaluated by Martinson; therefore, the interventions offered at the time cannot be properly assessed in order to distinguish the quality and effectiveness of the programmes. Since then other researchers have considered these points, and in particular, the methods and techniques used to teach offenders basic and key skills when exploring what works and how. The use of formal worksheets has been found to be ineffective in teaching offenders basic and key skills as they often they fail to provide the appropriate context, omit activities, group engagement and interaction, and offenders find them unexciting (Hurry et al 2005). However, more recently it was found that offenders were much more responsive and had longer concentration spans when activities and games were used to deliver basic skills (Hurry, Brazier, Wilson, Emslie-Henry and Snapes, 2010).

Tailoring treatment programmes to suit the individual learning needs of offenders produce more positive results (Murray, 2002). By catering for those who respond better to listening, reading or watching graphical displays, different techniques can be utilised when delivering a programme, which ultimately matches the preferred learning style of an offender. This can then enhance their learning experience and thus reducing their likelihood of future offending (Murray, 2002). In order for basic and key skills to be delivered effectively, innovation and creativity is essential in the administration and
delivery of teaching methods along with the creation of an informal and friendly atmosphere.

Flexibility is also required in order to create an informal atmosphere (Irwin, 2008). Irwin (2008) refers to prison pedagogies and concurs with Peckham’s (1995) claim that forcing an individual to learn is ineffective as it mirrors old school days. The term ‘andragogy’ refers to the skill of assisting adult learning and is a term that became popular as a result of studies carried out by Malcolm Knowles in the 1960s (Nahmad-Williams, 2011). His work highlighted the fact that different learners required different approaches and that some are more dependent on their teacher or facilitator whilst others are more independent and self-directing (Knowles, 1984). Other literature also explores andragogy and highlight in particular, the importance of providing adults with the opportunity to solve problems, interact, be responsible for their own learning thus emphasising the importance of learner-centred approaches (Rogers, 2002; Hillier, 2002; Huddleston and Unwin, 2002; Blondy, 2007; Nahmad-Williams, 2011).

Allowing learners to ‘sit and chat’ with one another and other forms of informal approaches to teaching can prove beneficial as it encourages natural engagement, the development of relationships and the creation of a safe environment to express oneself (Irwin, 2008). Such an approach to learning requires the curriculum to be organised according to life situations and a need-to-know basis rather than in line with predetermined content units. This andragogy ensures that all participants are treated individually, given the opportunity to generate their own knowledge, set their own goals and take responsibility for themselves. Earlier in this chapter some barriers to effective
rehabilitation were discussed, which related to prison culture and the impact negativity can have on offender rehabilitation. Informal interactions with learners can often be dismissed by the prison officers as ‘frivolous’ when in fact ‘laying the foundations for the trust and relationships [is] vital for the development of a learning culture or learning community within the prison’ (Irwin, 2008: 522). These negative attitudes impact greatly on offender’s willingness to engage in prison rehabilitation.

Elements of power and control were touched upon in the previous chapter when discussing the combination of theories, which led to the development of cognitive-behavioural interventions. These areas are relevant here also as order, control, discipline and power all play a crucial role in how an intervention is viewed by prisoners and delivered by facilitators. This has been a topic studied for several years by many social and penal theorists (Sykes, 1958; Sparks and Bottoms, 1996; Scott, 2001; Carrabine, 2004; Crewe, 2009). Four main mechanisms of power, control and compliance can be identified from this literature. First, coercion, which can come in the form of physical constraint, force, threat and deprivation, or in ‘softer’ forms such a casual threats and tacit warnings (Crewe, 2009). Prison officers are able to incorporate ‘lighter’ forms of coercion into the prison’s everyday routine more readily than the harder forms of power, i.e. cancelling evening association or gym access, threatening transfers to other prisons or removing televisions from cells.

The second mechanism is manipulation or inducement. For example, prisoners may adjust their behaviour and engage with institutional goals in order to benefit from trivial rewards amplified as a result of the lack of personal possessions, identity and autonomy.
whilst incarcerated (This area is explored in more detail in Chapter Eight). Policies such as the Incentives and Earned Privileges (IEP) scheme introduced in 1995 and Mandatory Drug Testing signalled a shift in the priorities of the Prison Service towards a more controlled system with an emphasis placed on individual responsibility (Crewe, 2007). Rehabilitation was associated with a ‘stick and carrot’ approach (Liebling, 2004: 30) as offending behaviour programmes too became incentivised. Crewe refers to these approaches as ‘governmental technologies’ and criticises the fact that they are based on the notion that all offenders are rational actors ‘who can be manipulated by incentives and disincentives to align their preferences with those of the governing authorities and self-regulate in a way that feels feely chosen, even when highly structured’ (2007: 258). He states that prisoners ‘learn’ how to develop personally, take ownership of their behaviour and actions and obey institutional procedures through an amalgamation of threats and opportunities. Ultimately, offenders are forced into making decisions for particular reasons and in order to achieve specific outcomes.

The third form of control or means of obtaining compliance is through habit, ritual or fatalistic resignation. This can result from despair and the realisation that little can be done to alter the situation one has found themselves in. Prison structures and regimes in the form of timetabling and organisation instil order and routine, which inevitably becomes second nature to the prisoner. The fourth and last form of social power is normative justification or commitment, which can be subdivided into three parts. The first is when the prisoner conforms due to their personal morality and belief that a particular type of behaviour is correct and right. Secondly, the prisoner conforms, as they are committed and loyal to those giving the order, this is known as ‘attachment
leading to compliance’ (Bottoms, 2002). Thirdly, they comply due to the fact that the order has come from an authority deemed legitimate (Wrong, 2004).

Regardless of whether or not an intervention is part of a sentence plan (and thus compulsory) often prisoners are coerced into attending programmes even if they view them as simplistic and/or irrelevant. However, often non-attendance is perceived as non-compliance and therefore prisoners run the risk of being transferred to a prison further away or miss out on the opportunity of early release (Crewe, 2009). In order for accreditation to be obtained the courses must be standardised and as a result of this many interventions are ‘managerial and pragmatic’ (Crewe, 2009: 133). Often prisoners find themselves trying to ‘fit into’ predetermined institutional categories. In relation to relevance, prisoners from Crewe’s study noted that some accredited courses had merit; however, they failed to relate them to prisoners’ lives. Here the lack of opportunities to challenge the content and explore alternative approaches due to strict manuals, rigid processes and inflexible timeframes was highlighted thus conflicting with Maguire’s et al (2010: 40) assurance that replicable techniques did not mean programmes would be delivered in a ‘rigidly prescribed and mechanical fashion’. The fact that sometimes prisoners are found to be ‘ineligible’ for a course on the grounds that they have too many issues or not enough in order to take part in the course is also outlined. As a result, prisoners feel frustrated and discouraged, which inevitably impacts on their perceptions of rehabilitation in prison. This questions the impact of accredited offending behaviour programmes and whether or not the prison environment is conducive to rehabilitation (Losel, 1995). Courses are likely to be more effective in establishments that promote a
positive prison culture rather than those that fail to ‘display the traits and behaviours that they are attempting to teach’ (Crewe, 2009: 133).

Other issues with the system can contribute to the prison culture and impact on the effectiveness of the programmes (Crewe, 2009). Reports from several prisoners stated that officers had advised them to begin an intervention by ‘acting like a prick’ and then start to show some improvement and engagement (ibid: 136). The emphasis placed by the institution on performance targets and ‘box-ticking’ exercises added to the perception that interventions were only on offer to promote a superficial form of rehabilitation (Solomon, 2004; Champion, 2013; Schinkel, 2014). These targets can demoralise staff and neglect the needs of prisoners (ibid). Crewe acknowledges prisoner awareness of knowing what to say in order to meet bureaucratic obligations and notes that prisoners understand that compliance needs to be observed and recorded even if it is far from being genuine or sincere. Here elements of game playing and deceitfulness can be observed where prison cultures are flawed and rehabilitation is artificial (See Chapter Eight for more information).

Prison culture and authority can have a significant impact on a prisoner’s quality of life and these elements can vary considerably from one prison establishment to the next (Crewe et al 2011). Research into the differences between private and public establishments found a correlation between prisoner quality of life and staff attitudes (ibid). This gave rise to the illumination of some issues, one being that a ‘traditional culture’, one that was more punitive in nature, had upper and lower thresholds, which were equally dangerous and damaging for prisoners. Another finding was that there
were positive and negative aspects to a more punitive and traditional culture. Positives included prisoners being safe, secure and clear about their boundaries while negatives included the overuse of power and control and a lack of respect. They found that when considering prisoner quality of life, behaviour and attitudes of staff towards prisoners are not the only contributing factors of a positive culture. Competences and professionalism are also significant along with experience, staff ratios prison design and conditions. They draw attention to the stability of staff cultures and comment: ‘they [staff cultures] are shaped by local factors, such as the nature of the local employment sector, and the particular history and ethos of a prison’ (ibid: 112). Prison culture can be influenced by the views and attitudes of staff on prisoners and prison life, which impacts on the way they use their authority. These staff attitudes differ depending on their level and length of experience, their relationship with the organisation and their overall job satisfaction.

**The Importance of Participant Motivations – Why?**

As seen from the above and from Chapter One many positive outcomes can result from the participation in innovative prison rehabilitative programmes; however, an area that requires more research is that of prisoners’ motivations for participation in rehabilitation. As discussed in Chapter One, often accredited programmes are part of a prisoner’s sentence plan subject to the outcomes of their ‘Risk – Need – Responsivity’ (RNR) assessment and so in these instances, their choice in relation to which course to participate in is often outside their control. This is normally the case, even though they
should be devised and reviewed with the input of not only the offender manager\textsuperscript{13} but also the offender (Prison Reform Trust, 2012). Here ‘cherry-picking’ offenders for certain courses and other bias practices can be carried out by the offender manager (HLPR, 2011; Nevill and Lumley, 2011; Johnston, 2013). A prisoners’ perception of their input in this process is illustrated below when questioned whether or not he received information about ETS at the recruitment stage of the programme:

Not that I remember no. I didn’t feel I had a choice, they stipulated that I had to do ETS as part of parole; without doing it I wouldn’t get parole, so in a sense I was made to do it.

(Programme graduate: 210 as cited in Clarke et al 2004: 8)

As a result, many programme participants are of the opinion that they have to complete courses in order to satisfy their parole board. Thus sometimes prisoners are ‘falsely’ motivated and comply, cooperate and engage for reasons other than to primarily change (Hörnqvist, 2010). (This is considered in more detail in Chapter Five). Prisoners’ lack of choice was also highlighted by Braggins et al (2003: 17) when they stated the following:

Most prisoners, especially those in the longer-term gaols, felt their personal choice of courses and classes was limited, not only in terms of what was on offer, and their chances of getting to classes, but also by what the prison would or would not allow. (Braggins et al, 2003: 17)

\textsuperscript{13} The role of an Offender Manager includes drawing up sentence plans, registering offenders on necessary programmes, providing personal supervision and producing a highly individualised service, which takes into account the diverse needs, risks and circumstances of an offender (NOMS, 2006). They are responsible for an offender throughout their sentence whether it is served in the community, in custody or a combination of the two (House of Commons, 2009).
This point supports to the concept of a ‘rehabilitation lottery’ as it emphasises the lack of control a prisoner has over the rehabilitation on offer to them in the establishment they are serving their sentence in. This area is currently under-researched and therefore considered in more detail throughout this research.

Another element that motivates individual inmates to participate in a particular activity relates to their expectations once the course is completed. Some offenders believe that the completion of an accredited programme puts them in a better position to obtain a job upon completion (Bruton-Smith and Hopkins, 2014). Others focus on the amount of pay they will receive for participating. As set out in the Prison Service Order 4460, the purpose is to ‘encourage and reward their constructive participation in the regime of the establishment’ (2002: n.p). The Prison Service policy ensures that prisoners receive payment for their constructive participation in the regime of the establishment. However, one of the problems with this policy is that the amounts of pay prisoners receive for an activity differs from one establishment to the next. Therefore, there is a lack of consistency and fairness. This inevitably sends out a message to prisoners that certain interventions are viewed by the establishment as more valuable and worthwhile than others (Braggins et al 2003). Another issue is that payments for activities vary, so prisoners make instrumentalist decisions about how they spend their time, sometimes based on the amount of money they will receive if they carry out a prison job, such as picking up litter in comparison with the amount they will receive if they attend education or vocational classes (which are generally lower). For example, in HMP Dovegate, prisoners receive £1.50 per educational session
in comparison with £2.00-3.50 for other employment sessions. This equates to £40 in the difference per month (All-Party Parliamentary Report, 2004) which makes a substantial difference to a prisoner’s life inside.

The final area that is considered here relates to the sacrifices some prisoners may or may not be willing to make. For example, the participation in an offending behaviour programme may coincide with a gym visit and in such a case the prisoner would have to decide which activity is more important to them. Further choices require much consideration as on the one hand becoming a wing cleaner would grant one access to daily showers and clean clothes while on the other hand it would make attendance on a daily educational course or offending behaviour programme impossible (Braggins et al 2003). Others feel that their cultural backgrounds limit their ability to partake in rehabilitative interventions or further education (Thomas, 2014). However, what is necessary to note here is that understanding the rationale behind their motivations allows staff to effectively utilise the programmes to capacity (Batchelder and Pippert, 2002). This then leads to the prioritisation of those who are motivated to participate in an activity for the right reasons and thus having a more effective rehabilitative impact.

**Conclusion: The Rehabilitation Lottery**

The macro-level changes in penal policy have a lottery equivalent in the current context at the meso-level, where there is a division of prison-based interventions into ‘accredited’ and ‘non-accredited’ programmes. This adds another layer of complexity to the overarching concept of the ‘rehabilitation lottery’. The former offer what theory
and evidence suggest will confer a greater rehabilitative outcome (through certain delivery, setting and teaching techniques) whilst the latter remain unproven although with the potential to produce positive outcomes. These programmes are far from evenly distributed throughout the prison system (as demonstrated in Chapter One, Table 1.2). The effect of this is that some prisoners may have a better chance of securing a dividend from the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ than others.

This chapter has illustrated how existing research focuses more on accredited than non-accredited programmes (for example, Clarke, Simmons and Wydall, 2004). The research deficit is made good by the following analysis of non-accredited interventions explored in this thesis. Given the usefulness of the concept of lottery in explaining penal practice historically and at the level of the introduction of accredited programmes, it is proposed that the two-level complexity may become even more elaborate at the micro-level of a non-accredited programme where the programme selection, delivery and impact may also be found to be in part a lottery – a product of good luck or not-so-good fortune. The concept of lottery is an underlying and unifying theme. This is the empirical dimension of the study.

The purpose of my research is to consider many of the areas discussed above and other related grey areas at the micro-level. In essence, the thesis aims to explore the following:

1) the motivations of staff behind the selection and implementation of certain non-accredited programmes in a prison;
2) the views and opinions of prison staff and managers, programme facilitators, participating offenders and ex-prisoners towards the range, purpose and delivery of interventions;

3) the significance of innovative and imaginative approaches to rehabilitation on offenders’ participation, engagement, completion and the achieving of positive outcomes.

One key objective of this thesis is to explore non-accredited programmes delivered in a prison. Literature on the selection process for the implementation and delivery of accredited programmes exists (see Wikstrom and Treiber, 2010 and Prison Service Order 4350), however, this research aims to fill the gap in literature in relation to the rationale behind prisons adapting specific non-accredited programmes. In doing so it examines which factors (i.e. the duration of the course, the programme designers, the course objectives, the programme cost etc.) are taken into consideration when making these choices. Understanding the motivation and processes that take place is important as the decisions made at this stage can have a significant impact on the life of an offender, the opportunities available to them in prison and their likelihood of re-offending upon release.

Another objective is to explore the conditions under which non-accredited programmes are delivered, taking into account many factors, such as location, the layout of the room, the space available, the atmosphere created, the resources available, the content of the course, the duration of the course and the length of each individual session, the number of participants, and many other factors. Here flexibility,
innovation and creativity are running themes along with prison culture and the impact this can have on such elements.

The thesis also explores prison managers, facilitators and current and ex-prisoners’ understandings towards the role of non-accredited programmes and whether or not they believe them to be influential in producing positive outcomes. Their views and opinions are sought regarding the design and delivery of the programme which is currently lacking from existing literature. Participants’ motivations for partaking in these non-accredited (which are not normally not part of their sentence plan) programmes are also explored. The presence of deception and elements of game-playing are examined in an attempt to understand the level of engagement of each target group. Here pressures felt by prisoners to conform and comply with institutional objectives are explored along with the value placed on rehabilitative interventions by prison staff. Chapters Five to Seven illustrate the salience, dimensions and complexity of the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ at the micro-level.
CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY: THE PROCESS

Introduction

In the previous chapters, the main gaps within the literature were identified and the areas to be explored in more detail throughout this thesis were outlined. These relate to programme selection, range, delivery and use of innovation. This chapter provides an outline of the methodological approach taken in order to collect the appropriate data and allow for an in-depth examination to be carried out surrounding the research areas. It gives a systematic account of the processes involved in conducting this piece of prison research. The research site and the non-accredited programme (IRP) observed for my study is discussed and justified along with the research design and the instrumentation utilised (which consisted of a modest ethnographic component, focus group and most importantly, semi-structured interviews). The sample group, the approach taken to analysing the findings and issue of representativeness are then considered. Reliability and validity are important areas, in relation to qualitative research; therefore, the approaches taken to ensure reliability are explored. Practical, ethical and safety considerations and limitations require particular attention when conducting research in a prison with vulnerable participants. Consequently, attention is drawn to the most problematic areas. This chapter, with Chapter Four, offers a clear and honest review of the research process involved in conducting this prison research by explaining and justifying the approach that was taken and why.

Selection: Programmes and Prisons
As discussed in Chapters One and Two there are many different approaches to rehabilitation in prisons. The focus of this thesis is on Offending Behaviour Programmes and the delivery of non-accredited interventions in prison. The differences between the ‘accredited’ and ‘non-accredited’ programmes have been outlined previously (see Chapter One). It has also been noted that existing literature pays minimal attention to whether a programme has been accredited or not and why it has been selected for delivery in a prison. The opinions of all those involved in the programme (from members of management, programme facilitators, current prisoners and ex-prisoners) is also an area that is under-researched. My study aims to shed light on these areas and therefore required access to an establishment that offered at least one non-accredited programme. After several attempts to gain access to institutions that offered various non-accredited interventions in particular, used for this study was one that offered only one non-accredited programme (the lengthy procedure and process of gaining access is reflected upon in the following chapter). This was interesting as it became clear from this point that the range of programmes on offer to prisoners from one establishment to the next differed greatly. The establishment the research took place in offered one non-accredited programme; Inclusive Recovery Programme (IRP) and one accredited programme; Thinking Skills Programme (TSP).

The non-accredited programme on offer; IRP, was a shortened version of an accredited programme titled Short Duration Programme (SDP), which had been previously delivered in the prison. SDP was a four-week programme targeting substance misusers (drug misusers in particular). The establishment was a Security Category B local prison, holding both category B and C, remand and sentenced, adult male prisoners (often
referred to by staff as a ‘dispersal prison’). SDP was discontinued as it was found to be too long and often, as a result of the type of establishment, participants failed to complete due to transfer or release. A shorter version of the programme was created; IRP, which was delivered over 10 days, Monday to Friday from 9:15 to 11:15. This programme targeted drug and alcohol misusers towards the end of their sentence. The course was designed to enable 12 prisoners to partake at a time and was carried out in a group workroom within the Health Centre.

**Development of Research Design**

The next area for attention was that of the research design and the type of approach required to obtain the appropriate data. Recognising and understanding my own ‘standpoint’ in relation to society and others was important (Walter, 2013: 11). This ‘standpoint’ is influential in underpinning the type of questions asked, the range of responses searched for, the approach taken in doing so and the way in which data are interpreted and analysed (Bryman, 2001). Self-reflection was required concerning my life experiences and personal characteristics such as gender, age, culture, political stance and social and economic class (which is discussed in more detail later on). The theory/theories utilised for a particular study emerge from the literature review and reflect what other relevant researchers used and whether the approach will answer the research questions. The conceptual framework is often divided into two main paradigms, i.e. positivism and anti-positivism (Bryman, 2001) but include many other philosophical approaches such as functionalist, conflict, critical and feminist (to name just a few) (Nahmad-Williams, 2011; Walter, 2013). The two main paradigms are defined and titled differently from one source to the next. In some cases, they are referred to as
normative and naturalist-interpretivist (Rubin and Rubin, 2005) or rationalist and interpretative approaches (Raftery, McGeorge and Walters, 1997). These terms are used interchangeably throughout this thesis.

A normative paradigm applies a scientific method to the generation of knowledge and does so through the use of observations, measurements and experiments (Dash, 2005). This approach is objective in that it ‘extract[s] simple relationships from a complex world’ (Rubin et al 2005: 24) and requires the researcher to manipulate the variables (such as age and gender) to test hypotheses and find causal links (Davies, Francis, Jupp, 2011).

The interpretivist paradigm emphasises the need to experience and interact with society in order to understand and interpret phenomena. Qualitative research methods such as in-depth interviews and observations are utilised to generate knowledge using this approach (Mackenzie and Knipe, 2006). The theoretical paradigm that fits most appropriately within my research is interpretivist as the study is based on a subjective approach in its natural state in order to obtain views and opinions of those involved. This required the use of qualitative research methods as opposed to quantitative.

The study aimed to explore the feelings and opinions of current and ex-prisoners, programme facilitators and prison staff in relation to non-accredited programmes. The tools that needed to be utilised were those, which produced data that related to the research areas. There are several different approaches to generate data, some producing quantitative data typically in the form of numeric data, and others producing qualitative data which are characteristically non-numeric. Both types of methods have their advantages and disadvantages. Qualitative research is ‘phenomenological,
grounded, naturalistic in its observations, subjective, taking an insider-perspective, exploratory, inductive, process-oriented, deep, holistic, and valid’ (Losel, 2008: 153). Quantitative research on the other hand can be described as ‘logical-positivistic, controlled in measurement, objective, taking an outsider-perspective, confirmatory, outcome-oriented, generalizable, particularistic, and reliable’ (Losel, 2008: 153). Qualitative methods to data collection are useful when the potential outcome of the study is not yet known while quantitative methods are most appropriate when a hypothesis needs to be proved or disproved (ibid). With the quantitative approach, the most common tools utilised are surveys, performing an experiment and conducting statistical social observations (Philips, 2013). Qualitative data collection is concerned with people’s opinions and understanding of a certain phenomenon therefore a common approach is the use of interviews, which are generally small-scale (White, 2013). This method produces data that are more individualised and has the advantage over surveys and questionnaires in that it can obtain in-depth descriptions of how people experience a given research issue rather than data that are generalizable (Wiersma and Jurs, 2005). Quantitative research in the form of bare statistics can often ‘dazzle’ the reader and at times disregard the underlying and sometimes hidden dramatic and complex life stories of those involved in a study (Jewkes, 2013: 14). Therefore, a qualitative approach was deemed most suitable in obtaining rich, detailed accounts from participants.

This was confirmed following a pilot study conducted a few months prior to the commencement of the fieldwork. I was invited to HMP Oakwood as a guest to observe a programme in action and ask participants about their experiences of this non-
accredited intervention. The pilot study was beneficial for many reasons. Firstly, it shed light on the direction the interview schedule should take and allowed some pointers to be made in relation to the observation guide. Secondly, it allowed for any linguistic corrections to the wording of the interview schedule to be carried out along with the exclusion of any potential leading questions (Marschan-Piekkari and Welch, 2004). Thirdly, it provided the opportunity to practice being an effective observer as this was a technique I was unfamiliar with.

Keeping a note of what is important or what might be important later on was initially difficult. However, by the end of my pilot observational period I had gained more confidence. I observed three classes lasting seven hours each (totalling 21 hours) and informally interviewed three participants. I also drew up a short questionnaire relating to my research area in an attempt to make the most of this occasion and distributed these to 11 questionnaires participants. Seven of these were completed correctly, two were only half-completed and two had completed the ‘tick the box’ section only. The seven completed and two half-completed questionnaires revealed a common issue. In the sections that asked ‘why’ or where I had prompted participants to include more information, the question was avoided which was indicated by a blank space. In some cases, participants entered ‘N/A’ although the question applied specifically to them. In one particular case, a participant began to answer a question and then stopped and put a line through it. It was clear that his level of English was poor as the sentence contained many spelling errors. He ceased to continue with his comment after attempting to spell ‘knowledge’, which was spelt ‘nolage’. When informally speaking to a participant about the surveys he stated: ‘I don’t like writing, we don’t write. I can barely write my own
name’ echoing the findings of Comack (2008) and Hanks (2008) discussed in Chapter Two. From this experience, it was apparent that questionnaires were not the best approach to obtain useful and in-depth information from offenders. I also observed their frustrations and lack of confidence when attempting to complete the questionnaires. This may have affected the development of a rapport and their willingness to participate further in the study if asked to.

**Research Methods**

This thesis utilised elements of different methodologies to gain an understanding of multi-perspectives, appreciate the complexities of the issue and capture detailed information. It included ethnographic research in the form of observations, a focus group with programme participants and semi-structured individual interviews with prison managers and staff, programme facilitators, current programme participants and ex-prisoners (a breakdown of the sample is provided in this chapter).

**Case Study Approach**

The research was conducted through a case study approach in order to obtain in-depth findings (Hammersley et al 2007). Stake (1995) defined the different approaches to scientific enquiry by creating three main types of case study; intrinsic, instrumental and collective. The first type of case study, intrinsic, involves the discovery of a unique phenomenon. The instrumental case study uses a particular case in order to gain a wider understanding of the issue. The collective case study involves the examination of multiple cases concurrently or consecutively in order to obtain a thorough understanding of a phenomenon or event. My research benefited greatly from adapting
an instrumental case study approach as information explaining ‘how’, ‘what’ and ‘why’ something occurs could be explored while offering and obtaining additional insights through the use of observations. This approach was utilised as it enabled me to explore an innovative non-accredited programme in one particular prison at a moment in time. It allowed for observations of prisoners and facilitators to be conducted while the programme was in operation allowing for a sociological insight to be gained.

It is also worth noting that the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (c.36) was utilised in order to gain more information and knowledge about the types of programmes that were on offer at various prisons throughout the West Midlands. This is now regarded as an emerging valuable and simple social science research approach utilised by other researchers, such as Lewis and Meek (2012) and Meek (2014). This approach required contacting the Ministry of Justice via email to make a Freedom of Information request. The email included the following information: my name, contact address and a detailed description of the information I required. The information was received within 20 days.

**Ethnographic Research**

Ethnographic research provided me with a starting point for my data collection. This is a method utilised by many prison researchers (see, Crewe et al 2011; Jewkes, 2011) and can be an invaluable means of obtaining an in-depth, multi-faceted appreciation of an issue or specific topic within its natural context (Crowe, Cresswell, Robertson, Avery and Shelkh, 2011; Yin, 2009). The observations of the IRP programme in action was carried out in an unstructured manner or was ‘naturalistic’ (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). By conducting the observations in this way an insight into the nature of the
programme and the way in which it was delivered could be gained. Consequently, a list of predetermined categories and classifications was not used but instead a list emerged during my observations. A short checklist was created, however, and was referred to from time-to-time in order to ensure that the key issues were observed. This research proved beneficial as an understanding of the programmes in practice, the layout and setting of the course, the engagement and interest of the offenders, the roles and responsibilities of the facilitators and staff members were viewed and obtained. Some of the key topics on the checklist were: content, layout and organisation, resources, activities, number of participants, location, facilitators’ engagement with students (vice versa) and atmosphere. Having a checklist ensured that notes were taken on all of these areas, however, during my observations, field notes were taken on what occurred naturally and then rearranged under the appropriate category at the end of the day.

Two of the ten sessions for IRP were observed which totalled four hours. During one observation, I sat at the back of the classroom and in the other, I sat amongst the group within a semi-circle layout. At times during the session, it was clear that some participants were physically present but lacked any conscious engagement in the programme (see James, 2013). The observation experience allowed me to learn more about the programme see and feel the atmosphere within the session and gave me the opportunity to interact, engage and begin to develop a rapport with potential interview participants.

**Focus Groups**
Focus groups are used to collect data from a number of participants at the same time (Braun and Clarke, 2013). They tend to be relatively unstructured as the discussion is only guided by the moderator and developed by the participants. Focus groups can ‘take us beyond the ‘snapshot’ view... The focus group approach allows people to discuss their views and compare their decision-making processes with others, in a social dynamic’ (Davies et al 2011: 65). One focus group consisting of 10 participants was carried out as part of this study and lasted 30 minutes. A limitation of focus groups occurs when members are uncomfortable expressing their views and opinions in front of others (ibid). However, during my focus group, discomfort and unease were not obvious and instead participants seemed willing to express their views and opinions in front of each other. Each of the participants had similar views on the topics being discussed which may have contributed to the relaxed atmosphere.

**Semi-structured Interviews**

Another approach to carrying out qualitative research is by conducting interviews. This can include individual interviews, group interviews and life-history interviews (Bryman, 2001). In order to meet the objectives of my research it was essential to carry out individual interviews with participants from each of the categories previously mentioned as a greater explanation of one’s feelings and emotions can be obtained through this approach (Losel, 2008). This method of data collection allows for rich and descriptive reports of individuals’ perceptions on certain topics to be obtained without the interference of others (Hakim, 2000). There are a number of different ways in which interviews can be conducted; they can be structured, unstructured or semi-structured (Bryman, 2004). Due to the nature of my study, semi-structured interviews were
deemed most appropriate as the interviewee is given a greater amount of flexibility in answering the questions while at the same time I retained the ability to guide the participant through my research topic (Bryman, 2004). They also allow participants to express their feelings more effectively than if they were to respond to closed-ended questions. The majority of the interviews were carried out face-to-face and lasted between 15 and 60 minutes depending on the quality of the interview. Two interviews were conducted over the phone; one with an ex-prisoner (EXP 1) who was located in Scotland and another one with the manager and lead facilitator (M 3) of a non-accredited programme. This approach is different to face-to-face interviews in that non-verbal communications such as facial expressions, gestures and reactions were absent which made it difficult to anticipate sensitivity to certain questions or displays of body language. At times whilst carrying out the telephone interviews it was difficult to determine whether or not the participant had finished answering a particular questions or whether they were instead taking a few seconds to think about their answer.

An important aspect of this approach was the ability to obtain multiple perspectives in order to gain a clearer and deeper understanding of the topic. This meant that interviews were carried out with current programme participants, ex-prisoners, prison staff (i.e. managers) and programme facilitators. An interview schedule developed as time progressed. Following my observational period, many changes and eliminations were made. The central questions posed to each of the target groups were as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Group</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Relevance to Research Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Group 1: Prison Managers (M)** | 1. (a) What is the process and rationale behind the selection and implementation of non-accredited programmes? | *Research Area 1*  
Understanding the rationale behind the selection and implementation of certain non-accredited innovative programmes in a prison |
| | 2. What is your view towards the range, purpose and delivery of these interventions? | *Research Area 1 & 2* |
| | 3. What is the significance of innovative and imaginative programmes to offenders participating, engaging and completing these programmes? | *Research Area 3*  
Investigating the significance of innovative and imaginative programmes on offenders participating, engaging, completing and achieving positive outcomes |
<p>| | 4. What types of positive outcomes are seen? | <em>Research Area 3</em> |
| | 5. Do you believe the prison which a prisoner is sent to | <em>Research Areas 1, 2 &amp; 3</em> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and the programmes that are being delivered there at the time affect their chances of successful rehabilitation and if so, why?</th>
<th>Exploring concept of a ‘Rehabilitation Lottery’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you feel there is an appropriate range of programmes on offer to prisoners at this establishment?</td>
<td>Research Areas 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploring the views and opinions of staff towards the range, purpose and delivery of these interventions and Exploring the concept of a ‘Rehabilitation Lottery’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2: Programme Facilitators (FA)</td>
<td>1. (b) What process did you go through in order to deliver this programme here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What is the purpose and approach to delivering this programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How does this programme differ to other interventions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>What is the significance of innovative and imaginative programmes to offenders participating, engaging and completing these programmes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>What types of positive outcomes are seen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Do you believe the prison which a prisoner is sent to and the programmes that are being delivered there at the time affect their chances of successful rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Do you believe a range of programmes on offer to prisoners is important and if so, why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 3A: Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>(c) What is your view towards the range,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Area 2 and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants/Current Prisoners (CP)</td>
<td>Purpose and delivery of these interventions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. (a) What is the significance of innovative and imaginative programmes to participating, engaging and completing these programmes? |  | Research Area 3  
Exploring the concept of a ‘Rehabilitation Lottery’ |
| 3. What types of positive outcomes are seen/experienced, if any? |  | Research Area 3  
Exploring the concept of a ‘Rehabilitation Lottery’ |
| 4. Do you believe the prison which a prisoner is sent to and the programmes that are being delivered there at the time affect ones chances of successful rehabilitation & if so, why? |  | Research Area 2 & 3  
Exploring concept of a ‘Rehabilitation Lottery’ |
| Group 3B: Ex-Prisoners (EXP) | Questions 1 (c), 2 (a), 4 and; 7  
5. (b) What programme (if any) did you find most worthwhile and why? | Research Areas 2 & 3 in particular |
The layout of the interview schedule was of particular importance as it was necessary not to make any participants feel uncomfortable at any time throughout the interview. It was also important to ensure that every question posed was relevant to the aims and objectives of the study. There was a need to begin with some ‘ice-breaker’ questions which participants would find easy to answer in an attempt to ease them into the interview. Another point that needed consideration was avoiding the inclusion of ‘double-barrel questions’ and ‘leading questions’ as these tend to guide the participant in a certain direction which can result in manipulation and dishonesty and can cause confusion and half answered questions (McNabb, 2004). However, in order to reduce the likelihood of manipulation and/or biased methodologies the interview schedules were pre-tested during the pilot study prior to the conducting of the actual interviews.

Suitable places to conduct interviews include empty offices in the prison, the prison library or vacant education rooms (Newman, 1958). However, during my fieldwork, the gatekeepers rarely asked for my opinion or preferences on where the interviews should take place. As a result, face-to-face interviews took place in a range of locations and depended on the target group being interviewed. For interviews with prison staff (i.e. prison managers and other prison staff), each of these took place in the participants’ offices. These offices were quiet and private and were an appropriate location for an interview. The interviews with facilitators took place mainly in an empty education room and in some cases a quiet office. The prisoner interviews took place in empty education rooms, quiet corridors within the Health Centre wing, quiet areas within a workshop, in prison officers’ offices and on one occasion took place in a back office in a noisy laundry workshop. Interviews with ex-prisoners were carried out in empty T.V rooms in hostels,
cafes, their workplaces and in my office within the Criminology Department. Therefore, the locations and settings for the interviews varied significantly.

The Sample

The number of interviews that are required for a qualitative piece of research depends on the purpose and aim of the research (Travers, 2013). The purpose of my research project is to gain a better understanding of non-accredited programmes carried out in a prison at a particular time. More broadly speaking, it aims to take a closer look at the design, layout and teaching techniques used by facilitators in attempting to produce positive outcomes, and to discuss with those involved in such programmes the significance of innovative interventions in increasing programme participation and completion. As a result of the nature of my research, generalizability, representativeness and statistical significance are factors which are of less importance and relevance than in-depth analysis and exploration. It is important to recognise that prison research is different to other criminological research in that even if the aims and objectives required data to be generalizable and representative it would be extremely difficult to achieve large numbers as part of a PhD thesis bearing in mind time and money restrictions. It is also worth noting that although approval may be obtained from the appropriate national bodies, the prison establishment (i.e. its Governor or Controller) still possess the power to grant or refuse entry at the final stage (Travers, 2013).

The sample was divided into three main categories in order to obtain a complete picture. Silverman (2004) coined the approach of using more than one sample group as ‘multi-method’. The benefits of adopting a ‘multi-perspective’ approach allow for the views
and opinions of all those concerned to be explored (Simonot and Donald, 2010). My research adopted this approach as it was important to highlight where commonalities and differences in perspectives existed and the way in which each group viewed the situation. The sample groups can be broken down as follows; Group 1: Managers/Prison Staff (M); Group 2: Programme Facilitators (FA); Group 3A: Programme Participants/Current Prisoners (CP); and Group 3B: Ex-Prisoners (EXP).

The four managers/prison staff were accessed through the means of ‘convenience’ sampling as gaining access to this group depended solely on who was willing and available to be interviewed at the time. Although this method was relatively straightforward insofar as making the most of whom was accessible at the time, the disadvantage with such an approach is that it can be extremely unrepresentative (Tranter, 2013). However, these interviews were very useful in relation to the selection of programmes process and overall supplemented the data obtained from programme facilitators. The chart below provides further details on this first sample group:
Figure 3.1 shows that two of the four prison staff were managers from within the prison and therefore wore prison uniforms. The other two participants were managers from an outside organisation delivering non-accredited programmes (thus wore plain clothes).

We can also see that three out of the four interviewees were female. What is not identified in the chart is that two of the prison managers were from the research site and the other two were from different establishments where they managed and delivered other non-accredited programmes.

The second sample group consisted of programme facilitators. Here eight facilitators participated in the study; five males and three females. This sample was accessed through purposive sampling and the participants were selected based on their role in delivering non-accredited programmes and how it related specifically to the purpose of the study (Blaxter, Hughes and Tight, 2006). The next chart considers the make-up of this group in more detail.
*It is worth noting, that only one of the facilitators interviewed was a trained prison officer and wore a uniform. The remaining seven were part of an organisation or charity and therefore wore plain clothes.

Figure 3.2 highlights how four out of the eight participants delivered IRP while the other four facilitated other non-accredited programmes such as ‘the HorseCourse’, ‘Music in Prisons’, ‘The Chrysalis Programme’ and ‘Family Man’. The following table provides further information:

**Table 3.3: Sample of Facilitators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>From Research Site</th>
<th>Role within the Prison</th>
<th>Prison Work Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>N*</td>
<td>Lead Facilitator</td>
<td>Y **– 5+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Lead Facilitator</td>
<td>Y – 7+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Y – 11+ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Facilitator and Prison Officer</td>
<td>Y – 9+ years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FA5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N* - No; Y** – Yes)

Table 3.3 outlines the number of participants within this sample group, their gender, whether or not the participants were located within the research site, their roles within their establishments and the minimum number of years’ experience each participant has working with offenders.

The final sample group comprised two sub-categories: (a) Current Prisoners (CP) and; (b) Ex-Prisoners (EXP). The current prisoners were, at the time of the fieldwork, partaking in the non-programme, IRP. Group 3a were obtained with the aid of the gatekeepers. Although I had very little control over who and how many participants the prison gave me access to, I still aimed for my sample to be ‘purposive’ (Davies et al 2011). This was achieved by informing the gatekeepers of the requirement to interview prisoners who had previously completed or were currently partaking in at least one non-accredited innovative programmes. As the establishment only offered one non-accredited programme, IRP, the intervention they were currently taking part in was the course that was also observed. The only other requirement was for the participants to have served a previous custodial sentence so that they were able to consider the concept of a ‘rehabilitation lottery’ from their own experience. As mentioned, participants were chosen by the manager of reducing re-offending and lead facilitator
or IRP and consisted of those currently on the programme and those who completed the programme in the past. The programme was relatively new and consequently decreased the ability to ‘cherry-pick’ participants as their main focus was on finding participants who were still serving their sentence in the prison as many had since been released. The sample was ‘purposive’ in that it was constructed to serve a specific case/issue relating to the research study and was based on what was already known about the target population (Tranter, 2013). The table below outlines further information regarding sample Group 3a.

**Table 3.4: Sample Group 3a - Current Prisoners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.D.</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Previous Convictions</th>
<th>Sentence Length</th>
<th>Education*</th>
<th>Audio Recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>White/British</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1y 4 mt</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Dual Heritage</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2y 8 mt</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>18 wk</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>African Caribbean</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>16 wk</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.5y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1y 6 mt</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1yr</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2.5y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>BB</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>6 mt</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>BB/C</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>1y 2mt</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(“Y” stands for ‘Yes’ and ‘N’ stands for ‘None/No’ in relation to whether or not they had completed their GCSEs, A-Levels, or other, i.e. Level 1 and 2 Diplomas or NVQs or whether the interview was audio recorded or not).

Table 3.4 outlines some background information about the participants. It should also be noted that from the number of programme participants that were interviewed, 18 of the sample had completed at least one accredited programme in the past and all twenty had completed at least one non-accredited course.

Group 3b; Ex-Prisoners were obtained through the means of snowball sampling which resulted in eight ex-prisoners participating in the study. The table below highlights some information regarding this sample group.

Table 3.5: Sample Group 3b - Ex-Prisoners
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I.D</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Date of Released</th>
<th>Previous Convictions</th>
<th>Sentence Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Jan 2006</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Jan 2014</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Nov 2013</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>2mt 3 wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>DH</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>11y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Feb 2014</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>5y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Aug 2005</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1y 6mt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(All of these interviews were audio recorded with the consent of the participant).

From this sample of ex-prisoners, a range of ages, ethnicities and sentence lengths is evident. Six ex-prisoners stated that they had completed at least one accredited programme in the past while four claimed they had completed at least one non-accredited intervention.

**Table 3.6: Summary of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Facilitators</th>
<th>Current Prisoners</th>
<th>Ex-Prisoners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above, a summary of all the participants included in this study is provided. Overall, 40 participants took part in interviews and this number increases to 50 when the focus group of ten is included. As discussed earlier, IRP was observed on two occasions in order to gather enough data to shed sufficient light on the research area.
Approach to analysis of findings

Transcriptions and Coding

The analysis of the data began with the transcription of the audio recordings. 19 of the 40 participants were audio recorded. The transcription of these recordings, as pointed out by many researchers (Willis, 2013; Bryman, 2001), is a tedious and time-consuming process. These transcriptions were carried out personally, which forced me to pay attention to every detail of each interview. The recordings gave me the opportunity to take into consideration non-verbal material also, such as long pauses, which may have indicated embarrassment or discomfort or laughter, which may have been used to demonstrate sarcasm or wit (Willis, 2013).

Once the recordings were transcribed and saved on to a word document, they were then organised in a clear and concise format. The interviews that were not recorded were also typed-up (following the completion of interview field notes immediately after an interview was conducted) and saved on to the same document. A thematic analysis was then utilised as themes began to emerge from the data, known as inductive analysis. In order to carry out this analysis, the first step involved the coding of the data, which is the most common approach to analysing qualitative data (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Richards, 2005). This meant that the data was segmented using symbols, descriptive words or categories (Willis, 2013). This was done by reading through the first set of transcripts and field notes and then repeating this step again and again (Bryman, 2001).
Once I became immersed in the data, I soon began to divide it into analytical units according to its rationale, frequency and importance; different coloured pens and pencils were used in order to manage this process. Some codes (‘a priori’ (Willes, 2013)) already existed and were identified through the literature. Others emerged inductively through analysis. ‘A good code will capture one idea; a theme has a central organising concept, but will contain lots of different ideas or aspects related to the central organising concept (each of those might be a code)’ (Braun and Clarke, 2013: 224).

Once the codes had been identified I then focused on what are sometimes described as ‘candidate themes’ (Braun et al, 2013). The reason for this is because these themes are still seen as provisional at this stage in the process. In order to find patterns in the data, I reviewed the codes and the corresponding data to each code with the aim of identifying similarities and overlap between them. Here I looked for concepts, topics or issues which several codes related to, and according to Braun et al (2013: 225) ‘could be used as a central organising concept for a theme’. An example of this is where the codes ‘time’, ‘money’, ‘listening’, ‘talking’, ‘equipment’ and ‘staff’ all related in one way or another to ‘resources’ which then became the main theme for these codes.

The themes identified captured the most salient patterns in the data that were relevant to the original research questions. Some codes were large, rich and complex enough in themselves to be ‘promoted’ to a theme, as also found by Braun et al (2013). Once all the themes were identified, they were then explored in order to identify commonalities and differences. For example, in relation to the theme ‘resources’, some staff felt that they listened carefully to what participants of the programme were saying, whereas,
participants felt that there was never enough time for them to talk and be listened to. Yet, each of the sample groups felt that there was not enough staff available to deliver the sessions. Throughout this process, reference was made back to the transcripts to ensure interpretations of the data had not been altered and the claims being made accurate (Willes, 2013).

**Reliability and Validity**

In order to increase reliability and validity many researchers aim to achieve a sample that is representative of the wider research population. This has been discussed previously; however, it is worth noting here that attempts were made to increase the validity and reliability of the research by obtaining multiple perspectives and by using more than one method to gather data. Another important issue that needed consideration was the reliability and truthfulness of the accounts given by the offenders. Although many of the participants stated that they had no reason to lie during the interview, many academics (Stevens, 1998; Carter, 2003) have outlined that ‘there is no one truth but many competing truths, and that therefore all forms of knowledge will be partial’ (Comack, 2008: 149). However, while other researchers include extra measures, such as adopting both quantitative and qualitative methods to the collection of data in an attempt to determine the accuracy of each interview, due to the limitations placed on this project and the research aims, the analysis for this research was constructed primarily on the responses given freely by each participant. This point also applies to prison staff and programme facilitators as they may feel the need to present a particular romanticised picture of their institution or the work they carry out by emphasising the positive aspects and minimising the negatives. However, as mentioned above, the
inclusion of observations helped to support certain claims and gave me the opportunity to challenge responses where applicable.

**Ethical and Practical Considerations**

**The University Ethical Review Process**

The University of Leicester necessitates that all research involving human participants receive ethical approval before commencing the project (University of Leicester, 2014). Thus, my research was subject to appraisal by the University of Leicester’s Ethical Committee. This process involved the completion of an online ethics application form which was approved by the Committee. The University of Leicester Research Code of Conduct was adhered to as the project was conducted in accordance with the standards expected of social research profession, including the Social Research Association’s Ethical Guidelines (December 2003), the British Society of Criminology’s code of Ethics for Research in the field of Criminology (http://www.britsoccrim.org/codeofethics.htm) and the UK Research Integrity Office’s Code of Practice for Research (September 2009).

There are numerous potential risks for an in-prison researcher; however, following discussions with various experts in the field, including supervisors and gatekeepers and also as a result of previous in-prison research carried out for my Master’s degree, I was aware of the main ethical, methodological and practical issues involved with this project. Other ethical and practical considerations are discussed in more detail in the following chapter which takes into account the approval required from the Ministry of Justice, in the form of NOMS approval, the support and authorisation of the governor/director of
the prison in order for the research to take place and the approval of staff managing and/or facilitating the rehabilitative programmes.

**Informed Consent**

Obtaining valid written and informed consent is particularly important when conducting prison research. Prisoners who participate in any research are automatically classed as a ‘vulnerable group’ as it is difficult to ensure that incarcerated persons have volunteered freely to partake and have not been coerced in any way (James, 2013). It is important to ensure that they fully understand the nature and purpose of the study so that they can make an informed decision as to whether or not to partake. To this end, a clear and simple overview of the research was given to each respondent. This overview was presented in plain and unambiguous English as many inmates are illiterate or have a poor educational level (The Howard League for Penal Reform, 2006; 2011). It was also highlighted that participation in the study would not mitigate the inmate’s sentence nor would it increase their chances of release. All of these points were explained at the beginning of the interview and participants were also given the opportunity to ask any further questions about the research. Each group of participants were also informed that they had the option to opt out or withdraw from the interview at any time and if this did occur then any information already obtained up to this point would be excluded from the study. When a recording device was available, we discussed the option to record the interview. I explained the importance and value of these recordings to me and clarified that I would be the only one with access to these recordings but also appreciated that it was their choice and I would not question their decision (recording interviews is discussed in more detail in the following chapter).
Data Protection and Confidentiality

Once the participant confirmed their understanding of the nature and purpose of the research and choose to partake in the study I asked them to sign a consent form for my records (see Appendix 2). The consent forms also addressed the issue of confidentiality as they included an ‘I.D code’ box at the top of the page. This was explained to the participants and they were made aware that their names would not appear anywhere in the thesis or any other reports or books written thereafter. I explained that they would be given a unique identification code instead of identifying them by name. My views on identification codes are similar to those of Crewe (2009) in that I feel a number or abstract designation to be very impersonal and somewhat disrespectful. I also believe offenders might associate a code with the impersonal and dehumanising prison numbers that the prison service use to track offenders when they first come to prison (Prison Reform Trust, n.d). As a result, I asked the interviewee to choose a code or name that they would like to be referred to as. I felt that prisoners respected my attempt to treat them more like a person rather than another number. Managers and facilitators expressed their preference of using I.D codes rather than pseudonyms. I believe this enhanced the validity and reliability of the data by protecting their identity and allowing them to be completely honest about the research area.

Another topic that I discussed with participants was the storage of the material I collected. I assured all participants that the information obtained would be held in accordance with the University of Leicester’s Data Protection principles. This required data to be stored in a secure location away from unauthorised access. I also informed
participants that I would be the only one with access to this data. In relation to information stored electronically, this too would be secured via a username and password.

I adhered to the requirements of the Data Protection Act and the Offender Management Act 2007 by: using the information obtained exclusively for research purposes; not using the information to support measures or decisions relating to any identifiable living individual; not using the data in a way that would cause, or was likely to cause, substantial damage or substantial distress to any data subject and; by not making the result of my research, or any resulting statistics, available in a form that identifies the data subject.

**Researchers’ duty to disclose certain information**

Due to the nature of the research, there is a strong possibility that on occasions the researcher may be informed of unsolved crimes or secrets, plans to disrupt the daily prison routine, behaviour that is against Prison Service rules (see section 51 of the Prison Service Rules 1999) or behaviour that is harmful to the participant themselves. There are three possible options available to a researcher if faced with such a situation. They can either decide to ignore the information, inform prison staff or attempt to discourage the inmate from carrying out the proposed action (Schlosser, 2008). However, participants involved in my study were informed before the interview commenced of my obligation to report to an officer any incriminating information against themselves or another inmate or other serious harms or plans to escape. I requested that participants refrain from informing me of such information. Although it was sensible to
have this safeguard in place to protect myself from compromising situations (Crewe, 2009), I still felt relieved that information of this nature did not arise during the interviews.

Conclusion

This chapter outlined the process involved in conducting this piece of research. It explained how and why the research site and IRP were chosen for exploration and considered the theoretical paradigm that fits most appropriately within my research. It outlined the approach taken towards the pilot study and identified the instrumentation utilised in order to obtain the relevant data. In doing so, ethnographic research, focus groups and semi-structured interviews were discussed to outline the approach that was taken and the reasons behind it. The sample included in my study is an important area that needed to be clarified at this stage and therefore is clearly addressed within the chapter. The reliability and validity of the study are explored along with the main ethical and practical issues.

The next chapter provides a reflective account of the methodological process in order to further explain why this research was carried out in the way it was. The findings are then split between four data chapters. Chapters Five to Eight analyse and discuss the findings obtained from the empirical research. During the analysis key themes and patterns emerged through the data. The findings were broken down into three main sections; (1) Selection: Programmes and Prisoners; (2) Design: Understanding the Programme; and (3) Delivery: The Importance of ‘Who’, ‘How’ and ‘Where’. These,
respectively, are the subjects of Chapters Five, Six and Seven. Chapter Eight then goes on to further explore the concept of a ‘rehabilitation lottery’ and how each of the sample groups engage in this lottery. These findings are presented by leading with an argument and relevant supporting literature followed by the use of verbatim quotations in reporting the qualitative research.
CHAPTER FOUR
METHODOLOGY: REFLECTIONS ON THE PROCESS

Introduction
This chapter discusses the emotional investment required from the start of this project in order to overcome the many practical, safety and ethical issues that presented themselves along the journey. The chapter provides an outline of the personal experiences and interactions that took place with participants of the study in an attempt to obtain a clearer understanding of cultural and social phenomena within a prison environment (Jewkes, 2011). Although this autoethnographic approach to social research has been criticised by some researchers (Anderson, 2006; Atkinson, 2006), others have argued the importance of providing honest reflective accounts of fieldwork (Crewe, 2006; Jewkes, 2012; Farrant, 2014). Prison researchers typically ‘extract out’ feelings of fear, vulnerability, frustrations and/or any other emotions while making sense of our experiences, despite prisons frequently being highly charged emotional settings (Jewkes, 2011: 64). It would be naive to assume that a researcher can and should ‘switch-off’ their emotions especially when expressions of emotion are connected to the normal functioning human body (Garot, 2004; Crewe, 2009). Confessing to our emotional investment is not something to be ashamed of nor is it something which should be viewed as irrational or unacademic (Oakley, 1981; Jewkes and Johnson, 2006). Instead, it should be embraced and theorised as an invaluable tool in understanding the research process.

The chapter offers some personal reflections on the choices that led to this particular piece of prison research. It discusses in detail the lengthy and frustrating process
involved in obtaining NOMS approval and access to an establishment via the various prison gatekeepers. It explains why I believe there is a particular need for ethnographic research to be carried out, along with the significance of being seen by prisoners as an independent researcher. Consideration is given to the process of note taking and the necessity of building a rapport with participants. Issues with safety are discussed, along with researcher flexibility when accessing establishments. The physical and demographical differences between myself and those interviewed are noted along with an acknowledgement of how these differences may have impacted upon the data I received and the analysis of this data. Themes such as respect, prison culture, ‘institutional thoughtlessness’\textsuperscript{14}, prison language, prison politics and policies are also examined. The chapter reflects on my thoughts and experiences and allows for others to use these perceptions to compare and contrast with their own (Jewkes, 2011).

\textbf{Reflections on the Research Area}

Researchers might find it easier studying remote and desolate communities than they would conducting prison research (Patenaude, 2004). From my experience, unfortunately this was also the case. There were times when I felt that I was never going to gain access to a suitable institution to conduct my research and that I should alter my focus to avoid wasting any more valuable time. Although I was aware that the process would be challenging, existing prison literature failed to prepare me for the lack of responses from gatekeepers at crucial times, the feelings of helplessness and

\textsuperscript{14} ‘Institutional thoughtlessness’ is a term coined by Crawley (2005: 350), which refers to the lack of consideration prison establishments give to the health and social needs of elderly prisoners. It is used within this chapter but its definition is altered so that it refers to an establishment’s failure to recognise the needs of researchers and importance of prison research.
uncertainty and the impact that many setbacks would have on my motivation and drive to complete this project\textsuperscript{15}. Few criminologists study prisons first-hand as a result of their nature and location and also due to the fact that this research area is rarely ever straightforward or uncomplicated (Patenaude, 2001; 2004). However, surmounting these obstacles may be half the attraction of carrying out this type of research. The process of gaining access is complex, lengthy and at times incredibly frustrating, while inside the prison the environment can be intimidating, challenging, draining and sometimes quite depressing. Yet, few people get the opportunity to witness these experiences (Quinney, 2000) and see for themselves what life is really like behind the high walls and within this secretive community. As a result of this and my keen interest in discovering more information about prison life, I felt it was extremely important to keep focused in order to make up for those who had given up the fight or were deterred from ever exploring this area in the first place as a result of the many procedures in place and challenges involved in researching these vulnerable groups. With prison numbers continuously rising and there being a need for more prison spaces (Ministry of Justice, 2014c), research into the area of reducing re-offending is essential. There is also a continuous need to bridge the gap between the community and ‘risky or hard-to-reach’ and isolated communities. There are many areas within the prison service that need improving and it is essential that the voices of those involved are heard in order for the necessary developments to take place. Above all else, prison research is exciting and can even elicit

\textsuperscript{15} Crewe (2009: Appendix 465) also comments in his appendix that ‘little of the prison literature that I had consumed had primed me for these encounters’. Although here he was referring to different types of encounters such as being shown heroin, being approached by a naked prisoner in the gym demanding to know what he thought of his body and so on, he still reflects on the fact that the prison literature had not prepared him for many important discoveries.
‘sneaky thrills’ (Katz, 1988: 52). It is for these reasons that I initially became interested in carrying out ethnographic prison research.

**Why this particular area of prison research?**

As pointed out by Bell (2010: 27), ‘*selecting a topic is more difficult than it at first seems*’. This was certainly the case for me, as the research needed to contribute to existing literature within the field, be worthwhile and shed new knowledge on the reduction of re-offending. After spending several months reading and identifying gaps in the literature, I realised that little research had been carried out on the differences and similarities between accredited and non-accredited rehabilitative interventions. I found this area particularly interesting as these offending behaviour programmes had the potential to have a significant impact (both immediate and long-term) on offenders, yet there was very little research or information available. It became even more apparent when I attempted to find out which prisons were delivering which programmes. Limited material was available online regarding the programmes that were delivered from one establishment to the next and even less material was offered in relation to whether the programme was accredited or non-accredited. In many cases, the information presented online was invalid or out-of-date. I decided this would be the focus of my research.

I discussed the possibility of carrying out research on accredited and non-accredited interventions with one prison establishment and was informed that this would not be possible as accredited programmes were copyright protected. I was told that I would not be given access to the programme manuals or be permitted to observe the
programmes in action as a result of this protection. Research into accredited
programmes has been carried out by researchers such as Clarke, Simmons and Wydall
(2004) on behalf of the Home Office, for example, and so it was clear that certain bodies
could get access to these programmes. It seemed as though access was carefully
controlled and there was a certain amount of unwillingness from the establishment to
provide an independent, early career researcher access to an aspect of rehabilitation
about which little is known. On reflection this lack of access may have also been
associated with the establishment’s priorities, resources or even, perhaps, their lack of
confidence in behavioural programmes, and therefore an element of self-protection
may have been utilised (Patenaude, 2004).

Upon realisation that this area of research would not be permitted I decided to focus
primarily on non-accredited programmes. These programmes are delivered in many
prisons throughout England and Wales but there is a general lack of information and
academic literature available. By focusing on this area I would also be able to shed new
light on how and why some of these programmes are chosen for implementation in
some prisons (and not others), the perceptions of those involved in regards to the range,
purpose and delivery of them, why offenders choose to partake in a programme that is
not part of their sentence plan, what kind of outcomes these types of interventions have
on offenders and why this is the case. Once the aims and objectives of the research area
had been established the next step was obtaining approval from the necessary ethical
bodies and committees.

The ‘Chosen’ Research Site: Third Time Lucky
The research location was particularly important for my study as the research needed to be carried out in an establishment that delivered at least one non-accredited programme. It would have also been advantageous if these interventions were innovative and creative in their approach. For these reasons, HMP Oakwood seemed an ideal location as this establishment delivered many innovative non-accredited programmes such as ‘The HorseCourse’, ‘MyndPlay’, ‘The Chrysalis Programme’ and ‘The Football Academy’. I had also begun building a rapport with staff from this institution as a result of many visits and various facilitators had expressed their interest in being involved in the research. The other reasons for choosing this establishment related to the type of prisoners it held (male offenders), the age of these offenders (adult prison) and the security category (category C). However, unfortunately, the Controller of the establishment denied access and thus an alternative location had to be found. (The power of Controllers and Governors is explored in greater detail later on in this chapter).

In seeking an alternative establishment, the criteria remained the same. The fieldwork needed to be conducted in a prison which (1) held adult male prisoners (as men make-up the majority of the prison population thus being most problematic (Ministry of Justice, 2014c); (2) was either a category B or C prison (accessing category A prisons are arguably more difficult than the lower categories and gaining the views and opinions from this group of offenders was not an essential element of my research. Category D or ‘open prisons’ have a different regime to category B and C therefore were not appropriate for my research either); (3) delivered (innovative) non-accredited programmes and; (4) was in relatively close proximity for ease of travel and reduction of
cost. In order to identify a prison fitting these criteria, I contacted a member of the National Research Committee (NRC) who suggested conducting the research in HMP Hewells. He described the non-accredited programmes delivered there and mentioned that this establishment had fewer research applications than others around the area, which may increase the likelihood of the Governor approving the research. However, four weeks following the submission of my application to conduct my research in this establishment I was informed by the Governor that I would not be given access to the prison. Upon reflection, I realise that the selection process or rationale behind Governors/Controllers approving research and the factors that contribute to them allowing or refusing access into establishments is another area that existing literature pays minimal attention to. There is a strong feeling in some quarters on the criminology conference circuit that some universities seem rather better placed than others for securing access to prison research, even when research competencies are held constant. This study did not address this issue; but it is arguably another variable to be added-in to the list of factors associated with the already tortuous process of undertaking prison-based research.

Conscious of deadlines, I decided to try one last establishment in the West Midlands which offered one non-accredited programme to male offenders in a category B prison. Gaining access to this institution was by no means straightforward but almost three months following initial contact they approved my research. To say that I felt a tremendous sense of relief would be an understatement. On top of relief, I felt surprised that access had been given and excited to finally proceed to the fieldwork stage. This process of gaining access to carry out research on the concept of a
‘rehabilitation lottery’ was ironic, as it seemed access for researchers is a lottery itself never mind the penal experience.


Reflection on the Entry Process: Access and Gatekeepers

NOMS

As noted by the Ministry of Justice (2013a: n.p):

All applications to conduct research across NOMS (prison and probation) must be made using the standardised NOMS research application form ... or through the Integrated Research Application System IRAS...

This process is lengthy, as the application form itself requires the completion of over 50 sections. The guidance for completing the application also imposes NOMS’ own restrictive criteria which includes the proposed research having sufficient links to NOMS business priorities, for example (Ministry of Justice, 2014d). These requirements have been compared to a monopoly of research within prisons and probation services as the Home Office places barriers in the way of research (Raynor, 2008). Another factor contributing to the length of time it takes to gain approval relates to the fact that the NRC only meet once a month to review applications. As a result, it took several weeks to obtain a response from the Committee and when that response did come through the Committee’s initial recommendation was ‘not to approve’ the research. This setback was worrying given the fact that the NRC would only give consideration for one more resubmission (Ministry of Justice, 2013a). The feedback received was also frustrating as some points I had included were identified as ‘missing’ and therefore must simply have been overlooked. I drew up an amended proposal and returned it to the Committee via the Integrated Research Application System (IRAS) as soon as possible.
Another requirement outlined by the NRC, which is not discussed in existing literature, is the fact that approval from the NRC must be obtained prior to researchers’ contacting prison establishments. Such a condition is incomprehensible as; in my opinion it is logical, courteous and important to develop a relationship with the target institution prior to submitting a proposal to carry out research there. It was also essential in my case, as I needed to find out what types of programmes were delivered in the prison before submitting an application to the NRC. Building a rapport with gatekeepers by having a number of meetings to discuss the research is important as it increases the likelihood of access being granted (James, 2013). Building this valuable rapport with the appropriate research site was the approach I had taken in the past. Therefore, when I became aware of the Controller’s decision to refuse access in the first establishment, I contacted other potential establishments almost immediately. HMP Featherstone is one of these establishments and following some early contact I was given the impression by members of staff that my research was something they would be interested in. However, the NRC became aware of this and soon I was contacted and advised by a member of the NRC not to contact any (more) prison(s) about my proposed research before obtaining new NOMS approval. The monopoly referred to earlier seemed even more apparent at this stage as feeling of helplessness and lack of control over my own research took over. Like Crewe (2009), my experience of feeling powerless in the face of condescension by the NRC was another area I was unprepared for, even after consuming much prison literature.
Another month passed whilst I waited for my resubmission to be reviewed by the NRC. Finally, I was informed that they were content that the key issues they had highlighted had been addressed and that their decision then was to 'approve' the research. I felt relieved that the process was now finally over and I could move on to the next stage. However, the next step involved obtaining permission from the establishment’s staff and was far from straightforward. As a result, several more modified applications had to be resubmitted to the NRC due to circumstances outside of my control. These circumstances, requirements and conditions set out by the NRC/NOMS and prison authorities made it almost impossible for me to conduct my research. Another PhD student had little choice but to abandoned her studies as a direct consequence of an ‘overly complex system’ and ‘quagmire’ of red tape’ (Gill, 2009: 11). This ‘quagmire of red tape’ resonates with me personally, as many obstacles and challenges presented themselves which tested my determination and motivation to carry out this research and almost ended it. A concerning lack of support for academic research in prisons is highlighted which is worrying for the future of valuable prison research (Bosworth, Campbell, Demby, Ferranti and Santos, 2005).

**Prison Controllers, Governors and Managers**

One of the main issues associated with prison research is gaining access into establishments as in many cases this process can take considerable time and effort. Gatekeepers are reluctant for researchers to enter prisons for a range of reasons: firstly, it is thought by many gatekeepers that the research might ‘disturb’ the inmates or the researcher’s entry may cause a potential threat to the prison’s security; secondly, research can disturb daily prison routine; thirdly, the research might not benefit the
prison in any way and; fourthly, prison staff sometimes fear that the research or possibility of publicising certain findings might cause problems for the prison or effect certain employees within the prison (Newman, 1958; Petenaude, 2004). The final point relates particularly to private sector prisons as these establishments are run by companies (such as G4S) which have entered into contractual agreements with the government, meaning that the welfare and future of the business is high on their list of priorities. Nonetheless, although some prison staff may be wary of inviting researchers into their establishments, others recognise the importance of academic research and allowing research to be carried out in order to establish good practice and highlight areas where improvement is needed.

Returning to HMP Oakwood, this recognition of the importance of academic research may have been the reason why the Head of Reducing Re-offending (HoRR) made initial contact with me after reading about my PhD research on the University website. She and the Interventions Manager (IM) were very welcoming and expressed their interest in my research area and, as a result, they invited me to look around the prison, meet with the Director and discuss the nature of my research. I first explained my interests in carrying out a comparative study into accredited and non-accredited programmes but was immediately informed of copyright issues and made aware that this research would not be permitted. The HoRR stated that these programmes had already gained accreditation status and as a result were of a high standard. Unfortunately, her views could not be explored further at this point; however, from her comment, it was assumed that she believed research into these programmes was unnecessary due to the fact that they were already accredited. The unwillingness of the establishment to allow
researchers to explore these programmes is worrying, as they remain protected by ‘red tape’ and arguably never truly assessed.

However, as a result of the establishment’s inability to give me access to both types of interventions, the only option available was to become more focused and explore non-accredited programmes solely. I decided to focus my research in HMP Oakwood and conduct an in-depth analysis of non-accredited programmes allowing for a sociological insight to be gained into an aspect of prison rehabilitation that was currently under-researched. I also thought it would be interesting to carry out my research in a prison which was relatively new (having opened in April 2012) thus having little previous research carried out there.

Following my first meeting with the HoRR and the IM, I came away feeling optimistic about my research and the potential of HMP Oakwood facilitating it. The positivity continued as a result of several other visits to the prison, i.e. being invited to attend a demonstration of a new programme called ‘MyndPlay’, having continuous contact via phone calls and emails and ultimately the granting of provisional permission to carry out my research there once approval had been fully obtained from NOMS. The correct procedural hoops were jumped through, updates were provided regularly and approval was eventually obtained from NOMS. However, communication with my contacts at HMP Oakwood began to dwindle. Often I waited weeks for a reply and then when I did get a response I would be informed that another person needed to review my NOMS approval before I could conduct my research. Almost three months later, I was informed that my proposal had reached the Controller of the prison who would have the deciding
vote on whether or not the establishment would facilitate my research. This was another lengthy process and so ultimately, I contacted the Controller to find out how long the review process would take, but he was unable to estimate how long it would take for him to reach a decision. Another month passed and I had still not received any response or information from the Controller. In the end, my supervisor contacted him and received a response the following day, reaffirming my fears that HMP Oakwood would no longer be able to facilitate my research. No reason was given for this decision and I was left wondering whether the decision reached was a result of the research area, the methodology chosen, my personality and existing relationship with contacts within the prison, or something unrelated to me and instead perhaps as a result of the issues the prison was having to deal with at the time - the ‘micro politics and local tensions’ that accompany the opening of any new prison (James, 2013:2). To date, I am still waiting for the Controller to email me to inform me of his decision and the reasons behind it.

Having completed a thorough literature review of prison studies, I was aware that negotiating with gatekeepers could be time-consuming, but I did not think it would take quite as long as it did. The issue of delayed responses from contacts is something, which is rarely ever discussed in existing research methods literature, yet when this issue was raised with fellow prison researchers, it seemed as though each and every one has their own story to tell about the obstacles they encountered. The setbacks made me seriously question whether or not I was going to have enough time to complete my research within the permitted timescale for a PhD. The fact that the Controller responded to my supervisor the day after she contacted him and did not feel it necessary to reply to me
felt belittling. This may be related to the prison culture and the attitude of prison staff towards early careers academics.

At this point I had realised that when attempting to conduct prison research three characteristics in particular were essential; flexibility, persistence and resilience. Once I came to terms with the initial shock that HMP Oakwood would not facilitate my research (even though access had been preliminarily approved on the condition that authorisation had been obtained from NOMS), I began to explore some other potential establishments that delivered non-accredited interventions. As discussed earlier, this was difficult as very little information is available online or otherwise outlining the types of programmes delivered where. However, with the help of some prison contacts and guidance from a member of the NRC, I was informed that HMP Hewell delivered some non-accredited interventions. I decided to apply for this prison and thus before doing so needed to alter my NOMS application and return it to the NRC (for the third time) In this instance the NRC responded swiftly, informing me that the proposed research to be conducted at HMP Hewell had been approved and that my proposal had been passed to the Governor of HMP Hewell. Three weeks passed and I was still awaiting a decision from the Governor. This was a very stressful time but eventually, almost four weeks later, I was informed by a member of the NRC that HMP Hewell had also declined my research application as they were ‘unable to accommodate any further research at the time’. This came as a surprise as I had been advised by a member from the NRC to apply to here as it had fewer research applications and researchers in the prison at the time than other establishments in the West Midlands.
As a result of this refusal another application to the NRC had to be drawn up in order to conduct my research in a different institution. This time I contacted the Manager of Reducing Re-offending (MRR) personally and outlined my circumstances and misfortunes. I received a prompt reply informing me that another University was carrying out research at the prison at the time and they had an agreement with them not to facilitate any other research while this was ongoing. This was tremendously frustrating as I felt another University should be aware of the need to carry out valuable research and should also be considerate and understanding of the difficulties in gaining access into prisons. I felt it was unfair and biased to draw up such an agreement and stand in the way of other research. However, as time was of the essence and this was ultimately my last chance, with the help of my supervisors, contact was made with those from the said University who were carrying out this research. The University in question contacted the MRR and soon I was informed that I would be granted access to conduct my research.

Once inside the establishment, I was faced with more gatekeepers; this time in the form of the manager of IRP and the lead facilitator. I was informed that the manager had the deciding vote as to whether or not I would obtain access to the prisoners on this non-accredited programme (the only non-accredited programme offered in the prison). Thankfully, she had no issues with the proposed research and as a result gave me access to twenty programme participants and four facilitators. She also participated in the research.

**Reflections on the Methodological Approach**
In comparison to quantitative researchers, qualitative researchers ‘face instant tests of [...] credibility and personal integrity prior to and on entering the field’ (Patenaude, 2004: 72). Some of these tests (such as gaining entry to the field) have already been discussed; however, a test, which I was unprepared for, occurred during the ethnographic element of my research. It was my intention to be a non-participant or ‘complete observer’ (Bryman, 2001) during both the pilot and actual study for this thesis; however, during the pilot study I became an ‘observer-as-participant’ as both the facilitators and programme participants were eager to engage in conversation and hear my thoughts and opinions on certain topics. I participated when prompted to do so as I did not want to seem discourteous nor did I want to create a negative atmosphere (Crewe, 2009). I was also conscious of the fact that the programme participants would later be my target audience for the pilot interviews and therefore it was important that I made a good impression on them.

Upon reflection, however, the experience was quite daunting as, at times, I felt as though I was being assessed, especially by the facilitators. This was particularly the case in one scenario where the facilitator made it clear before entering the classroom that I must partake in the activities and then proceeded to single me out on several occasions to provide answers to riddles which explored the concept of ‘thinking outside the box’. This was an uncomfortable experience as I felt as though the facilitator was quizzing me on my general knowledge and acuteness and the offenders were also carefully examining my credibility and capabilities to respond to such a situation. I also felt pressured to live up to the expectations of the University badge hanging from my neck and felt an overwhelming and surprising sense of relief when I managed to successfully
‘think outside the box’ and answer the ‘riddles’ correctly. The programme participants seemed to appreciate my participation however and demonstrated this by smiling and nodding in my direction once I had offered an answer. On reflection, I realised that these were credibility and personal integrity tests of the kind described by Patenaude (2000; 2001; 2004).

However, regardless of this unpleasant experience during the pilot study, once my observational phase was complete during the actual research project I realised how important the stage had been. The pilot study was initially included to gain an insight into the delivery of a programme, but was adapted to support the main methodological approach; that being the interviews. However, the pilot played a much greater role than previously anticipated. As a result of my observations, I managed to fine tune my interview schedules. I became more familiar with certain terms and prison ‘lingo’ used within the courses. I also built a rapport which proved beneficial when it came to recruiting participants for the interviews and learned that being present allowed me to really get to grips with how these programmes were delivered, how participants responded to them and how to interpret this rather than rely on someone else’s interpretation (Foster, 1996).

On reflection, I also realise that without the observational experience of IRP, I would not have been given the opportunity to carry out focus group with participating offenders. The opportunity arose straight after a session I observed. The facilitator simply asked if I would like to spend a few minutes speaking with the participants on my own as the session had ended a little earlier than she anticipated and, as a result, the prison officers
were not present to escort them back to their cells. It was a great opportunity and proved beneficial as participants bounced ideas off each other and elaborated on certain points using examples to support these points. It also presented them with the opportunity to get to know me a little better, understand why I was there and what my research was about. Furthermore, it gave me the chance to invite them to speak individually about their thoughts and opinions. Participants need to be willing to share their experiences and thoughts with a researcher (James, 2013) and the observational period was greatly beneficial as it allowed for me to interact with potential participants and alleviate any fears or suspicions they might have about me.

The researcher having their own set of keys to enter and exit wings can enhance, reduce or have little effect on how prisoners (and staff) view that researcher (Drake, 2012). Keys can symbolise power and control to some prisoners and highlight a divide between the two worlds which can make researchers and prisoners feel uneasy (Drake, 2012; Jewkes and Wright, 2016). However, it may be the case that the idea of having symbolic power is more significant and meaningful to the researcher (and the staff) than it is to prisoners who often fail to differentiate between ‘outsiders’ who are clearly not prisoners (Drake, 2012). Having keys also has advantages. These include: spending as much time in whichever area of the prison appropriate for the research without having to clear it with staff; being more independent and less reliant on staff; and reducing the institutional burden (King, 2000) which can increase a researcher’s likelihood of gaining approval to conduct the research once they accept responsibility for carrying keys (Jewkes and Wright, 2016; Drake, 2012).
However, in my case, such decision making was taken out of my hands, as also noted by Jewkes and Wrights (2016). Here the option was never presented to me and therefore a member of staff escorted me to and from the wings and waited outside the door of the room where the interview was taken place. This approach enabled me to build a rapport with staff, whom later participated in the study, as we walked and talked to and from different wings and also allowed prisoners to recognise my lack of institutional involvement and power.

‘Memos’ or ‘field notes’ (Willis, 2013) were taken at every opportunity throughout the field work (even when interviews were audio recorded) in order to obtain a precise and detailed account of the entire process (Braun and Clarke, 2013). Audio recording is one of the most effective ways of keeping an accurate record of an interview, allowing the interviewer to listen back whenever is necessary and arguably increase the opportunity for the interviewer to bond with the interviewee through increased eye contact and interaction, which may not always be the case when note-taking is conducted (Kendall and Kendall, 2002). Unfortunately, not all the interviews were recorded, as the necessary paperwork authorising entry of the recording device was not always present at the prison gate. The searching through possessions and paperwork at the gate varied from one officer to the next (Tunnell, 2009). Some officers required certain paperwork in order to gain access with a recording device whilst others were satisfied with my assurance that permission had been granted and did not require such formalities. When an officer felt the paperwork was necessary they would ask who had given me permission and then they would attempt to contact them on the phone. This occurred twice and each time their attempt to get in contact with the appropriate body was
fruitless which ultimately resulted in me being unable to use the recorder. It seemed as though denying the recording device was used as a form of control over my research as permission had been given from the IRP manager and Head of Reducing Re-offending Manager but officers on the gate ended up having the final say. The lack of consistency may be what Crawley (2005: 350) has termed ‘institutional thoughtlessness’, and this ‘thoughtlessness’ impacted greatly on my research. As a result, many field notes were taken to compensate and ensure that adequate records were obtained. It was important to be aware that an over-use of written notes during an interview can have a detrimental effect on the success of it due to the lack of eye contact and observation of non-verbal cues (Press, 2006). In my study key words and phrases were taken down to avoid the possibility of hindering the research followed by more in-depth recording immediately after the interview or later on that same day (Crow and Semmens, 2008).

Some prisoners challenge the information researchers write down and at times may ask see it (Crewe, 2009). In my experience, participants seemed content with me writing my notes while talking to them during and after the observational period. On one occasion, when I looked away from my notes, a participant read what I had written and when I turned back around he informed me of the accuracy of my notes stating they were ‘exactly right’ and urged me to write another point which he thought would also be useful to me. At times, I felt myself in a similar situation to Crewe (2009) who mentions jotting down notes which did not seem that relevant at the time but revealed themselves to be useful later on. This could be related to Patenaude’s (2004) point regarding reciprocity which can be viewed as a ‘mutual obligation created by gift-giving’ (Eriksen, 1995: 169, as cited in Patenaude, 2004: 76). In prison ‘gifts’ can refer to
knowledge, time, change in regime, speaking with someone different/new and the research accurately reporting information given to them. When the participant told me to write a particular comment in my notes, I felt obliged to do so and when I did he seemed satisfied that I was accurately reporting information he felt was important. Such exchanges promote the development of a rapport and from my experience led to many participants coming forward to be interviewed individually (Patenaude, 2004).

Building a rapport of adequate intensity with the participant is necessary in order to obtain reliable responses. It requires mutual trust and confidence, which is difficult to obtain when the participant is incarcerated. Here it was important to make participants aware of the lack of involvement I had with the police or prison service. Many researchers write about the significance of not being perceived as ‘part of the system’ or in connection or association with the prison or police service and instead an independent researcher (Jewkes, 2002; Crewe, 2009). In order to avoid this assumption, I made the decision to wear my University of Leicester identification badge throughout my fieldwork phase in the prison. The ribbon on the badge was blue which immediately stood out to prisoners as something different to that which programme facilitators or prison staff wore (which was red). When I stood in close proximity to prisoners, many of them questioned the information on my badge asking me what it said and which University I came from. They also commented on my picture and the fact that the colour of my hair was different which unexpectedly acted as an ‘ice-breaker’ and seemed to precipitate a friendly and relaxed atmosphere which increased the likelihood of obtaining valuable and reliable findings.
Respect seemed to flow once a comfortable environment was achieved and participants did not see me as a threat. When conducting my research, I reminded participants at the beginning and at the end of the interview about how grateful I was to them for partaking in the study. I also demonstrated respect and gratitude by informing them that I would send a copy of the findings to the prison once the study had been completed. Many participants thought this was a good idea and appreciated the gesture. The development of trust and respect and creation of informal and relaxed settings impacted on my perception of safety. Some people see prisons as scary and dangerous places but my experience of conducting prison research was somewhat similar to that of Crewe’s (2009). I learned that the prison could be a safe environment once I respected the prisoners and they respected me.

‘...inmates and staff possess the ability to either corrupt the research agenda and/or informally terminate the research project’ (Patenuade, 2004:74). I originally believed I had a lot of power in that I could leave the prison whenever I wanted to and could guide the research in the direction I felt most appropriate once access had been obtained; however, in actual fact the prisoners exerted a lot more power than I had initially thought and could lead me in the direction they felt most applicable. They, along with the other sample groups, were ‘co-producers of knowledge’ (Jasanoff, 2004). I depended on them to partake in my research as they had the power to accept or decline the opportunity. I also depended on the staff to escort me to and from different areas within the prison and therefore utilised the least amount of power within the research field.
Reflections on the Research Limitations

Differences in Ethnicity

It is important to recognise the influence the interviewer can have on the interviewees’ conversational behaviour and, consequently the data collected and the analysis of this data. Participants respond differently to every researcher and these responses may too be interpreted very differently by one interviewer in comparison with another (Goldman-Eisler, 1952). A participant may react or behave in a certain way as a result of many factors relating to the interviewer, such as ethnicity, age, gender, social class and so on, which can have a significant impact on the information obtained by the researcher. A respondent from an ethnic minority will tell a researcher who is not from the same ethnic group something different than if they belonged to the same ethnic minority (Carter, 2003). Some researchers believe that participant responses are more reliable and honest if the researcher is from the same ethnic background (Tinker and Armstrong, 2008). People from ethnic minorities speak differently to researchers than they normally would to those from the same group (DeVault, 1990). This has advantages and disadvantages. If the interviewer is of the same background then the respondent may not feel comfortable sharing their information, thoughts and opinions (Shah, 2004). Results may be ‘contaminated’ if the researcher feels s/he has shared a similar experience and also the respondent may take for granted that the researcher understands his response and the researcher may interpret the response incorrectly (Shah, 2004). However, if the researcher is from a different background then the respondent will be more willing to give a clearer explanation due to the assumed lack of knowledge on the interviewer’s behalf (Gibson and Abrams, 2003).
This occurred a few times when the participants gave a fuller explanation in order to help me gain a deeper understand of their point of view, therefore providing a more in-depth account of their views and thoughts. Prior to conducting the research, whilst interviewing and observing participants and then afterwards when I analysed the data I was conscious of the influence I had on the entire process. My ethnicity and background was brought up by two participants who detected a familiar accent as soon as I introduced myself to them. I was asked where I originally came from, was told by them where they or their ancestors came from and then I was asked by both participants if I knew certain people. These questions worked as icebreakers and each participant seemed more comfortable given such commonalities or connections. Therefore, I believe my ethnicity and background enhanced the data I collected rather than hindered it as it made participants feel comfortable enough to speak to me, probed them to clarify certain areas and acted as an icebreaker in particular interviews which further promoted a positive atmosphere.

Interviewer/Interviewee Gender Differences

The second issue that needed to be considered was the fact that I was a female researcher in a male dominated prison setting. This was something, which I was reminded of regularly while in the prison. Some chivalrous behaviour was observed, i.e. by prisoners opening and holding doors for me, apologising for swearing in my presence, paying me compliments and one prisoner informing me that he chose to wear his ‘good shirt and put on posh aftershave’ on the off-chance that I would be visiting the prison that day (see Claes, Lippens, Kennes and Tournel, 2013). I can only assume that if I were a male researcher this type of behaviour would not have been so obvious.
The gender of the researcher can be considered as an asset in some respects, i.e. gaining access and building rapport with participants but it can also have a negative effect (ibid). One outcome may be participants restraining from expressing obscene comments about women or sex-related jokes because a female is in their presence (ibid: 66). During my observations, facilitators occasionally drew attention to our difference in gender by making comments such as ‘Before answering the question [What is the first thing you want to do when you leave prison] can I remind you all that a lady is present?’ In response to this question some participants seemed to give a genuine answer; however, others appeared to use this opportunity to try and embarrass me or challenge my fortitude by making sexual references (in this case their answer being ‘have lots of sex’) whilst looking around to see my reaction (ibid).

Some prisoners were what I would describe as ‘cagey’. When I attempted to start a conversation with them during the observational period, they responded with short one-word answers and avoided eye contact. Other prisoners noticed their reservations to engage with me and later felt the need to assure me that their behaviour towards me was not personal. Instead, I was informed that their reaction was the result of incarceration and the fact that many prisoners find it difficult to trust others and like to keep themselves to themselves.

Other prisoners were less ‘gentleman-like’ than those mentioned earlier and at times, I could relate to Mills’ (2004) experiences of intimidation and fear. In some instances, conducting ethnographic research in a mainly male dominated environment can impact
a researcher emotionally especially when unexpected (Claes et al 2013). Feelings of intimidation, disgust and shock were expressed in Tournel’s field notes after she was subjected to insulting and offensive comments from cell windows. She notes:

I knew beforehand that I would be the object of such practices and although the staring and name-calling had become a daily occurrence, I had never expected such vulgar and insulting communication for which I wasn’t prepared for at all.

(Field notes Hanne Tournel, March 2010 as cited in Claes et al 2013)

One particular instance, which comes to mind during my research, was a feeling of vulnerability when an officer timed our exit from one wing on to another incorrectly. As a result, a large group of prisoners met us unexpectedly during a ‘free-flow’ period. The prisoners seemed quite surprised to see me too and their reaction made me feel slightly uncomfortable. The feelings of intimidation did not necessarily come from the situation I found myself in, but instead arose from the sheer noise the prisoners created (Mills, 2004). I was not expecting to be confronted with such personal and critical remarks about my appearance, height and age (Claes et al 2013). I was not emotionally distressed by such comments but I was surprised at how judgmental and stereotypical these prisoners were towards me when often prisoners express their frustrations when others stereotype, stigmatise and label them. I was also a little shocked by their general lack of maturity, as many of those shouting and wolf whistling were not in their teens or twenties.

Some questions draw responses that differ depending on the gender of the interviewer (Groves and Fultz, 1985). ‘The sex of the interviewer and the sex of the respondent makes
a difference because the interview takes place within the cultural boundaries of a paternalistic social system in which masculine identities are differentiated from feminine ones’ (Denzin, 1989: 116). Throughout the interviews it seemed as though many of the participants were aware of our differences which was evident, for example, when some participants apologised for the use of bad language in my presence and when initially arriving at the prison being aware of my physical presence (as a woman) and feeling slightly uncomfortable with the majority of people within the prison being male and a relatively small proportion of females. However, arguably the differences in gender was advantageous when laughter and tears could be expressed equally within an interview when it may have been the case that many men would not have felt comfortable crying or expressing one’s true feeling’s in front of a male researcher (Hua-Fu, 2005; Claes et al 2013). As a result of these experiences it is clear that the researchers gender can have a significant impact on access, gathering and analysis of information (Warren and Rasmussen, 1977; Bell, Caplan and Karim, 1993; Claes et al 2013).

Social, Educational and Age Differences

One of the other differences that existed was my level of education and the fact that I was carrying out this piece of research for a doctorate degree. Offenders who are socially and economically marginalised can feel intimidated by the level of education the interviewer has (Wilson and Powell, 2001). However, the prisoners I spoke with instead seemed genuinely interested and asked several questions about my educational background and how I progressed to this stage. They also agreed that my research area was one of significant importance requiring further examination to gain a better understanding of non-accredited programmes. One prisoner I spoke to agreed strongly
with the need for the research and stated ‘all they [prison staff] care about is the likes of ETS and not these ones that actually work!’ (CP 5, 12-5-14).

Interviews can be influenced by characteristics such as the age of the interviewer (Breakwell, 2006). The participants in my study varied in age between 23 and 65 and some participants commented on the fact that I looked quite young. Some participants are more willing to give greater in-depth responses to someone of a similar age or of a different age depending on the question being asked (ibid). Another difference was the fact that I never served a custodial sentence or have even been in trouble with the police. As a result, there was an automatic invisible division between the world of the researcher and the world of the offender. Some prisoners asked me if it had been my first time in a prison. When I informed them of the different prisons I had visited, they seemed to see me in a different light, almost as though I was more attuned to the prison environment. One prisoner joked about how we had both ‘been around the block’ and then reflected on how our visits to each of the prisons could not be any more different.

Although many differences existed between our two worlds, if the research had been carried out by someone with more or less in common with the offenders the same results and information may not have been obtained. Due to the fact that I was less familiar with certain aspects of the prison setting and many differences between both parties existed, opportunities arose easily for follow-up questions to be asked and greater explanations for specific views and opinions to be obtained. It also gave me the opportunity to check responses against what I had previously observed in the field (Crewe, 2009). Another advantage of carrying out the interviews myself was that body
language and cues could be observed and taken into account. This allowed me to gauge whether or not a prisoner was feeling uncomfortable or nervous about answering a certain question. It also allowed me to encourage and be empathic towards participants by simply nodding if I felt the need to.

Social, educational and age differences also needed to be taken into account when interviewing prison staff and programme facilitators. Participants from each of these groups asked me within moments of meeting whether or not it was my first time in a prison. When I informed that I carried out research for my master’s degree in three different prisons, arranged and accompanied BA Criminology students on several prison visits and attended a range of presentation days and programme launches in other prisons, many seemed surprised. Out of curiosity I asked two people whether or not they were surprised by this and if so why. Their responses were; ‘Well, yeah; ‘course I am, you look like you’re only out of nappies’ while the other commented; ‘Yeah, you’re such a small and dainty young girl, I wouldn’t have thought you’d want to come to visit a place like this very often’. These responses highlighted the fact that these groups could be and in actual fact were just as judgemental and stereotypical as the prisoners. From this point onwards these two groups treated me in one of three different ways; (1) They appreciated that I had some experience of doing prison research and dealing with prisoners effectively and safely and so treated me with respect and left me to get on with my work; (2) They remained unconvinced about my ability to carry out prison research and continued to be quite patronising and condescending in how they spoke to me; and (3) They seemed to treat me as a potential critic or some sort of spy and were less welcoming and friendly in their behaviour towards me. This was particularly evident
in the first prison I approached when the Interventions Manager told me that she would have to approve any criticisms of the prison before I published my thesis because the prison was a business and their first priority was to protect it.

‘Slang’ language used by offenders during interviews can also present some problems for prison researchers. It is essential for the interviewer to fully comprehend the responses of her sample in order to form a conclusion. Due to the upbringing of many offenders, ‘street-lingo’ is the only language they can communicate in, which can sometimes seem foreign in the academic world of the researcher (Devlin, 1996). During my observations and interviews, the difference in language used by prisoners and myself was obvious and extended to include abbreviations and other words created by prisoners in relation to certain issues and people within the prison. One way to overcome this potential barrier was by familiarising myself with their colloquial speech by reading unofficial glossaries of various informal phrases. Another was by asking correctional authorities to define terms and the last approach was by simply questioning the respondent for the meaning when faced with an unfamiliar term during the interview (Newman, 1958). This issue arose several times during the interviewing process and participants gladly gave an explanation, which made me feel as though they were eager and pleased to teach me something whilst at the same time taking back some of the power.

**Conclusion: The Rehabilitation Lottery**

Many limitations and potential issues need to be taken into consideration when conducting prison research and my research was no exception. One of the main
limitations of my study related to gaining access to a prison and the length of time this process took, which has been highlighted by many researchers. It would have been interesting to carry out research in one or two other institutions to increase the amount of data obtained, to compare the type of programmes carried out in each of the prisons and also to be more representative; however, gaining access to one establishment was difficult enough. Observing accredited programmes or even exploring other non-accredited programmes along with IRP would have contributed to the study; however, perhaps as a result of these limitations, a more concise and in-depth piece of research was conducted. It is often suggested that bigger is better and that a research project should be representative and generalizable. Although a few more participants would have been welcomed, many more participants may have impacted upon the depth of the analysis that was carried out. As discussed earlier, smaller sample groups are not uncommon for qualitative research projects.

As a result of ‘institutional thoughtlessness’ and the many other obstacles that I was forced to contend with over the course of my research, it is now very apparent how important it is to be flexible and resilient. There were numerous setbacks, which meant that I needed to consider alternative routes, as nothing was straightforward. Prison researchers require patience, resistance, stimulus and passion in order to carry out their research. Other factors which need to be considered are that, as a method of data collection, interviews are expensive (Braun et al 2013), time-consuming and can be thwarted by difficulties in obtaining access to the desired sample group or location (Davies, Francis and Jupp, 2011). However, as Schlosser (2008: 1521) concludes; ‘there are significant landmines in doing prison research, some of which are daunting and
discouraging; however, the product that results is too important to bury or forget because of our own fears or inadequacies as researchers’. What did shine through from my research is how lucky I ultimately was to carry out my study as many other researchers fail to make it through the ‘quagmire’ of ‘red tape’ and as a result abandon important prison research.
CHAPTER FIVE
SELECTION: PROGRAMMES AND PRISONERS

Introduction

Chapter Five: ‘Selection: Programmes and Prisoners’, presents and investigates the motivations and process behind the selection and implementation of a programme within a prison at the micro-level. This chapter also discusses the entry criteria regarding prisoners’ eligibility for the course relating to prisoners’ risk, needs and responsivity as mentioned in Chapter One. It then considers the motivations behind prisoners’ participation on these programmes and takes into account issues discussed in Chapter Two in relation to the importance of choice versus compulsion and the impact of requirements and ‘cherry-picking’. The ways in which these programmes are advertised to potential participants are also examined within the chapter, which touches on issues such as spaces, availability, range and resources. Finally, the chapter concludes by demonstrating how this information fits in with the overall idea of rehabilitation being similar to a lottery at the micro-level, paying particular attention to the significant role the establishment plays in selecting such programmes for potential participants in the first place.

The Selection Process

As mentioned previously, past research has discussed the implementation and delivery of effective interventions, yet very little research discusses how an establishment decides which intervention to implement for delivery within their prison. The PSO 4350 Effective Regime Interventions states that:
Priority must continue to be given to delivery of interventions which are accredited by the Correctional Services Accreditation Panel and external bodies. (HM Prison Service, 2002: 2)

As outlined in Chapter Two, the motivations and rationale behind the selection process is missing from the literature. However, inevitably the choices made at this stage affects what the prison has to offer its prisoners in terms of rehabilitation and thus potentially affects their chances of some form of rehabilitation or positive impact thereafter. Wikstrom and Treiber (2008) point out some factors considered by practitioners when deciding whether to implement a multi-systematic therapy, cognitive-behavioural therapy programme or a more generic type intervention. They state that the practitioner needs to answer the following questions:

1. Is this kind of intervention appropriate for the target population?

2. Is there evidence supporting the effectiveness (and cost-effectiveness) of the intervention in routine practice?

3. What resources are required to implement the intervention?

4. What kind of outcomes should one expect?

(ibid: 43)

There is some evidence of these four criteria being applied in the research carried out for this thesis. They are referred to throughout the chapter and in Chapters Six and Seven. Non-accredited interventions delivered in prisons across England and Wales are known as ‘Effective Regime Interventions’ under the Prison Service Order Number 4350. This Prison Service Order provides guidance and information on how to manage interventions intended to alter the behaviour of prisoners (please refer to Chapter One.
and see Chapter Six for more information on ‘Effective Regime Interventions’). Figure 1 outlines the procedure for approving an effective regime programme:

**Figure 5.1: Procedure for Approval of Regime Interventions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the intervention an accredited offending behaviour programme?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Is the intervention validated by an independent external body?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>The programme must have been accredited by the CSAP or its predecessors, or has been included in the Prison Service’s programme development portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Is it an intervention designed to change prisoner behaviour?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>The intervention must have been validated by a recognised independent external body which includes site inspection or audit OR standards of professional body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Decide if it is within the scope of PSO 4350 - refer to table 1 and annex A for details.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>If above applies, the only action required under PSO 4350 is to record details of the intervention in the database of regime interventions – see Annex E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>No action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>A business case pro-forma must be completed as at annex C, to demonstrate how the intervention meets the nine quality assurance criteria in annex E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Taken from: HM Prison Service, 2002: n.p)

The process in place to approve regime interventions is clearly set out above; however, very little existing literature explains the process for the selection and delivery of accredited and non-accredited offending behaviour programmes. In order to shed light on this area interviews were carried out with four managers and two lead facilitators. As outlined in Chapter Three, two of the four managers were from the research site (M1 and M2) and the other two delivered non-accredited programmes in other establishments (M3 and M4). The two lead facilitators delivering non-accredited
programmes in other establishments also provided their opinions on the programme selection process within their establishments (FA1 and FA2).

The reasons for selecting a programme for implementation in a prison varied according to each of the six respondents. The first manager (M1) explained that the prison decides what type of intervention to implement based on the security category of the prison and the type of prisoner it holds, thus supporting the first point outlined by Wikstrom et al (2008). The respondent continued to explain that the establishment then submits a bid to NOMS for the commissioning of the programme, which is either accepted or rejected. If it is accepted, the programme will be implemented and delivered within the prison. If it is rejected, the prison will submit a bid for a different programme. M1 stated that because of the process it was more likely that an accredited programme would be selected and implemented in an establishment than a non-accredited programme. As stated earlier, accredited programmes are given priority as these have been accredited by the CSAP and thus proven effective in reducing re-offending therefore referring to the second criteria set out by Wikstrom et al (2008). The participant admitted that he was not always sure, why a bid to NOMS for the commissioning and thus implementing of a certain programme was unsuccessful and stated that this was very frustrating. He said that often the establishment failed to agree with the reasoning given for rejection by NOMS. He further commented that:

As a prison we would be aiming to implement programmes which we felt would be beneficial to the needs of our prisoners yet the funding for the delivery of the programme would still be withheld by NOMS and ultimately rejected therefore impacting on the needs of our prisoners.

(M1, 2-6-14)
He went on to say:

Surely, we are in a better situation to know the needs of our prisoners than NOMS. (M1, 2-6-14)

When discussing funding for the delivery of non-accredited programmes it was found that the responsibility ultimately rested with the organisation wishing to deliver the programme. M1 stated that:

If the prison felt that the programme would be useful then we will give it a go. (M1, 2-6-14)

However, he also commented that it would need to be independently/externally funded. This refers to Wikstrom et als (2008) point in relation to cost-effectiveness. He admitted that the establishment needed to be cautious in their acceptance as the objectives of a programme could be damaging to participants. It could also impact on their limited resources and therefore interventions delivered in the establishment need to be cost effective.

M2 commented that the decision to implement the Inclusive Recovery Programme (IRP) was in response to the introduction of the Government’s new National Drug Strategy: ‘Reducing demand, restricting supply, building recovery: supporting people to live a drug-free life’. The participant also stated that by implementing this particular programme the prison was incorporating changes set out in the Ministry of Justice Green paper ‘Breaking the Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders’. The respondent did not refer to any submissions to NOMS for approval nor did she take into consideration cost effectiveness, available resources, commissioning or the appropriateness of the intervention for the prisoners within the establishment.
According to M2, the main rationale behind the selection and implementation of this particular programme was to adhere to government requirements.

The third and fourth participants (M3 and M4) both thought that the programme selection process solely took into consideration a gap in a specific type of intervention being offered in an establishment. Each respondent observed the previous lack of programmes being offered to substance misusers and thus realised the need to design a programme quickly in order to fill this gap. Their responses from managers made no mention of the Government’s new National Drug Strategy, the Ministry of Justice’s Green paper, submitting an application to NOMS for commissioning or obtaining funding to run the programme.

The two senior facilitators from different prisons (FA1 and FA2) did not believe that there was a substantive rationale behind the selection of a programme for implementation within a prison. One respondent stated that:

It’s a case of getting your foot in the door. (FA2, 30-1-14)

The other respondent commented cynically:

It’s all about who you know on the inside. (FA1, 11-2-14)

However, both facilitators discussed the fact that they were invited to carry out a pilot study, following initial meetings, in order for the establishment to learn more about the programme in action and decide whether or not to continue with its delivery. Here an element of ‘luck’ plays a role as the respondents admit that the implementation of their programme is not contingent on the type of intervention being offered, its
appropriateness for the target population or its cost effectiveness; rather it is dependent upon who knows whom, the quality of the rapport between them and the initial agreement to comply.

From the data obtained, a clear and concise process is not apparent. It does not demonstrate a collective understanding from the respondents of the procedure (if any) in place. It also demonstrates that the questions outlined by Wikstrom et als (2008) are not always considered by practitioners when deciding whether to implement a multi-systematic therapy, cognitive-behavioural therapy programme or a more generic type intervention. However, what the data does highlight is the lack of understanding in regards to the significance of these choices, processes and actions and that the process involved is blurry from one person and establishment to the next. The selection of a programme for delivery in an establishment may be a result of who the facilitator is, who they know and whether or not the programme will impact on limited prison resources.

**Prisoner eligibility for programme participation**

One of the key principles in delivering effective rehabilitative interventions is targeting the appropriate prisoners (Ministry of Justice, 2013b) thus referring back to Wikstrom et als (2008) second question for practitioners. The MOJ highlights that offenders are more likely to experience positive outcomes in an accredited programme if ‘he/she demonstrate levels of risk and need that are appropriate for the particular intervention’ (Ministry of Justice, 2013b: n.p), thus relating to the fourth point outlined by Wikstrom et als (2008). Although this specifically refers to ‘accredited programmes’ it can be
assumed that offenders would benefit from participation in a non-accredited programme if they demonstrate levels of risk and need that are appropriate for the particular intervention. The report goes on to outline the stages of suitability assessment, which include five stages; assessing risk, need, responsivity factors, readiness for treatment and assessing practical factors. Wikstrom et al. (2008) outline other factors such as gender, ethnicity or the age of participant and state that these may also affect the outcomes of the intervention. Culturally attuned programmes in relation to Aboriginal men in prison were considered by Zellerer (2003) which found that their background, rituals and traditions also played a part in deciding who was eligible for a programme and how programmes needed to be designed in a certain way to ensure the target group would benefit most from it.

The IRP course was aimed at substance misusers. As a result, the content was only relevant to prisoners with these types of problems as the main objective was to reduce drug-use. When discussing this point with the manager and facilitators of the programmes they were certain that only those meeting the requirement of ‘appropriateness’ were able to gain access to the programme. However, when speaking to participants of the programme, two offenders argued that they were not ‘appropriate’ participants and that the programme in fact lacked relevance to their offence and personal situation. One participant stated that he was convicted for growing cannabis, yet he had never smoked or taken any drugs in his life. In this case, the course content, which included information on how to deal with cravings and triggers, did not apply to him or his offence. Another participant spoke about the fact that the course
was designed for drug misusers and failed to take into consideration the differences between drug users and alcoholics.

From the data obtained it is questionable how rigorous the suitability assessment is in relation to non-accredited programmes or if, in fact, one exists and is carried out by the manager of the programme. The second most prevalent reason for men participating in the programme was due to a recommendation from their offender manager (Zellerer, 2003). Often it is the case that prisoners are advised to complete a certain programme to help them with particular issues and needs therefore relating back to the fourth criteria outlined by Wikstrom et al (2008). When this topic was discussed with managers and facilitators of the IRP programme, some participants commented that prisoners were referred to the Drug and Alcohol Recovery Team (DART) and on to the course after a risk and needs, assessment was carried out on them upon arrival at the prison. While it seems logical for an assessment to be carried out upon entry into a prison, from the data collected it seemed that only a certain number of prisoners were directly referred to the DART team and subsequently on to the course. Although 16 participants admitted to having a drug problem, only three of the total sample group were referred on to the programme. One participant was referred by a DART worker in the Courts at the time of sentencing, the second was referred by a member of staff upon entry into the prison and, for the third prisoner, the course was part of his sentence plan (it is worth noting that he was the only prisoner who had this isolated non-accredited substance misuse programme on his sentence plan; further consideration is provided later). Eight participants had discussed the course with a member of the DART team and subsequently decided to volunteer for the course. The remaining nine had not been
referred upon arrival following their assessment, nor had they been approached by anyone from the DART team. It is not clear why this was the case given that the Prison Service Order 0550 states that up to 80% of prisoners have a serious drug problem when they arrive in prison. The lack of a tailor-made procedure was difficult for some participants to comprehend. One respondent commented:

I have been in an out of prisons since 1999-15 years - and no one has ever given me help with my drug problem... This sentence was the first time I sat down and talked to anyone about my drug issues and it was the first time that I was told what I should be doing to resolve them, why is that? 

(CP 5, 12-5-14)

From the above it can be seen that the first criterion for course eligibility, namely having a drug problem, seems less straightforward than one may hope. The second point highlighted by facilitators concerned a prisoner’s motivation and desire to change which was subjective and a decision that the facilitator made by themselves. FA5 commented:

We select people who actually want to do it. 

(FA5, 12-5-14)

It is worth remembering that this particular course was voluntary for the majority of the prisoners (only 3 being referred on to the course and the remaining majority (17) choosing to participate themselves). It was found that the way in which prisoners could demonstrate their interest and desire to change was by approaching DART workers directly and asking them for help or by contacting a prison officer and asking them what programme they could go on to help them with their substance misuse issues. The facilitators involved with IRP pointed out that if a desire to change was not observed by a facilitator then it was unlikely that the prisoner would be granted a place on the course. When facilitators were questioned further about how they knew whether or
not a prisoner wanted to change, one facilitator responded: ‘You just know’ (FA4, 12-5-14) which may suggest a lack of structure, consistency, rigour and thoroughness, but may also suggest professional expertise built through experience and a high-level of trust in facilitators’ exercise of discretion. Another potential issue with the approach relates to bias and the idea of ‘cherry-picking’. Programme facilitators could select certain participants, for example, those with a lower drug dependency, fewer behavioural problems and a higher I.Q. These participants would have a greater likelihood of completing the intervention and obtaining positive outcomes than someone with greater needs and risks.

Another criterion outlined by one facilitator related to the participants’ actual drug intake whilst on the course. FA3 commented:

If I get the slightest inkling that one of the lads on the course is still using then I will get someone [on the wing] to take a drug test and if it comes back positive they will be kicked off the course straight away.

(FA3, 12-5-14)

Other facilitators did not refer to this point but when discussing group participation with the prisoners it was interesting to hear one respondent say how obvious is was to see those who really had no interest in being there. He said:

Some of the people didn’t want to be there. They weren’t serious as they were still taking drugs; you could clearly see that they were drugged-up.

(CP10, 13-5-14)

This questions how aware some facilitators are of the signs and symptoms of an individual being under the influence of drugs. Out of the four facilitators that were involved in the IRP, their experience of working with drug users ranged from between
three years to 11 years. It is reasonable, then, to assume that each facilitator had sufficient experience to identify the warning signs. However, other facilitators of the course may not be as aware, may not have as much experience, or may not know what to do if they do suspect that someone is under the influence. Only one facilitator outlined the steps they take if they have an ‘inkling’ that a participant is still using drugs. This was not stated as policy and in fact, it was implied that such steps were carried out on behalf of the DART team but under the guise of ‘routine and mandatory drug checks’. Therefore, perhaps not all facilitators have the power or authority to direct a prison officer to carry out such a test; maybe they feel the course is still beneficial even if they are continuing to use drugs or perhaps they are focused on reaching targets and obtaining course completions. It is difficult to comprehend why these discrepancies occur but what can be gained from this point is that there are inconsistencies in processes and actions carried out by facilitators, which again links back to subjectivity and power.

The final point facilitators mentioned when discussing the selection criteria related to the stage a prisoner was at within their sentence (similarly highlighted by Clarke et al (2004) and in questions one and four outlined by Wikstrom et al (2008)). Access to courses at mid-sentence was preferable as skills ‘could be practised and refined in the prison environment before release’ (Clarke et al 2004: vi). In relation to the IRP, facilitators prioritised those who were close to their release date. The reason for this was because they felt the programme content was more beneficial to participants towards the end of their sentence. Prisoners agreed and felt that it was useful to refresh their memories before they were released back into the community. However, others
felt that they would benefit more from additional and consistent help once they were back in the community. One participant stated that:

Doing the detox is the easy part but being back out there that’s the hard part. \(^{(CP16, 6-10-14)}\)

Another said:

We should be given the help out in the community. \(^{(CP10, 13-5-14)}\)

Some participants commented that they should be able to get access to the course when they wanted it. These participants stated that such rules and regulations hindered access and their willingness to partake at a later stage. This contradicts the idea that prisoners should participate when they are ‘ready to change’. Perhaps ‘transition programmes’\(^{16}\) would be more effective here as these are designed specifically to provide prisoners with pre-release programmes followed by post-release support for when they return to the community.

**Rationale behind prisoner participation**

As pointed out in earlier chapters, there are many different reasons for prisoner participation in a course. Motivation varies according to individual personalities and backgrounds, but external factors can also influence the nature and extent of motive (Clarke et al, 2004). Some prisoners participate in courses because they want to avail themselves of the help on offer and learn more about a certain topic (Zellerer, 2003). However, not all prisoners partake in an intervention to increase their knowledge and

---

\(^{16}\) ‘Transitional Programmes’ are part of the Corrections Victoria Reintegration Pathway delivered in Melbourne, Australia. These pathways are designed to provide prisoners with pre-release programmes according to their transitional needs once they enter the prison, throughout their sentence and in preparation for release. Post-release support is also available if required.
understanding. Some choose to learn something new primarily for the ‘joy of learning’ and fail to consider its application in life (Blondy, 2007: 125). Other reasons for participating in a programme may be external pressures from family members, teachers/facilitators, offender managers or the individuals’ own desire/need for employment upon release. ‘Referrals’, involving an Offender Manager’s recommendation that a certain programme be completed may also be the main reason for participating; in other words, they were told they had to do it as part of their sentence plan following a ‘RNR’ assessment (Andrews, Bonta and Wormith, 2011) (See Chapter One).

Many individuals do not transition to further education, as it is not part of their social and cultural background (Thomas, 2001). In these instances, prisoners might feel that partaking in education or an Open University course is not common practice within their community and therefore fail to engage with this element of prison life. Often prisoners participate for a range of other reasons such as a method of passing time, improving and increasing employability, gaining skills and new qualifications and doing something interesting while incarcerated (Braggins and Talbot, 2003; Hughes, 2006). Meek and Lewis (2014) echo some of these points and state that participants in their study reported that:

[Participation in the academies] improved their quality of life within prisons by providing something to focus on, alleviating boredom and frustration while providing an incentive for good behaviour. (Meek et al, 2014: 101)
Pay is another factor that is taken into consideration by some prisoners (The All-Party Parliamentary Report, 2004; The Select Committee Report, 2005). The amount of money offered to prisoners for participation in an intervention can affect their decision-making process. Others, however, report that prisoners often feel they had no choice but to participate on a course (Clarke, Simmons and Wydall, 2004). Participating in courses to increase the likelihood of parole and/or early release and meet the requirements set out in a sentence plan means that the freedom of choice and the psychological theory on what motivates an individual to change are disregarded and instead replaced with coercion.

My research found that seven prisoners partook in the course for one reason alone; however, the majority of prisoners participated in the programme for at least two reasons (in total 13). The breakdown of this is as follows: seven participated in the course for two main reasons; three for three different reasons and three for four reasons.

A range of motivations was evident that mirrored those outlined by other researchers above (discussed in more detail later) but I also found that the rationale behind these motivations to participate contrasted from one target group’s perspective to the next. Some facilitators believed prisoners opted to partake in a course to gain more knowledge and understanding; however, in some cases prisoners’ reasons for partaking were solely concerned with the financial aspect of programme participation. However, the majority of facilitators believed that the prisoners took part because they wanted to change. FA3 believed this was their only reason for participation. FA4 went further to
say that they also signed up in order to receive a certificate at the end. FA5 (12-5-14) stated that they participated as ‘it puts a tick in the box and looks good to probation’ and FA6 (13-5-14) believed that the other reason for participation was because ‘they like group work and sharing and listening to other people’s experiences’.

However, some of these motivations were not shared by participants (for example, receiving a certificate at the end of the intervention) and instead many other reasons for participation were found when an analysis of prisoner responses was carried out (See Table 5.2 below).

Figure 5.2: Prisoners’ Motivations for Engaging in Programmes

(*Some prisoners participated in programmes for more than one reason as outlined above).
Figure 5.2 demonstrates how the majority of prisoners participated in the course because a DART worker had recommended it to them and equally because they felt they needed support and help with their substance misuse problem. Participants commented on how helpful the facilitators had been in discussing the benefits of IRP and providing them with the necessary information. One (CP9, 13-5-14) stated how he had to make enquires about such a course and sought a facilitator of that course in order to get help for his problem. He made the point that this offer of help did not come to him and that he instead had to pursue it. Another CP10 (13-5-14), was of a similar opinion, commenting that ‘I needed help so I went looking for it’.

Also seen in the chart above and as discussed earlier, many offenders took part in the course because it had been recommended to them by a member of staff or because they had been referred to the course following a risk assessment rather than because they were involved negotiators in the target-setting interventions. ‘Sentence plans seemed to be yet another thing that was done to them, rather than with them’ therefore failing to provide prisoners with the opportunity to choose to participate because they ‘want’ to (Braggins et al 2003: 19). An offender manager’s subjective decision-making process and their perceptions of risk may impact on their professional classification of an offender’s level of risk (Kemshall, 2008; Calder and Goodman, 2013). Here they place an emphasis on the biased nature of risk assessment due to its complexity. This in turn can impact on the type of interventions an offender is required to complete and thus set out on their sentence plan. An ex-prisoner (EXP 6, 17-12-14) referred to this in an interview by stating how his offender manager would change his scores in order to get him access to particular courses. He commented:
On my sentence plan, I had loads of stuff aimed at my violence charge, like CALM, Victim Awareness, a lot of the emotional based courses and then as my sentence plan went on they realised that I had quite a good grip on my emotions so they tried to tailor it and tried to suggest that I was more of a thinking criminal, more of a calculated criminal. Then they turned to more of the thinking programmes, like TSP and basically tried everything but they had to change my scores from when I first came into prison. They had to change my scores to get me back on these courses, you see. I had been assessed four times in four different prisons and was told that you don’t meet the criteria so you can’t do these programmes and so then they had to find a way of screwing the system so that I could do them.

(EXP 6, 17-12-14)

This quote demonstrates how problematic the ‘RNR’ assessment can be. Here the offender manager takes control over the unsuitable outcome of the assessment and in fact ‘fiddles’ the scores in order to obtain the desired outcome, demonstrating their level of control and power. It also highlights how easy it can be to ‘change’ a prisoner’s scores and again questions the rigor and thoroughness of these assessments. The issue of ‘score-fixing’ is considered in more detail in Chapter Eight.

Almost half (eight) of participants admitted that they volunteered for the course because they had a drug problem and needed help and support for it. This number excluded those who had been recommended by an offender manager to complete the course and then later volunteered for it. CP8 (13-5-14) stated:

I chose to do this course because I needed to get the demons out of my head or otherwise they would have just stayed in there.

Another participant (CP18, 6-10-14) said:
I began to see myself as a junkie and realised I needed to change. I need to recover.

Many participants associated the ‘need for help’ with it being the ‘right time’ to get help, which concurs, with the theory of change discussed in earlier chapters. The two variables ‘age’ and ‘time to change’ were analysed in order to determine whether or not a significant correlation existed between the two. It was found that almost half (eight) of the sample came from the 31-35 age group; four were from the 61-65-year-old category; four were from the 41-45-year-old age bracket and four was from the 26-30-year-old age category. There were no participants from the 18-21; 51-55 or 66+ age brackets who admitted that they participated because they were ready to change. Phrases such as ‘the right time to get help [or support] and ‘want to change or learn something’ were reiterated by participants and it was found that each of the participants from the age group 41-45 felt it was now the right time to get help. Eight of the age group 31-35 also expressed this opinion, one for each of the age groups 22-25 and 26-30 concurred and both participants from the older age groups (56-60 and 61-65) felt the timing was right. Unfortunately, however, from these numbers there is insufficient data to support statistically significant conclusions.

When the variable ‘sentence length’ was analysed alongside ‘readiness to change or learn’ once again a weak correlation was found as a range of sentences were present. One participant was still on remand, three were serving sentences of 12 months or less, one was serving a sentence between one and two years long, five were serving sentences between two and three years long and one was in custody for three or more
years (See Chapter Three for more information). This fails to show a significant relationship between the two variables.

A factor which seemed to influence participation, was a cell/pad mate or friend who had previously completed the course. Previous participants/completers were something not considered by facilitators of the course but was the case for five of the sample group. CP14 (6-10-14) said:

I found out about the course through my pad mate as he had gone on the course so I thought I’ll try that.

CP6 and CP7 also signed up for the course after hearing their cellmates and friends on the wing talking about it. Four prisoners admitted to participating in the course because they thought it might be interesting and beneficial. CP4 commented that after a DART worker told him about it he thought it sounded interesting and signed up for it, supporting the findings of previous research (Braggins et al 2003; Meek et al 2014). Another participant volunteered for the programme because he felt it would be ‘beneficial on the outside’ (CP2, 12-5-14) again concurring with Braggins et al (2003) research.

Three participants were referred on to the course. As outlined earlier, one participant was referred by a DART worker in the Courts, the second was referred upon arrival to the prison and the third had to complete the course as part of his sentence plan. CP20 admitted that the only two reasons for participating in the course were (a) because he had been told to and (b) because otherwise he would have to spend too much time in his cell. The same percentage of prisoners (accounting for three prisoners) felt ‘trapped’
into completing the course by conditions that had been imposed. One prisoner had to complete the course before he could appear before the parole board; the second needed to complete before being transferred to a category D prison and the third prisoner was required to complete the course before he would be given a place in a workshop. These participants felt that sentence plans could be beneficial if the courses on the plan were related to them and their offence. However, CP14 (6-10-14) stated:

Choice is important. When you are forced into doing something you are more reluctant to do it therefore you are going to be more bitter and not going to participate in the course as much as you would have if you choose to partake yourself.

Evidently ‘choice’ and the right to exercise free will when choosing how to spend one’s time inside prison are regarded highly by prisoners. The amount one gets paid to participate in programmes and education is something which has been discussed previously. However, only two prisoners referred to the financial gain for participating in the programme. The first explained how participation in the IRP earned him up to £7 per week (CP4) and the second participant commented that he had to partake in the intervention in order to get money for the canteen every week (CP6). From the above it is obvious that money is a clear incentive for these two prisoners. Although unrelated to the IRP explored during my study, CP 13 (13-5-14) revealed the following:

I am a wing cleaner and health cleaner so I can go gym 3-4 times a week. With every other job you can only go to the gym once a week and with being a wing cleaner you get decent pay, well decent for a prison – that is why I originally wanted to become a wing cleaner.
The above respondent’s motivations to engage in activities were directly influenced by the perks of the job (i.e. gym access) and the amount of money on offer. Ex-prisoners also compared the wage they received for participating in courses or education with wing jobs. One participant stated the following:

[I] got a landing job so quit education altogether then... [I did this] because it was a better paid job for one, more perks – food-wise, decent laundry, decent t-shirts which might not seem a lot from the outside but on the inside to have nice clean clothes and be able to go and wash your own clothes in the facilities is really good, ya know, more so than going to education. It sounds completely wrong doesn’t it, but that is the way it is. The perks are different and pay is different because more people go to education. I think you got £2 a day to go to education where you might get £3 a day for being a landing cleaner and then you got association every day, you got to have a shower every day which not everyone got to have so there is just a lot more perks staying on the landing. (EXP 2, 26-8-14)

Here the participant is aware of his distorted understanding of the importance of education but justifies it on the grounds of what is more important to him while incarcerated. He rationalises it by weighing up the benefits of going to education against the perks of a landing job to include clean clothes, association, shower, food, laundry and income and the outcome he reaches is that the cleaning job is more advantageous to him. These ‘added bonus’ and potential perks of the job were not considered by any facilitator when discussing prisoner’s motivations to participate or not as the case may be.

Another ex-prisoner commented that he failed to become involved in any programmes because of the strict security procedures in place:
You have to go through so much rigmarole, searches, pat downs to get on the course. I thought to myself, I’m just going to stay on the wing. I can cut hair so I can so I’ll just become the wing barber or something.

(EXP 1, 11-8-14)

Again, here the participant makes a rational decision and weighs up his options. Unfortunately, for this respondent, participation in rehabilitative interventions are not worth the effort, especially when he can earn an income as a barber.

The final reason given for participating in a course was because there was nothing else on offer. CP13 (13-5-14) commented:

I stuck to the drug’s side of things because there is nothing really else to do. There are no other courses.

Here the participant highlights the poor range of interventions available to him during his sentence. This area is explored in greater detail in the following chapters. None of the participants stated staying close to home as the sole reason for participating in the IRP; however, CP 14 (6-1-14) disclosed the following:

It matters where you are sent, of course it does. Some prisons offer really good courses but you might want to stay closer to home for visits. It’s a tough one really.

Although my research does not explore the importance of maintaining communication with family and friends, it does take into consideration how seriously some prisoners view rehabilitation. The quote above highlights the dilemma the respondent experiences when an establishment offers a beneficial course at the expense of being further from home. The participant recognises the value of courses but also emphasises
the fact that where one is sent impacts greatly on an offender’s life and potential future re-offending.

Advertising an Intervention

The promotion of a programme is an important element when it comes to obtaining participants and making prisoners aware of the programmes being delivered in a particular establishment. This is an area that receives very little attention both in terms of academic research and in relation to the emphasis placed on it by prison staff. However, the attention (or lack of) paid to the advertising of an intervention can impact significantly on participants’ motivations towards engagement, their completion, their attitudes towards the importance of rehabilitation more generally and the overall prison culture. Advertising an intervention can also influence the choices prisoners make as to whether or not they should participate in another activity (i.e. workshop or wing job) and therefore can impact on their prison experience and quality of life inside (See Chapter One for a discussion surrounding the MQPL survey). There are a variety of ways of promoting a programme and reaching potential participants as set out in a toolkit drawn up by Nacro (2014). The guide outlines approaches and includes ‘posters (in prominent areas); leaflets distributed under doors, the prison radio, existing committees, the prison newsletter, an events launch and the use of the Independent Monitoring Board to spread the word’ (Nacro, 2014:14). The Prison Development Work of Barnardo’s ‘Parenting Matters’ Project informed prisoners about the intervention during their induction process and then later informally via ‘word-of-mouth’, leaflets and posters (Collins, Healy and Dunn, 2007). The IRP programme was promoted through face-to-face presentations and by ‘word-of-mouth’.
This thesis found that leaflets and posters were useful but word-of-mouth was even more effective at reaching a wider audience. However, word-of-mouth recommendations can also be problematic if, for example, a previous participant did not enjoy the intervention or found it to be of little use. They may pass on their negative experience to other potential participants, which might result in offenders deciding not to participate. Many participants referred to cell/padmates or other offenders who had previously completed the course and admitted that their experience either positively or negatively impacted on their decision to partake or not. This is an area that existing research pays minimal attention to, yet was frequently brought up by participants in my study (as previously discussed, for example, when CP9 and CP10 had to go looking for information about course which may be beneficial to them).

The role of the programme manager in promoting and developing awareness among both uniformed and non-uniformed staff may also be a key to the successful implementation of programmes (Clarke et al 2004). An effective way of achieving this is by delivering a staff awareness course as part of the induction programme for new staff and a ‘pro-social skills course’ for prison staff (ibid: vii). By ensuring all staff are given the necessary background information and are aware of the contents of offending behaviour programmes, they can not only support each other but they can also support participants and course completers in applying and practicing their new skills and knowledge. The information they then provide to interested potential participants can ultimately affect their decision to register for a programme.
As previously mentioned, three prisoners were referred on to the IRP course and eight were recommended to participate by a DART worker. From the information provided above it is clear to see that other prisoners heard about the course through friends and pad mates (five participants). The remaining participants found out about the course through some other means. Prisoners discussed the fact that some courses were advertised via posters on the notice boards on the wings. However, CP7 (13-5-14) stated that:

More advertisements/flyers are needed on the wing; the right place would be where you go for dinner or by the office.

The extent and usefulness of this type of advertising was also questioned by another prisoner who commented:

I am dyslexic therefore although it may be advertised or on the computer boxes I will not know about it. Most of the prison staff are unaware of the courses on offer and some prisoners don’t want you wasting their time therefore only the CARAT workers are going to tell you about it but you have to find them and get that information. (CP4, 12-5-14)

This response questions the value of the ‘word-of-mouth’ approach; however, participants stated that only ‘some prisoners’ were of this opinion.

Electronic kiosks are now found on the wings of some prisons and used by prisoners to gain access to a host of information (Independent Monitoring Boards, 2011). Prisoners can use kiosks to order meals, access prison information, explore the rules and regulations of the organisation, provide feedback using on-screen surveys, arrange access to legal services and advice, print out forms (for example, housing applications) and view information relating to education courses and rehabilitation interventions that
are offered in the establishment. The research carried out for this thesis found that prisoners believed these machines were useful in selecting meals, ordering personal items, providing feedback to the institution, ‘topping up’ their phone credit and checking finances. Those who had difficulties reading English found the pictorial illustrations easy to understand. However, although there were some positive aspects to the kiosks, the majority of prisoners felt that more information regarding the range of courses on offer should be included on them. CP7 (13-5-14) highlighted the lack of detail provided in relation to the advertising of rehabilitative interventions:

The computer contains limited information on the courses available, for example, it only has ‘Education’ and ‘Employment’, it doesn’t go into much more detail. If you want to do a course, it will only come up with educational courses – for example, the forklift course or the warehouse course isn’t on it.

When discussing the advertising of courses with the programme facilitators, once again their viewpoint differed greatly to that of the prisoners. Prisoners wanted to see more advertising of the programmes on offer, yet facilitators openly admitted to purposely not advertising their programme. They said that they could not openly promote them because they would not be able to cope with the high number of prisoners that would want/need to access to the course. By not advertising it they could control numbers and refer only those prisoners they believed would benefit most from it and also refrain from over-stretching staff. This relates back to the discussion on bias and the issue of potential ‘cherry-picking’ but also highlights concerns over resources. FA3 (12-5-14) commented:

Sometimes the course cannot run, as there is not enough staff.
This participant discussed how they had tried to run the programme every two weeks but this depended on several factors; having available staff being the main issue. As a result of the strain of resources and the criterion to have participants that demonstrated a willingness to change the issue of ‘cherry-picking’ arises. Facilitators met up with potential participants in order to gauge their appropriateness and eligibility for the course, which meant that perhaps other ‘difficult’ prisoners with more serious drug problems failed to be selected. Nevill and Lumley (2011: 10) found similar selection processes, concluding that ‘this means that ‘cherry-picking’ is embedded within the programme—those who enter it are already less likely to re-offend’. However, due to the fact that staff are already limited and often over-stretched, perhaps these ‘easier-to-manage’ participants are the only suitable participants for the programme.

**Conclusion: The Rehabilitation Lottery**

From the discussion above it can be seen that the choices made in regards to the selection of programmes for implementation and delivery within a prison can have many consequences for the prisoners within an establishment. These decisions affect the type of programme on offer to a prisoner and can ultimately impact their chances of rehabilitation. My research found that there is a general lack of emphasis and regulation placed on this potential problem. The inconsistency in the responses obtained from each participant interviewed show that the role of NOMS, the impact of government strategies and the stimulus of cost effectiveness all have some part to play in what programmes are introduced for delivery. These responses also show inconsistencies in opinions on the process involved from one participant to the next. The facilitators’
awareness of the lack of provisions in place highlights the need for clarity, structure and fairness.

The chapter highlighted potential issues with eligibility requirements and assessments of risk, which ultimately lead to referrals or rejections on to courses. Subjectivity surrounding what constituted a ‘motivated’ prisoner gave rise to concerns over ‘cherry-picking’, which again fed into the concept of a ‘rehabilitation lottery’ and how luck might play a role. The influence of a cell/pad mate or other previous participants on an offender choosing to partake in a programme was found to be significant according to the data collected. Having the freedom to choose and partake (or not as the case may be) in an intervention was also highlighted along with pay and the perks of participating in a particular activity. The lack of other programmes on offer was also noted as central in prisoners choosing to partake in a particular intervention. Sometimes it was found that prisoners participated in a course because there was nothing else on offer rather than because they wanted to change or learn something new.

The areas discussed in this chapter and many other elements contribute to an offender’s journey towards rehabilitation and the obtaining of positive outcomes. However, these factors are outside an offender’s control and therefore similar to a lottery as prisoners may or may not be ‘lucky’ enough to be chosen to participate in pre-selected programmes they may or may not find useful.
CHAPTER SIX
DESIGN: UNDERSTANDING THE PROGRAMME

Introduction

Much research focuses on the effectiveness of programmes being delivered in prison along with the cost of their implementation (Clarke, Simmons and Wydall, 2004; Brookes, Barrett, Netten and Knapp, 2013). However, less attention is directed towards the design of prison programmes and, in particular, non-accredited programmes (Bruening, Welty Peachey, Evanovich, Fuller, Coble Murly, Percy, Silverstein and Chung, 2015). This chapter aims to consider the way in which participants understand the value of a programme and interpret its ‘usefulness’ to them upon release, at the micro-level. It explores some issues participants had with previous interventions and highlights factors, which are highly valued by participants yet barely recognised by those governing the content and design of programmes.

As previously mentioned, NOMS are responsible for the accreditation of programmes they consider to be consistent with the ‘What works’ literature and have outlined the requirements in two different types of programmes in Prison Service Orders 4350 and 4360. The criteria that must be met by regime interventions in order for non-accredited programmes to obtain the approval of a Prison Service Area or Operational Manager include the following: Design: Objectives, Rationale and Structure; Participation: Selection and Achievement and Management: Scale and Costs, Staff Selection, Records, Monitoring and Audit; and Evaluation (PSO 4350, 2015). However, there are many other factors, which are perennially missing from existing academic literature, the Effective
Regime Interventions criteria and the CSAP criteria. This chapter takes a closer look at these factors.

This chapter points out that participants view certain elements (some present in the criteria outlined above and some absent) as essential components to them achieving positive outcomes. It assesses the way in which a programme is designed and how it is viewed and understood by the target groups. In doing so it highlights some positive and negative aspects of the design of prison programmes and also throws light on the lack of innovation and creativity according to a range of participants from each of the target sample groups.

The chapter begins by examining what is understood by ‘accredited’ and ‘non-accredited’ by current and ex-prisoners. This is an important aspect of the research because, although the groups of participating prisoners and ex-prisoners demonstrate a lack of understanding of these terms, some still viewed their importance differently and were able to distinguish between them as a result of the way in which they were delivered, their content, whether or not the programme was part of their sentence plan, the pay they received for completing it\(^\text{17}\), and the flexibility afforded to the facilitators delivering the programme, among others. The way in which participants view the contents of a programme (and particularly IRP observed for my study) and take into account whether or not there is any overlap of material delivered elsewhere within the establishment is also examined in this chapter. The duration of the programme is taken

\(^{17}\) See Chapters Two and Five for a discussion on the motivations behind prisoners’ participation in programmes
into consideration, along with the participants’ views on group sizes. Resources and prison culture are themes that are explored throughout, but are the subject of a detailed discussion towards the end of the chapter. The final section summarises the chapter under the heading of ‘The Rehabilitation Lottery’ and concludes that there is much more to the design of a programme than what is outlined in Prison Service Orders, NOMS Commission Intentions (2014a) and the NOMS Evidence and Segmentation Companion Document to NOMS Commission Intentions from 2014 (NOMS, 2014b). It also reinforces the argument that the likelihood of satisfying all these requirements and factors is slim and thus constitutes a ‘lottery’.

Understanding and differentiating between accredited and non-accredited programmes

As highlighted in earlier chapters, there are many differences between the two types of programmes commissioned by the Prison Service. As outlined in Chapter One, a formally accredited programme through the CSAP (Prison Service Order 4360) is defined as a ‘systematic and manualised series of activities that are evidence-based and congruent with the ‘What Works’ literature’ (MOJ, 2014d: 4). These programmes focus on offending behaviour and are given priority over other programmes such as non-accredited programmes and programmes offered by voluntary and community groups (under the PSO 4190).

It was also stated in Chapter One that a non-accredited programme aims to alter the attitude and behaviour of a prisoner by adhering to the ‘What works’ principles. However, these interventions have yet to meet the necessary standards set out by the
CSAP, are currently lacking sufficient evidence regarding their effectiveness and thus do not have the ‘accreditation’ status. Although the criteria and approval process for each of the interventions differs greatly on paper, facilitators and participants of the programmes draw attention to other differences between the two which ultimately affect the quality and design of the interventions and impact on participants’ opportunities to achieve positive outcomes and satisfy the aims of the intervention.

What participants understand by the terms ‘accredited’ and ‘non-accredited’ is important, as it gives an insight into what offenders think about the design and purpose of these types of interventions even if they are unable to correctly define each term. Although little research has considered this point of view in much detail, the way in which a prisoner views the nature of a programme can impact on their willingness to participate in an intervention and their motivations to engage with that programme effectively (Clarke et al 2004). If a participant thought that completing a programme would enhance their chances of employment, they would be more likely to engage. However, if they believed the programme was a waste of time and of little use to them upon release, they were less willing to engage and may have a negative impact on the rest of the group. The prison culture and staff attitudes towards interventions can influence a prisoner’s understanding of a programme and thus can be detrimental to its effectiveness. Creating the right environment and culture is therefore an area that is highlighted as significant in the Rehabilitation Service Specification (NOMS, 2015). Here it is noted that effective rehabilitation requires the creation of an environment that is safe, hopeful and fair. It also outlines that the attitudes and behaviours of staff towards rehabilitation can be detrimental to the creation of this culture and thus staff ‘need to
have a sense of purpose in believing that offenders can change and desist from crime’ (NOMS, 2015: 9).

Some establishments are unsupportive of cognitive-behavioural interventions, evident through the lack of resources provided by the institution, the negativity detected from other prison officers and other difficulties encountered in the day-to-day running of such programmes (the area of prison culture is explored in more details later in this chapter) (Clarke et al 2004). From the data gathered for this thesis, it was clear that prisoners were conscious of negative staff attitudes towards certain interventions and as a result it was found that although prisoners had heard the terms ‘accredited and non-accredited programmes’ on several occasions they were unable to correctly define the two types of interventions but were able to differentiate between them. The following chart reveals their understanding of the term ‘accredited’.

**Figure 6.1: Serving Prisoners definition of the term ‘accreditation’**

![Chart showing understanding of accredited programme definitions]

(*AP stands for ‘Accredited Programme’*)
Figure 6.1 shows that the majority of participants (11 prisoners) had no understanding of what an ‘accredited’ programme was. Five participants, however, believed that accredited programmes were ‘recognised’ on the outside by potential employers. These participants were adamant that completing these courses would make them more employable, as businesses ‘recognised’ these ‘established’ programmes unlike other programmes delivered in the prison. Unfortunately, however, there is no evidence to support the notion that potential employers ‘recognise’ accredited prison interventions and make decisions regarding employability based on this. There is evidence to suggest, however, that prisoners enrolled on accredited and non-accredited interventions are more likely to be employed than those who do not enrol as these interventions help to reduce rates of re-offending (Brunton-Smith and Hopkins, 2014). Two participants believed that accredited programmes were part of a sentence plan and non-accredited programmes were not. However, as seen in Chapter One, OASys is a tool used to select offenders who will benefit from both accredited and non-accredited interventions; therefore, if applicable non-accredited programmes can and should also be part of a sentence plan. One participant defined accredited programmes as ‘rigid’ and ‘by the book’ (thus contradicting Maguire’s et al assurance of responsivity discussed in Chapters One and Two) which differed to non-accredited programmes, as these were seen as more relaxed and less structured. The last participant distinguished accredited programmes from non-accredited by stating that the former were the type of programme that was irrelevant on the outside whereas the latter were viewed as more useful upon release.
In relation to the sample of ex-prisoners, they too were unable to correctly define the term ‘accredited’. An overwhelming majority (seven of the eight participants) of the sample stated that ‘accredited’ programmes were worthless once released from prison. These participants also stated that non-accredited programmes were more beneficial upon release. Another participant stated that accredited programmes were old-fashioned and required up-dating unlike non-accredited programmes which were more creative and in touch with reality. One participant said that although they have been proven to work and consequently ‘recognised’ by the prison they are still ‘not worth the paper they are written on’ (EXP 1, 11-8-14). The final participant stated that accredited programmes were checked and verified and therefore were more established than non-accredited programmes. This participant claimed that knowing this made him feel more secure and admitted that he would participate in accredited programmes before non-accredited programmes as a result of this. It is worth noting, however, that this participant failed to complete any ‘accredited’ programmes.

There is a stark contrast between prisoners and ex-prisoners’ understanding of accredited and non-accredited programmes. Over half (11) of the current prisoner sample claimed that they had no understanding of the terms whatsoever. Each of the ex-prisoner participants, on the other hand, offered one or more differences between them. One of the biggest inconsistencies between the two target groups was the relevance of accredited programmes once released from prison. One current prisoner stated how irrelevant accredited programmes were upon release while the majority (seven out of eight) of the ex-prisoner sample claimed that they were worthless. This difference in opinion may be a result of the situation the participants found themselves
in, i.e. one group still being incarcerated therefore unable to fully comprehend the usefulness of the intervention while the other group were free from imprisonment and as a result able to appreciate and fully experience the value of such programmes.

**Differentiating between the two types of programmes**

Although over half (11) of serving prisoners claimed to have no understanding of the difference between accredited and non-accredited programmes, when these responses were compared with their replies relating to their thoughts on previously completed programmes, participants’ subconsciously differentiated between the two types of programmes. Both current and ex-prisoners discussed their completion of courses such as ETS and CALM and provided their views on the design, purpose and delivery of these courses. The table below outlines the courses completed by groups: 3(a) current prisoners and (b) ex-prisoners.

**Figure 6.2: ‘Accredited’ courses completed by Group 3(a): Current Prisoners and 3(b): Ex-Prisoners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Ex-prisoners: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R and R</td>
<td>Ex-prisoners: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOR</td>
<td>Ex-prisoners: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TF</td>
<td>Ex-prisoners: 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDP</td>
<td>Ex-prisoners: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALM</td>
<td>Ex-prisoners: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-ASRO</td>
<td>Ex-prisoners: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS or/TSP</td>
<td>Ex-prisoners: 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-prisoners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6.2 highlights how the majority of both serving and ex-prisoners completed ETS or TSP, 13 prisoners and five ex-prisoners respectively. Half the sample group of ex-prisoners completed CALM whilst four current prisoners completed this course. The number of current and ex-prisoners who failed to complete any programme is also clear from the above table with two representing ex-prisoners and four being current prisoners. The reasons for this varied.

For the ex-prisoner sample group, one of the participants carried out the majority of his sentence in a Young Offenders Institution (YOI). As a result, many of the accredited courses were not delivered there. The other participant had ETS on his sentence plan; however, the course was not delivered in the prison where he was serving his sentence and therefore he could not complete it. In the participant’s own words:

This showed how seriously the prison viewed the programme and rehabilitation.

(ESP 8, 22-1-15)

This comment relates back to the type of culture existing within an institution and the amount of resources afforded to particular interventions.

In relation to serving prisoners, four out of the 20 participants failed to complete any accredited programmes for the following reasons; 1) they felt they would not achieve anything from participating; 2) the programmes on offer were limited and not of interest; and 3) one participant already had a wing job and so did not need to participate in a course. One ex-prisoner and two current prisoners completed R&R. The remainder of the courses were completed by current prisoners solely. Four prisoners from the
sample participated on the P-ASRO course, three on the SDP and one on FOR and TF programmes.

As for participation on the non-accredited courses, the following chart outlines what courses current prisoners and ex-prisoners completed.

**Figure 6.3: ‘Non-Accredited’ courses completed by Group 3(a): Current Prisoners and 3(b): Ex-Prisoners**

![Chart showing participation in non-accredited programmes]

As seen from the above, all current prisoners completed at least one non-accredited course. Each of the 20 participants had completed IRP and half the sample had completed another drug treatment programme (such as AA, Substance Misuse, Relapse Prevention); one prisoner had completed a Gym course and one other participant had completed a Victim Awareness course. In regards to the ex-prisoner sample, half the
group said they failed to participate in any non-accredited programme as there were none on offer at the time. One participated in an Art programme (which was based on music in prison), two participants took part in the Sycamore Tree programme and one participant completed the Community Support Leadership Awards programme.

It is clear to see, then, who participated in what programme, accredited or otherwise, and what serving and ex-prisoners understood by the term ‘accredited’. As previously mentioned though, my research unpicked how participants viewed the two types of programmes regardless of their understanding of the nature and purpose of the programmes. The next section looks at this more closely and includes the perceptions of Group 1: Managers and Group 2: Facilitators. The next section begins by discussing the importance of the design and delivery of the programme. It considers areas such as content, innovation, quality, flexibility, programme integrity, duration and group size. It then takes into account the impact prison culture and available resources can have on interventions being delivered in prisons and the production of positive outcomes.

Content

As discussed in Chapter Two, the aims and objectives of any programme are important in working towards reducing re-offending and producing positive outcomes. Research has shown that offending behaviour programmes and in particular those containing a cognitive-behavioural element, are most successful in assisting an offender to lead a life free from criminality (McGuire, 1995; Clarke et al 2004). Accredited and non-accredited programmes aim to reduce offending by changing prisoners’ behaviours and attitudes towards crime (PSO 4350 and PSO 4360) through the use of cognitive-behavioural
modification techniques. There are a wide range of non-accredited programmes delivered within the criminal justice system, however, research into these programmes and consequently accumulated data is limited (Ministry of Justice, 2013b). In contrast there are many studies which consider the aims and objectives of more established ‘accredited’ programmes (Murray, 2002; Clarke et al 2004; Hollin and Palmer, 2006; Robinson and Crow, 2009) and identify certain areas within the content to be more beneficial than others. According to Prison Service Orders 4350 and 4360, for an accredited programme to be effective, there must be a clear model of change identified. For an effective regime intervention to be validated, the primary aim of the intervention must be to change prisoners’ behaviour and therefore must contain cognitive elements. What is clear from this is that the main objective does not necessarily have to be ‘desistance from crime’, but instead a change in behaviour, which may assist and contribute to the overall participation in criminal activities. For example, Clarke et al (2004) found that participants in a cognitive skills programme expressed interest in some of the course content and in particular the problem-solving areas, ‘stop and think’ skills and learning more about social skills.

My research explored participants opinions towards the content of completed programmes. They were asked whether or not they thought the skills and techniques they learnt would be useful to them upon release from prison and in relation to the reduction of future offending. From the 20 current prisoners interviewed, 11 had completed Thinking Skills Programme (TSP) or Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS) and one stated he was ‘almost’ sure he had completed ETS. He thought it was humorous that he had forgotten the name of the programme and explained that the reason for this was
because it was not worth remembering as it was a complete waste of time. Of these 11 participants, only one felt ETS gave him more confidence. Only one participant said TSP was ‘Alright’ but the remainder of the sample said either ETS or TSP was ‘rubbish’ (CP9, 13-5-14), ‘common sense’ (CP11, 13-5-14) and/or ‘useless’ (CP19, 6-10-14). This shows that the majority of participants felt that they were pointless. CP5 stated:

ETS was condescending. It was rubbish! Who doesn’t know the shit they were ranting on about? I didn’t even have a choice to complete this course. I didn’t take any notice of the information provided as it was stuff I already knew. I don’t even class it as a course... [IRP] doesn’t belittle you like ETS. Those who deliver this course [ETS] should really stop and think and realise that we already know this stuff. It is an insult to your intelligence.

(CP5, 12-5-14)

The group of ex-prisoners were equally negative towards accredited programmes. Overall their comments were very similar. Each of the participants commented on their lack of value when released from custody and while inside the prison. They all felt that they had learned very little, if anything, from partaking in them and each stated that these types of programmes were nothing but ‘a box ticking exercise’. EXP1 stated the following:

They were some token accredited courses, which are basically not worth the paper they are written on, no offence to the people who are doing them, but in the real world like I found out that they aint worth nothing. I did all those ‘jumping through the hoops courses’, I call them. They put a line of hoops in front of you and like with my life sentence it was like how many hoops have you gone through? I am a critical thinker and the whole concept of it is a little bit far-fetched for me. It doesn’t do any good; all it does is make sure that they have all their targets met and their reports in.

(EXP1, 11-8-14)
The participant summarised his thoughts by saying:

The programmes are designed and delivered for target reasons. It’s for the system and not for the prisoner. (EXP1, 11-8-14)

EXP4 (2-9-14) also had strong views on this point:

[With accredited programmes] they don’t really push you. They just want you to sit there and listen. As long as you pass it they aint bothered. It’s just a system, it’s all about numbers and that’s all you are, a number.

EXP5 (8-9-14) explained that accredited courses are:

 [...] geared up to get certain answers out of you...you sit in a classroom with a whiteboard and they are there writing the answers on the board and you are just taking them down. We have to play the game.

When asked to further explain this, he replied:

When you are asked what you would do in this situation, you’re not going to say I would attack him or you won’t pass the course so instead you say what you need to say and write down what you need to pass it.

(EXP5, 8-9-14)

The concept of ‘game playing’ is considered in greater detail in Chapter Eight.

Innovation and Overlap

Prisoners need to be challenged and motivated otherwise the boredom they experience will destroy their self-esteem and desire to work and engage in the future (Blom-Cooper, 1987, as discussed in Chapter One). Innovation can preserve and encourage the desire to work and learn and as a result of this preservation an increase in participation in other educational and rehabilitative interventions can be seen (Bamford and Skipper, 2007; Langelid, Maki, Raundnip, Svenson, 2009). New learning experiences and opportunities allow for a sense of achievement, which can then lead to participants’ eagerness to learn
and experience more (Caulfield, Wilson and Wilkinson, 2009). The need for innovation was also highlighted by the Ministry of Justice (2013b) regarding the government proposal to transform rehabilitation. It recognised that there was a need for providers to be more innovative in their approaches to working with offenders. However, participants with high IQ levels often feel interventions are boring and repetitive (Clarke et al 2004). In relation to my research and the non-accredited programme observed, participants found the content of the course useful; however, they also stated that it was similar to other courses they had participated in.

During the focus group, participants opened up about their thoughts on the creativity and uniqueness of the course in more detail. According to one participant:

> All the programmes are the same. The only thing that has changed is the name of the programme and the front page! They take a section out here and there and jiggle it about a little and that’s it, they stick it back together and give it out to us again. Take Thinking Skills as an example, it’s now called Enhanced Thinking Skills – same shit, different name.

(Focus Group Member 1, 3-6-14)

This perspective was common among both current prisoners and ex-prisoners. Another participant commented:

> We have done these courses time and time again and we find ourselves back here again and again – when is someone going to realise that these programmes have been done to death and are not working! We need to have a different approach, we need someone coming from the outside with fresh perspectives – the staff in here have done my sentence with me and are just as institutionalised as me. They cannot think outside the box. We need something new and different or else what’s the point in going around in circles.

(Focus Group Member 2, 3-6-14)
M3 discussed her view on creativity and in doing so related to the accreditation process. She explained how they had put a case together for the accreditation of their programme but stated that the process was excessively long and attempted to take the creativity out of the programme. As a result, they decided to withdraw from the process and find another way of delivering their programme in order to protect its innovation.

When the content of the course was discussed with other managers and facilitators, they seemed oblivious to what was being delivered elsewhere within the prison. M1 admitted that they were not sure what exactly was delivered by the Education wing or if it was similar or not to what was being taught in the Health Centre. The facilitators were also unaware of the possibility of overlap and repetition. One course facilitator was certain that the programme they delivered was in no way similar to any other intervention delivered in the establishment. However, the prisoners seemed to have a better insight as they provided information on an Alcohol and Drugs Programme that was delivered in the Education wing which was ‘more or less the same thing’ (PP 8; 13-5-14). This clearly confirmed overlap and repetition of material and also failed to demonstrate creativity and innovation. Again, prison culture plays a role as this lack of joined-up thinking and cross fertilisation suggests a ‘silo’ culture. This concept is explored in more detail later on.

**Maintaining Quality and Issues with Flexibility**
Maintaining the quality and integrity of a programme entails monitoring\textsuperscript{18} and modifying it to ensure that it is functioning effectively and as intended. This is the ninth criterion set out in the PSO 4360 by the CSAP and applies only to accredited programmes. This criterion seeks to ensure that integrity of the programme is maintained and nonconformities to the agreed standards are limited by supervising the (a) supporting conditions and programme integrity and the (b) treatment integrity (PSO 4360). Supporting conditions and programme integrity includes providing information regarding the staff selection procedures, delivery treatment assessments, staff training, staff support and supervision, procedure guidance, resources and facilitates available, and the programme management structure.

Treatment integrity includes providing details concerning the approach to treatment supervision and adherence to the programme manuals, methods used to ensure the correct use of participant inclusion and exclusion and information regarding how staff are monitored on their treatment styles (Ministry of Justice, 2011a). These types of programmes also require certain documentation, which are viewed as crucial for the effective implementation and delivery of such a programme. These include a programme manual outlining the aims, objectives and content of each session; a theory manual outlining the theoretical base of the model and how it adheres to a theory of change; an assessment and evaluation manual which includes information and guidance surrounding the assessment used during the programme; the management manual which outlines the training, supervision, offender selection criteria, assessments,

\textsuperscript{18} See Chapter One for more information on the monitoring of accredited programmes.
monitoring and roles and responsibilities of staff involved; and, finally, the staff training manual which includes information regarding training courses, staff competences, assessment of competences and reviewing performances.

It is evident, then, that many requirements are in place to ensure for the effective delivery and monitoring of a programme. High level monitoring of programme integrity is often accepted by staff in prisons (Travers, Wakeling, Mann and Hollin, 2011). However, issues arise with flexibility, lack of individualisation, privacy and comfort when sessions are recorded to ensure programme integrity (Clarke et al 2004). Participants recognised the importance of programme integrity but at the same time felt that the manuals were too rigid, inflexible and patronising. Issues of generalisation were also identified with this approach as manuals were systematic and fixed which failed to take into consideration the needs of prisoners with low/high IQ levels, low/high literacy and numeracy and those whose first language was not English. They proposed more flexibility in the delivery of programmes in order to tailor the programme to work towards the needs of its participants. Clarke et al (2004) also referred to the social background of the participant and pointed out that due to the inflexibility afforded to facilitators, at times, much of the content failed to relate to many participants. They stated that participants were unable to relate and apply the examples and skills taught from the manuals to their lives as their way of life differed greatly to what was written in the script. As a result of this, they felt as though they were patronising participants and creating an awkward and uncomfortable atmosphere.
My research also highlighted the issue facilitators had with the video recording of programmes. They felt that feedback from these videos were undermining and was not carried out to ensure the integrity of the programme, which was in fact its original purpose. Instead, similar to Clarke et al (2004), facilitators felt uncomfortable and admitted that the monitoring experience impacted on their confidence and overall quality of the session (This is considered in more detail below).

The government proposal to transform rehabilitation (See Chapter Two for more information) notes the need to provide facilitators with more flexibility in their approach to rehabilitation. It states that those working with offenders are the professionals and have the best understanding as to what offenders need and what works. It also comments that by giving providers and facilitators more discretion and flexibility in their approaches to working with offenders a higher rate of reduced re-offending is expected (Ministry of Justice, 2013b).

When discussing these areas (programme monitoring, integrity and flexibility) with participants interviewed for this thesis, many of the same issues highlighted in other literature emerged from the data. The majority of respondents (managers, facilitators and current and ex-prisoners) felt that accredited programmes were too rigid and failed to allow for flexibility in delivery. M2 recognised the importance of monitoring the delivery of a programme in order to ensure high standards but felt that quality services could be provided regardless of accreditation. She commented:

   A non-accredited programme can provide a service to a high standard therefore, we can work without ‘accreditation... [Accredited programmes]
are too strict with time and the way it has to be delivered.

(M2, 3-6-13)

M4 agreed that accredited programmes are too rigid and as a result, impacted (and continues to impact) on the participants’ experience. She also explained that non-accredited programmes are much more flexible and individual in their approach. It is worth noting here that this particular respondent had experience of delivering both types of offender behaviour programmes; accredited and non-accredited.

Each of the eight programme facilitators delivered programmes, which were non-accredited and expressed their preference for this. When discussing the difference between the two types of programmes, ‘lack of flexibility’ was a phrase, which each participant referred to as a main concern and/or disadvantage of accredited programmes. Participants felt that by making a programme ‘accredited’ it negatively impacted on the prisoner’s experience. FA2 (30-1-14) commented:

[When applying for accredited] …NOMS muscle in and change it [the programme] to what they want and not what the prisoners need...

[NOMS consists of] pig-headed people who think they know it all. Once they get their grips into your programme they change it, make it all a step-by-step manual and far from personalised and engaging. (FA2, 30-1-14)

FA3 also referred to the lack of flexibility afforded once the accredited status has been gained and discussed how time bound the facilitator is once it becomes manualised. FA4 (12-5-14) felt that programmes needed to be less rigid and ‘by-the-book’.

[You cannot be too structured] ‘cause you never know what the lads are going to talk about. When you deliver an accredited programme you cannot have flexibility and as a result this impacts hugely on the lads.
FA7 (9-9-14) stated that it will never be the case that ‘one size fits all’ and so as a result
programmes need to be flexible, individual and thus non-accredited.

Serving prisoners were also aware of the lack of flexibility afforded to accredited
programmes (although being unable to fully define the terms accredited and non-
accredited). They discussed certain accredited programmes in a negative light and
expressed their lack of engagement as a result of the rigid format. CP10 (13-5-14)
commented:

If we were discussing something they would stop us and go on to something
else as though they had a set out thing and they had to stick to it. The agenda
was way too rigid; it was like they had to get all the information out before
a certain time.

Ex-prisoners expressed their appreciation of a more relaxed approach to delivery of non-
accredited programmes. One said:

Like on the course [TSP], they’re so rigid like, there might be four categories
that you have to choose from and if I say ‘look I don’t fit into any of those
categories but I know a category that I would fit into, let me write down my
category’, they say no you can’t do that.  (EXP 6, 17-12-14)

This group of participants also expressed their views on programme individuality and
adapting to offender needs. The same participant as above commented on the issue of
a ‘one size fits all’ approach:

CALM was absolutely useless purely because it was a ‘one size fits all’
programme. It didn’t even attempt to address my situation. It’s not working
for me who’s in here for fighting so it can’t be working for this other guy
who’s in here for butchering his missus so how can it be working for him
who’s in here for shooting his best mate. It’s tailor-made for one type of
certain criminal and so they are like, ‘you are all this type of criminal then’.
11 individuals, who don’t know each other, never meet before, all inside for
different types of crime but you are all the same type of criminal doing this
course. How does that make sense?  

( EXP 6, 17-12-14)

FA3 also referred to the fact that many accredited programmes are video recorded in
order to monitor the delivery. She stated that this practice made her feel very anxious
and uncomfortable and commented that this would make her change the way she
delivered her programme:

I’m completely myself when I teach. I swear and joke and really am myself
around the lads. If they stuck a camera in front of me I wouldn’t be able to
be myself. I wouldn’t be comfortable and neither would they [the
participants]. Non-accredited programmes are more relaxed and more
focused on the client rather than on time and rules and regulations.

(FA3, 12-5-14)

Prisoners also commented on the video recording of sessions. They did not seem to
understand why they were being recorded, who saw the recordings and what was done
with the materials afterwards. This made them feel nervous and anxious. One
participant stated that he was so conscious of who might see the recordings that he
would refrain from opening up during a recorded session. In this case, programme
integrity clearly compromised programme effectiveness.

Duration
The duration of a programme is an important factor when it comes to participation, engagement and achieving positive outcomes (Prison Reform Trust, 2008). Some prisoners are unwilling to sit through a lengthy intervention as they do not have high levels of concentration and feel that the programme will take too long to complete. Others simply get bored halfway through and as a result drop out of the course. This can have a negative impact on their willingness to participate in subsequent courses thereafter (Bamford et al 2007; Langelid et al 2009; Caulfield et al 2010). On the other hand, if a course is too short, participants feel that they do not have enough time to work on their issues and resolve their problems (PSO 4360). Another reason why the length of an intervention is so important relates to the length of a prisoner’s sentence and their ability to complete it before their release date, bearing in mind practical issues (such as legal visits and health checks) and waiting lists (All-Party Parliamentary Report, 2004). This was highlighted, as an area for amending in the Ministry of Justice Transforming Rehabilitation proposals (2013b), which outlined that rehabilitation would be extended in order to reach as many offenders as possible. It also pointed out that 55% of offenders serve less than 12 months in custody and as a result of this have fewer opportunities available to them to participate in programmes and as a result of this, it needed transforming.

From the data generated from the interviews and the non-accredited programme observed, an overwhelming majority of participants (accounting for 18 prisoners) felt the intervention which was carried out in the mornings and lasted ten days was too short by design (even though it was a condensed version of a longer programme). Participants stated that if the course was a week longer or if they also attended in the afternoons
they would benefit more as they would be able to have greater in-depth discussions and more time to develop their thoughts. Facilitators of the course were also of this opinion but sceptical that this would be a possibility given that the establishment was a dispersal prison. One facilitator noted that in the past the course was 16 weeks long but was shortened due to factors outside the control of participants and facilitators, i.e. as a consequence of the type of prison establishment and the resources available.

Size

The group size is another area that existing prison research pays minimal attention to. Limited studies have taken into account the impact group size has on participant engagement. The average group size for a cognitive-behavioural intervention normally consist of 8-12 individuals (Wikstrom and Treiber, 2008). They highlight the issue of contagion, in the form of ‘deviancy training’, which refers to the influence other members of the group can have on contributing to and escalating deviant behaviour. During an observation for this thesis, a form of contagion was observed when a discussion surrounding different types of drugs arose. As the programme was designed to target drug issues, the fact that different types of drugs were being discussed was not a surprise, however, the conversation rapidly escalated into a discussion about mixing drugs and the highs experienced from doing so. One participant whispered quietly to the person beside him; ‘Have you ever done Spice with Black Mumba?’ to which the other participant responded; ‘No, what’s it like?’ The man replied; ‘It’s the most amazing buzz ever, like, it’s so fucking good, I was ....’ Other participants sitting close by overheard this conversation in the background and joined in. Another participant interrupted saying:
I’ve done it and it’s true, the high is unbelievable, you should do it man, you should, wait, I shouldn’t be saying that here, should I?

(Focus Group Member 4, 3-6-14)

The group laughed aloud, the facilitator’s attention was drawn towards them, and they were asked to pay attention. What was interesting to observe was how quickly other participants got involved in this conversation and how easily the discussion led to each of the participants recommending particular mixes of drugs. This is reminiscent of Wilkström et al (2008) warning about contagion and how group settings provide for perfect opportunities for the influence of delinquent behaviour.

On the contrary, the size of the group can also prove to be an important element for the creation of a suitable working environment. In Chapter Seven, ‘Communities of Practice’ and ‘Prison Dialogue’ are considered, which are interrelated to group size. Each participant from my research commented on the fact that ‘less was more’ and the most appropriate group size fell into the category of eight to ten. Six participants in a group was seen as too small yet would have been preferable to a larger group. One participant stated the following:

Eight allows for enough of a discussion but is at the same time not intimidating. We had a good group where everyone felt comfortable talking out loud and had enough time for this to happen.

(CP 17, 6-10-14)

Another participant said the following in relation to group sizes:

When there are too many people in a group you get bored listening to everyone, you don’t really want everyone to know about your problems and even if you do you don’t get a word in edge-ways as there are too many of you so there’s no point.

(CP 20; 6-10-14)
However, some of the facilitators had different opinions. One facilitator felt that 12 participants in the group was ideal as this allowed for comfort. Another commented that they aim for 12 participants but that this was quite a high number and as a result, they normally end up with seven or eight participants. Two other facilitators stated that the managers of the intervention push for 12 participants but they felt that this was too high and with smaller groups, they had more time to talk and think. It also gave them a greater opportunity to open up and feel more comfortable around the rest of the group because there were fewer participants. This is another area that researchers of prison rehabilitation pay minimal attention to yet the data here has shown that group sizes can impact greatly on participants’ willingness to interact, engage and thus achieve positive outcomes.

**Prison Culture and Resources**

Resources and prison culture are themes that have run throughout this thesis. Both play a central role in the effectiveness of rehabilitation in prison establishments and can have a significant impact on facilitators’ motivations and participants’ engagement in a programme. Often programme facilitators experience a lack of support from other prison staff, which can come in the form of prison officers’ lackadaisical spirit with regards to rehabilitation (Clarke et al 2004). Other examples included participants arriving late because of delays in unlocking cells and escorting them to their appropriate classrooms and instances where sessions had to be cancelled as a direct consequence of staff shortages. These examples illustrate poor institutional support and a lack of
necessary resources, which questions how highly these types of interventions are valued by the prison establishment itself.

This issue of poor officer attitudes was also highlighted in the All-Party Parliamentary Report (2004) as outlined in Chapter Two. This chapter drew attention to the fact that prisoners were often aware of prison staff negativity surrounding rehabilitation. Some officers deliberately disrupted educational opportunities, which added to the creation of a poor prison culture (Braggins and Talbot, 2006). Successful rehabilitation requires a certain type of environment which is ‘largely determined by the attitudes and skills of staff’ (NOMS, 2015: 9). This paper outlined the importance of staff having faith in rehabilitation and confidence in the ability of offenders to change. An integrated approach to rehabilitation where all members of staff strive to assist offenders in their journey towards desistance is central to this.

My findings support these points, with many programme participants and ex-prisoners agreeing that none of the establishments they had served sentences in over the years displayed an integrated approach to rehabilitation. Participants commented that officers openly expressed their own personal views regarding the value of certain interventions. They stated that many of these views were negative. One ex-prisoner indicated:

Some people are there for the pay cheque and it is that simple. Other people they have an interest, they will tell you personal stories, they will get personal with you. Others will tell you the answers are on the board just take down the answers, get your certificate and move on, you’ve got to get these
certificates to get your D cat. They don’t care if you’re rehabilitated or not.

(EXP 6 17-12-14)

Other participants referred to accredited programmes as ‘box-ticking exercises’. They too stated that many facilitators gave them the answers they wanted/needed to hear in order to pass them. Participants clearly picked up on the facilitators’ lack of interest and faith in a programme and one participant summed this point up nicely by saying ‘...so we’ll play along with the game too’ (EXP 5, 8-9-14).

During an interview with a programme manager/facilitator, this area was explored further. The participant discussed his experiences of prison culture and the issues involved in delivering a programme within a private prison as an ‘outside’ facilitator. He stated that he felt very isolated and abstract from the prison staff and that although he commented this might be positive in terms of what the participants preferred he explained that it was not always useful in working alongside the prison. When probed to explain this viewpoint further he provided an example of how and when he felt ostracised, he stated:

I’m seen as different because I am not one of them. I’m not a prison officer and they like to remind me of that. I have got keys to get in and out of the gates and I don’t think they like that. One officer in particular is making my job very difficult. You see, I’ve got a good bit of technology here and I am not supposed to leave the lads in the room alone with it, but I have to at times because the officers at the gate pretend they can’t hear the buzzer go off when my lads want in. So that means I have to trust the lads not to take anything and run to the gate to let them in when in fact this is something they could have done quite easily. I see it as a form of bullying really. It really grates on me and on the lads. The biggest problem is that sometimes my
lads get mouthy to them and that just causes problems for everyone. Once, one of my lads got taken back to his cell for getting wound up and swearing at an officer. The other problem is that we never get to start on time because of it or if we do start on time, then I have to leave every couple of minutes to let a few more lads in. It’s just really annoying.

(FA2, 30-1-14)

This comment suggests a divide within the establishment between facilitators from outside of the prison and officers who work on a daily basis within the prison. It also suggests hostility, which subsequently is transmitted on to programme participants and then negatively impacts upon their rehabilitative experience. This reinforces the significance of an establishment demonstrating a unified approach to working with and rehabilitating offenders as outlined above (NOMS, 2015).

Another area that lacks much attention and focus is the amount of resources afforded to accredited programmes in comparison to non-accredited programmes. Resources can have a significant impact on all aspects of an intervention, from its design to its delivery, yet little research explores the differences and the perceptions of those involved. During my observation, the lack of resources available to the facilitators became very apparent. Poor resources directly impacted on teaching techniques and the use of the flip chart in the lesson as the same pieces of paper which were used previously were re-used in the next lesson. It became even more obvious when the facilitator got to a section of the presentation where she needed to use ‘post- it’s’. Here she resorted to using mine as she did not have any of her own. On another occasion when visiting the prison, a facilitator mentioned that they had to cancel the previous week’s course as they did not have enough staff to cover the daily tasks while they delivered the programme. On yet
another occasion, a manager of the course explained how the programme had to be
cancelled the day before because the prison officers’ radios were not working properly
which meant there was no means of communicating with them. One prisoner
participant commented on resources and the prison’s priorities at the time of his
sentence:

I didn’t do anything in Lincoln because nobody asked me to do anything and
well I guess they were too busy trying to stop hostage instances. More time
and effort seemed to go into keeping everyone safe rather than
rehabilitation when I was there. (EXP 7, 30-1-15)

Conclusion: The Rehabilitation Lottery

From the discussion above it can be seen that there are many factors participants view
as influential and beneficial in the progress they make towards obtaining positive
outcomes. Yet, as the literature suggests (or lack of research in many cases), these
factors are often dismissed or ignored by researchers, policy makers, practitioners and
penal institutions. My research found that although the label of ‘accreditation’ is not
necessarily understood by participants, they still have the ability to explain from their
own experiences how each type of programme differs. The data clearly differentiates
between the two types of programmes and demonstrates that their understanding of
the terms affect their decision to partake in a programme and engage fully with its
content. The data also highlights that the opportunities available to them depend on
the establishment they are sent to which differs from one prison to the next, yet can
have significant consequences on their participation on programmes and thus their
chances of rehabilitation. This makes it seem more like a ‘rehabilitation lottery’ rather
than equal rehabilitation opportunities.
As discussed above, other programmes delivered elsewhere in the prison also affect participants’ experiences, learning outcomes and willingness to partake in new or further programmes. This factor impacts on their thoughts towards the usefulness of a programme which sounds similar to another programme delivered elsewhere in the prison. This can act as a barrier or a doorway to participation in other programmes depending on whether the experience was positive or negative. What has also been found and discussed is that the type of programme (accredited or non-accredited) impacts on the way it is designed and delivered which again affects how it is received by participants. The content of the programme and how it relates to specific offender needs too plays a role and in some instances can be useful and in others completely useless. The approach to delivery (which is developed further in the next chapter) can be innovative and exciting for participants or it can be old-fashioned and boring thus again impacting on their experience and engagement.

From my research, it can be seen that programmes require a specific length of time for participants to absorb the information; however, if a participant is lucky enough they will have the opportunity to absorb this information and develop their skills within an adequate time frame. However, if they are unlucky they will be expected to do so within almost half the time as a result of where they were sent. My research found that the type of establishment, for example, a dispersal prison, has a significant impact here as it is more difficult to extend the duration of a programme as a result of the prison type. It also needs to be recognised that innovation is essential and overlap and repetition of material is detrimental to an offender’s participation and engagement. My research
acknowledges that no two participants are the same and that strict manuals and rigid time frames do not work effectively towards meeting the needs of offenders and allowing them to relate to the content of the programme. This chapter has demonstrated that accredited and non-accredited programmes differ in many ways. Some of these differences receive relatively little attention, yet some are central to how they are viewed and received by participants. These factors can play an important role in whether or not a participant experiences positive outcomes and comes back to the idea of a lottery as to whether or not they are lucky enough to have the necessary elements in place.
CHAPTER SEVEN
DELIVERY: WHO, HOW AND WHERE?

Introduction
Further consideration is given to the design and delivery of IRP at the micro-level within this chapter. It includes an exploration of the significance of who delivers an intervention, how they deliver the programme and where exactly the programme is delivered. It begins by discussing the importance of who the facilitator is which allows for an exploration of how participants view and value both ‘internal’ facilitators or ‘insiders’ and ‘external’ facilitators or ‘outsiders’. The discussion takes into consideration issues such as legitimacy, trust, respect and power. It also considers the level of training facilitators receive in order to deliver an accredited programme compared with that of a non-accredited programme. The approach to teaching and the range of teaching styles, techniques and resources available and utilised is examined followed by a discussion relating to the significance of listening to others and having the opportunity to be heard. The power of dialogue is considered significant, as participants from the study described it as a rare but beneficial element. Finally, the chapter considers the importance of the location of the programme. It not only considers the size and layout of the teaching room but also bears in mind other factors such as its distance from the wing and other non-participating prisoners, which evidently affects the rehabilitative experience. It also refers to prison culture and priorities throughout the discussion. The chapter reveals that many factors contribute to the essential working atmosphere discussed in Chapter Two and that other elements influence a participant’s overall rehabilitative experience which are sometimes overlooked by those with the power to make a difference.
Who?

Andrews and Kiessling (1980) outlined five dimensions to be utilised in order for effective correctional practices to be attained. These included effective use of authority, anti-criminal modelling and enforcement, problem solving, resources and interpersonal relations between staff and service user. The last factor was identified as possibly the most important factor for positive outcomes to be achieved and best staff practices to be utilised. Other research found that when a facilitator was approachable, warm and sincere, their influence on the participant was at its maximum (Andrews et al 1980; Dowden and Andrews, 2004). As outlined above and in Chapter Two, the enthusiasm and motivations of a facilitator can contribute significantly to the creation of the necessary atmosphere for working and learning (Prison Service, 2003; Davies, 2005; GHK, 2011). Passionate and motivated providers can impact greatly on the quality of the programme and the interest obtained from the participants (Ward, Day, Howells and Brigden, 2004). This also underlines the argument made in Chapter Five exploring the motivations behind programme participation. Here it was found that the majority of participants took part in the programme because a programme facilitator had recommended it to them. This demonstrates trust and interpersonal relationships between both staff and the client for them to actually take their advice and voluntarily partake in the intervention.

Interpersonal relationships between staff and prisoners are significant as they enable essential correctional practices to take place. Such practice including offender managers building relationships, which are non-judgmental, empathic and honest in order to
contribute to reducing re-offending and producing positive outcomes (Ministry of Justice, 2013b). The development of relationships through interpersonal communication styles or non-programmatic components influence participants’ behaviour and attitudes and contribute to positive outcomes (Palmer, 1995; Taxman, 2008). However, often this is overlooked within the literature. My research found interpersonal skills crucial for programme participation and engagement. One prisoner commented:

The facilitators [of IRP] were approachable passionate people, which made it more comfortable when it came to talking out loud about my problems; their passion and motivation helped me a lot. (CP 16, 6-10-14)

Some participants referred to facilitators as ‘human’, ‘normal’ and ‘kind’, echoing the terminology found in Liebling’s (2001) research and the concept of legitimacy as discussed in Chapter Two. Here it was stated that fairness and respect shown towards prisoners are invaluable elements in the quest towards rehabilitating prisoners.

However, motivation and passion are not the only elements that have been highlighted as important in engaging and educating participants. Human capital, in the form of knowledge and understanding of the subject area, are also areas that have been identified as central in effectively delivering a programme. McGuire (1995: 232) stated that ‘practitioners must have a sound theoretical and intellectual understanding of the basis for the programmes that are being used’. The Ministry of Justice (2013b) also considers skilled and trained practitioners as essential when working with offenders. These skills are essential as some participants depend on facilitators for the transmission of valuable information. If the facilitators lack knowledge, experience or skills then they
will not be able to successfully disseminate the information to their participants. Two respondents commented on the lack of the facilitator’s fluency when it came to delivering the programme. CP2 stated:

They kept going back to their notes as though they were not quite sure themselves what they were talking about. It wasn’t second nature to them which came across blatantly and then made me think they weren’t sure what they were doing. (CP 2, 12-5-14)

CP 19 (6-10-14) said that ‘it did not seem like they had been doing it for long’, which affected the atmosphere conducive for learning and thus his experience and what he took away from the programme.

Training

In order for any course to be delivered effectively, the facilitator must obtain some form of training to enhance their knowledge and develop further skills. As previously stated, for accredited programmes the accreditation panel must approve the detailed training manual submitted during the application process (PSO 4360). For non-accredited programmes the business case must outline the roles, responsibilities and competences of potential staff (PSO 4350). Therefore, for each type of programme it is clear that training plays a significant role. Those who deliver accredited cognitive skills programmes are required to attend a two-week residential training course, which needs to be passed before they are allowed to facilitate a session (Clarke, Simmons and Wydall, 2004). They are then required to deliver two sessions before being considered for training, which would give them the status of accredited tutor. Once this has been achieved the tutor can go further and complete advanced training. However, on the
other hand, there is minimal research that takes into consideration the training facilitators of non-accredited received before delivering this type of intervention.

This was an area that was further explored for this thesis. It was found that facilitators of the non-accredited programme received minimal training before delivering the programme. This consisted of two days training with two different organisations on how to facilitate a group. FA 4 (12-5-14) provided some information on this, stating:

We did this before we knew what course we were going to be delivering. The second day was the same as the first day. It was like a déjà vu. I am not sure what the point of it was.

Facilitators seemed anxious about their lack of adequate and appropriate training and as a result doubted their ability to perform their roles effectively. One facilitator commented:

I am not sure how experienced we are at all. With the accredited programmes the facilitators get more training and that training is more robust, that’s good practice in my opinion. It is not the same for non-accredited programmes. (FA6, 13-5-14)

Another facilitator commented that if she had the ability to change anything about the programme then she would work towards improving the training they received:

[The problem is] ...learning on the job. With the training for this you really have to get on with it yourself. The content is about drugs so this is what we do every day. With the group work, though, I have had no experience with this at all so it’s a case of learning on the job. Last year we had two days training. Perhaps because it’s not accredited and not filmed we get no proper training. (FA5, 12-5-14)
Tolerance of the situation was common amongst facilitators, as many accepted their lack of training as a direct consequence of the programme being non-accredited. This refers to the prison culture and also to a lack of available resources. It also emphasises the concept of a ‘rehabilitation lottery’ and the fact that some facilitators are ‘lucky’ enough to get the necessary training to effectively carry out their roles. Ultimately this impacts on the quality and level of rehabilitation participants of the programmes are fortunate (or unfortunate) enough to receive.

Some programme participants and ex-prisoners were also aware of the training (or lack of) officers completed before delivering a specific course. Their level of training or qualification was an important element to some participants:

The problem with screws delivering [programmes] is that they are trained at being a prison officer and then they go on a two-day course and then they are told that they can deliver an offender behaviour programme to me. I’m supposed to be a scholar of society, I need help, I need changing and they have just put a screw whose ‘trade’ is unlocking and opening doors; that is their trade, they have no psychology qualifications or experience or background; and they are now going to tell me why I offend, deliver a programme to me and sign me off and say I’m okay to go on through my journey. That doesn’t make any sense. That’s what they do in Government, you know, the Health Minister I thought he was the Transport Minister before, what are you actually qualified to do, what is your skill, your trade? If you put these people in charge of me and then I get out and I don’t change and I reoffend well then why are we so surprised? Because the courses don’t work, they are not designed to work, they are designed the churn people in and churn them out, the figures look good. It is all about doing a white wash.

(EXP 6, 17-12-14)
Another respondent commented:

[Those who delivered the non-accredited programmes] were educated facilitators psychologist people. Better by 100% than PO’s. POs are there to keep you behind the wall and in your cell, to control crime, to look after the jail, to escort you to the gym, to make sure you get fed and all that. These were totally different people coming into the prison to do the courses, because that is what they do, that is what they are educated at, they know what they are doing, they want you to learn.

( EXP 7, 30-1-15)

The majority of responses from programme participants and ex-prisoners in relation to perceptions on facilitators training were consistent and can be summarised by the following quote:

PO’s are not qualified, [Rehabilitation] is not their primary aim; safety and security is. Facilitators, that is their career and their job and they are passionate about it. This makes all the difference. (EXP 8, 22-1-15)

‘Insiders’ versus ‘outsiders’

Who the facilitator is in regards to whether or not they are a member of the prison staff or an outside body is an area that is under-researched. One of few studies that considers this element found that participants made very little distinction between the professional backgrounds of the facilitator (Clarke et al 2004). This research found that the background of a facilitator was ‘irrelevant’ when it came to deciding the attributes of a good tutor. This area was explored further and revealed that prison officers who were also tutors were valued highly as they were viewed by participants as role models outside of the ‘classroom’. The research referred to the strong relationship an officer could develop with a prisoner as a result of being in close proximity to prisoners on the
wing and being able to support them with day-to-day living in custody. Another study carried out found the opposite (which corresponded to the findings obtained for this thesis, which is discussed in more detail below) by suggesting that prisoners appreciated an external interest in their lives, which consequently resulted in increased levels of self-esteem, motivation and respect (Davis 2005).

Respect, safety, fairness and trust are important components in developing a close relationship (Liebling, 2004; Hulley, Liebling and Crewe, 2011) and link to the concepts of morality and legitimacy as discussed in Chapter Two. Respect is the product of not only interpersonal relationships (prison officers being courteous and considerate to offenders) but also from prison officers ‘getting things done’ which is referred to as ‘organisational respect’ (Hulley et al 2011). Prisoners are more respectful towards staff who communicate with them in a dignified and worthwhile manner and those who are honest, trustworthy, fair and effective and responsive in meeting their needs. However, more respect is afforded to prisoners in private prisons than public prisons and not all prison officers prioritised respectful and humane treatment (ibid). Crewe’s (2011: 456) characterisation of ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ power (as discussed in Chapter Two) outlines the authority and control a prison officer has at their disposal. Officers hold a high level of ‘discretionary power’ in their day-to-day duties and play a crucial role when it comes to parole boards and release dates. Officers exercise psychological power in giving prisoners hope and causing them despair (ibid). This level of legitimacy, in the sense of power and authority, can impact on the creation of trust and respect and can be detrimental to the development of supportive relationships, the treatment of offenders
and the learning process throughout their sentence (Sparks et al 1996; Tyler and Huo, 2002).

In exploring this particular area further, respondents gave their opinions on the background of the programme provider. In this instance (as outlined in Chapter Three) there were two possible backgrounds; some facilitators and managers were DART workers and others were prison officers working with the DART team. The data generated here showed that the majority (12 prisoners) of the sample felt more comfortable discussing their issues with ‘an external body’ or DART worker. There was a range of reasons for this. Some resonated with Davis’s (2005) findings that they were ‘externals’ coming into prison to help them and not necessarily to obtain a bigger pay package. They felt privileged in some way to have these ‘outsiders’ working with them.

One commented:

I feel lucky that they are taking the time out to work with me and help me with my problems. (CP 7, 13-5-14)

Others felt that they would be working as a team rather than ‘them versus us’; a common attitude held by prisoners in relation to prisoner officers as seen within the data.

Some participants commented on the fact that DART facilitators were more approachable, friendly and more likely to listen to them than prison officers. Some felt it was easier to build a rapport with someone who was not going to lock them up at the end of the night, assert their authority against them or tell another officer about their problems or what was discussed within the group. This echoes Crewe’s (2011) discussion
of ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ power and the impact this authority can have on building relationships and developing trust. However, it was also noted from the data obtained here that one of the main reasons for favouring external facilitators over internal prison officers had to do with feelings of ease and comfort when talking out loud about personal and other issues. One participant stated the following, echoing Crewe’s (2011) findings on use of ‘discretionary power’:

[It is] so important for the facilitator not to be a screw as you can talk about certain stuff you couldn’t say in front of a screw without getting in trouble for it. (CP 20, 6-12-14)

When analysing this data further it was found that five prisoners had no preference. Participants said that it did not matter if the facilitator was ‘external’ or ‘internal’ as long as their ‘heart was in it’ (CP12, 13-5-14). This group also said that they needed to be trustworthy, supportive and non-judgmental and, if a facilitator had these characteristics, it did not matter what their background was. Only one participant stated that he did not have a preference but that only certain prison officers could carry out this role effectively.

Only two prisoners felt that programmes should be delivered by ‘insiders’ or prison officers. Participants commented that they preferred prison officers because they understood what life on the wing was really like (see also Clarke et al 2004). This group felt more comfortable talking about their problems in front of a prison officer because they were more familiar with them than a stranger coming from the outside. As a result, they understood each other properly and trusted each other. This resonates with the
research carried out by Hulley et al (2011) and Liebling (2004) as discussed above. One respondent commented:

I know I can trust him [a prison officer] as I see him time and time again – unlike the book worm who you might never see again - and I would know if he told anyone anything about me. It would not be worth it for him and he would know that too. (CP 5; 12-5-14)

When discussing the topic with programme facilitators (both ‘external’ and ‘internal’), external providers seemed oblivious to the differences between the two types of facilitators. When questioned about it, one drug worker replied:

I think we have moved on a lot from this. This doesn’t really exist anymore...I don’t see a difference in how they treat staff. I believe we have broken that barrier. (FA3, 12-5-14)

Yet data from the service users suggest this barrier is still very much intact. When the same question was asked to a prison officer who facilitated programmes he replied:

I think there is quite an obvious difference in how they [programme participants] view prison officers and facilitators [externals]. For instance, I walked by a group of participants once and they said ‘ssssh’ and paused their conversation until I had made it to the other side of the room. (FA4, 12-5-14)

Here it is clear that the view of the ‘external’ differs greatly to the understanding and lived experience of the ‘internal’ prison officer. Again, this may demonstrate a characteristic in the prison culture as the external facilitator proved to be oblivious to the prison officers’ struggle to fully integrate, engage and develop a trusting relationship with the participants.

How?
The term ‘andragogy’, coined by Malcolm Knowles in the 1960s, was discussed in Chapter Two and refers to the skill of assisting adult learning. This chapter drew attention to other literature, which explored this area and highlighted the significance of providing adults with opportunities to consider and find solutions to their own individual problems, engage with others, take ownership of their own learning and thus emphasised the importance of learner-centred approaches (Hillier, 2002; Huddleston and Unwin, 2002). This was an area that was explored further for the purpose of this thesis in order to discover whether or not participants felt they were in control of their learning and if the content was challenging enough for them. The data obtained produced mixed reviews. In relation to accredited programmes that had been completed in the past (18 having completed at least one accredited programme) over half of all current prisoner participants expressed how unchallenging and un-interactive the programmes were. Many participants (both serving and ex-prisoners) commented on how they possessed little control over what they were learning and how rigid the layout and structure of such programmes were. Others commented on the fact that they finished the course early, which again suggests that they too were unchallenged by the content. An ex-prisoner stated:

It’s just annoying when you know yourself you don’t need to go on a course, for example TSP and they make you do it anyway. (EXP 1, 11-8-14)

Participants also commented on the patronising content, with many stating that they felt insulted by the facilitator’s lack of appreciation that the material was pure common sense to them. My research found that approaches to teaching in accredited interventions failed to impress participants, which in turn negatively impacted on their rehabilitative experience.
With non-accredited programmes, participants generally seemed a lot more content with the approach to learning. Participants discussed the level of flexibility afforded to facilitators, which impacted positively on their opportunity for ownership and control of the intervention. Instead of the programme layout being strict and time-bound, participants stated that they were given the chance to tailor the sessions more to meet their needs, which inevitably made for a more engaging experience. Therefore, the research found that participants preferred a more relaxed and individualistic approach to learning. This questions the appropriateness of highly structured accredited programmes that are rigid and leave little time for interaction and collaborative processes.

Another area that lacks in-depth research as highlighted by Dowden et al (2004) is that which focuses on effective staff techniques used in the delivery of an intervention. In this research, they referred to work carried out by Andrews and Kiessling (1980) which outlined the five dimensions to be utilised in order for effective correctional practices to be attained, as mentioned earlier. Other effective approaches to rehabilitation include firm and fair authority, anti-criminal modelling and reinforcement, problem solving techniques and the building of relationships through caring and motivated approaches (Andrews and Bonta, 1998). As highlighted in Chapter Two, teaching techniques and methods utilised by facilitators impact greatly on the atmosphere created during the delivery of an intervention and the willingness of participants to engage (Hurry et al 2005). Teaching techniques and innovative approaches to rehabilitation such as the inclusion of role playing and other games and activities increase participant
engagement, concentration levels and responses (also mentioned in Chapter Two) (Hurry et al 2010). Many offenders associate rehabilitative interventions with negative past educational experiences (Hawley, Murphy and Souto-Otero, 2013), which may contribute to the need for creative approaches to teaching. Group work can be beneficial as participants feel this method of teaching makes ‘a good contrast to sitting and listening’ (Clarke et al 2004: 12). Participants wanted something to do instead of listening to the facilitator continuously talking at them. They were happy to sit and listen to other participants talk about their problems and experiences as this gave them the opportunity to reassess their own beliefs and perceptions having heard from new and differing viewpoints (ibid). However, overall, little research has been carried out on what other teaching techniques participants find beneficial.

Programme participants and facilitators interviewed for this thesis were asked for their views on the teaching techniques and styles adapted and utilised. It was found that the course content was presented to the participants via the use of the flip chart. This teaching method was met with mixed reviews. The majority of participants felt the technique was useful as it allowed for further explanation to be presented and thus enabled a greater understanding of the points being made. However, some were not impressed with the quality and effectiveness of this display tool. One commented:

It would have been alright if the flip chart actually worked. She had to keep holding it up and tried to sellotape it up and it kept falling down. You could see she was getting stressed out with it all. The idea was good as it is good to see the lesson developing and what she actually wants you to bring out but it was frustrating that it didn’t work well. It would have helped more if
The lack of resources available was obvious during the observational element of my research. The flip chart paper was being reused repeatedly and the quality of the paper was poor with visible rips in several places. The fact that the paper had already been used several times before questioned how ‘tailor-made’ the programme was. It also raised questions in relation to how valued the programme was in the eyes of the staff who delivered it and the establishment that afforded it resources.

The programme observed also utilised teaching techniques such as ‘Design Thinking (case method)’ which allowed for group analysis and brain storming; ‘Concept Mapping’ which enabled participants to focus on a specific problem or issue and then create a map which helped them resolve the problem; and ‘Role Playing’ which required each participant to adopt a role of a person affected by an issue and study the issue from the view of that particular person. Each of the teaching techniques required the participants to talk openly and freely in front of each other. Participants reacted well to this style of teaching expressing their appreciation for the opportunity to listen to other people’s problems. This also became a realisation point for participants that they were not alone and in some cases, other participants were in worse situations than themselves. One participant admitted, after hearing about another group member’s problem, that ‘this could actually happen to me’ which demonstrated a sudden moment of clarity and realisation.

The Power of Dialogue: Listening, Being Listened to and Opening Up
Prisoners value staff who take them seriously and respond to their concerns (Hulley et al 2012). This was because not only was an issue being resolved or considered but they were being listened to and respected. The Prisoner Education Trust (2014) works towards enabling prisoner learner voices to be heard with the goal being to influence policy and practice. It believes that prisoners need to be listened to in order to understand their needs. Dialogue improves relationships and increases participation by giving prisoners opportunities to be included and by sharing ideas. It is also substantive in improving communications by enabling prisoners to open up and share their experiences with others in a safe environment (Jewkes, 2001; Innes and Clarke, 2013).

Being listened to by facilitators and fellow prisoners was something that was regarded highly by participants from data accumulated for this thesis. This was evident as 11 prisoners expressed how important this was to them and at the same time how rare it was for someone to take the time to sit and listen to them. Participants explained that this was beneficial to them and one participant said:

Most of the time we just want to talk about our problems and have someone listen to them but no one has time to listen and I feel that it would really help to share and learn from other people’s experiences.

(CP3, 12-5-14)

These non-accredited programmes allowed for this and participants felt this to be very beneficial in being able to ‘get something of my chest’, as described by another participant, while at the same time being able to relate to another’s experiences. For some participants this was the first time they had ever sat down and discussed their
drug issues and for others the opportunity had finally come for them to talk freely and to be heard. Participant eight said:

I needed to get the demons out of my head or otherwise they would have just stayed in there and I would have gone mad. This course allowed me to talk.  

(CP8, 13-5-14)

Another said:

I quite liked it once I got into it and got listening to peoples stories and then every morning I thought to myself I can’t wait to go to class so that I could get all this stuff in my head out. Because if you don’t talk and you keep everything in you start getting depressed, you’re almost like a time bomb then where you can just go off at any minute so it was good to get it all out.  

(CP 6, 12-5-14)

Although the benefits of talking openly about ones’ issues and problems are clearly highlighted here, unfortunately, at times the importance of this process was overlooked by facilitators delivering accredited programme. One participant said:

If we were discussing something they would stop us and go on to something else ...When people talked about their problems, I could relate to them and get feedback from them but they kept stopping us.  

(CP 10, 13-6-14)

Where?

As highlighted in Chapter Two, Martinson (1974) commented on the impact the conditions under which a programme was delivered can have on reducing the rate of re-offending. The location of a programme relates to the condition under which a programme is delivered and hence was further explored in order to establish if in fact this was an important element, which affected engagement and the creation of a working atmosphere. Very little other research pays attention to where in the prison a
programme is delivered. My research explored the location of the programme delivery in more detail. An overwhelming majority (19 participants) of respondents commented on the importance of the location of a programme. In this instance, the programme was delivered in the Health Centre, which was situated in a separate building away from the wings. The participants’ opinions towards this were as follows; nine participants felt that it was really important to be away from everyone else on the wing as being on the wing was a distraction and there was no privacy. As a result of the programme being delivered elsewhere there was a completely different ethos and participants were more relaxed and focused. Interviewee CP17 said that he was so relaxed that he didn’t feel like he was in jail. Eight prisoners felt that having the course delivered away from the wing allowed them to concentrate properly.

On the wing the TVs are on, there are 160 men talking and shouting about and there is so much banging of doors. The course was in the Health Centre, which was quiet and allowed you to think and concentrate as it was off the wing. Being in a different atmosphere makes such a difference and is a lot better. (CP 4, 12-5-14)

One prisoner associated it with college with one participant saying that he felt like he was going to a ‘college of learning in comparison with sitting on the wing like every other day’ (CP 8, 13-5-14). Another participant felt it was beneficial to attend a course in a different environment, as he did not like to work where he lived and slept (CP 19, 6-10-14). Only one participant remarked that he did not mind where the course was delivered. From this data, it can be seen that the location of a programme is an important factor for a range of reasons depending on the individual. Participants commented that in the past when programmes were delivered on the wing that they
were easily distracted by other prisoners on the wings and as a result failed to fully engage in the course. One went further to say:

I’ve done a few courses on the wing in the past and to be honest with ya I couldn’t even tell ya the name of them now ‘cause I wasn’t listening to a word that was going on ‘cause firstly the noise in the background was too loud and secondly ‘cause I was keeping an eye on what was going on around me; I wouldn’t bother doing another one if it was on the wing.

(CP 7, 13-5-14)

Other factors taken into consideration when discussing the location of the programme was the amount of natural light the room obtained and the facilities available to them within the room. Here participants observed the fact that one entire wall was made of glass which enabled lots of light to get in and also highlighted the advantages of a sink and running water as this allowed for them to make a hot drink before the session commenced and then again halfway through. On many occasions, participants informed me of their preference for this particular room in the Health Centre over another available room. This preferred room had temporary sliding doors and was directly in front of the reception desk, however, participants stated that this fact did not bother them and instead re-emphasised the positive aspects of the setting. Nevertheless, the issue with this location was the fact that these were the only facilities available to staff and so, regardless of its availability; this room was only ever used occasionally.

This relates back to prison culture and the fact that staff accessibility to these facilities at particular times in the morning was given priority over the preference of programme participants, the comfort they experienced and the atmosphere these conditions
created whilst undertaking a rehabilitative course. From the above, it is clear that the location of the programme impacts on the decision-making processes to participate in a programme or not and on participants’ concentration levels due to environmental distractions.

**Barriers to Successful Delivery and Completion of an Intervention**

Many factors impact on the successful delivery of an intervention and have been discussed previously (i.e. trained facilitators, effective approaches to teaching, flexibility, innovation, group size and so on). However, one issue, in particular, was repeatedly stressed by both staff and current and ex-prisoners. This related to the transfer of prisoners from one establishment to the next and was discussed in more detail in Chapter Two. The impact of overcrowding on increased transfers have been explored by many (Crewe, 2009; National Skills Forum, 2010; Criminal Justice Alliance, 2012; Tickle, 2013). Over 30% of courses were not completed as a direct consequence of prisoner transfers. Abrupt transfers damage motivation and enthusiasm to partake in other courses and also increase feelings of anger and frustration (Tickle, 2013). This procedure was arguably the most detrimental to an offender’s rehabilitation as it involved the transfer of a prisoner to another establishment irrespective of their engagement and participation in an intervention.

The research carried out for this thesis explored the potential impact ‘detainment’ and ‘transfers’ of programme participants had on their motivations towards participation in another intervention thereafter from the perspective of each sample group. Firstly, it was found that it was unlikely for a participant to be transferred to another programme
if the programme they were partaking in was accredited; however, it was more likely that a participant was transferred if the programme was non-accredited. The first group of participants; ‘Managers and Prison Staff’ supported this action of transferral by stating that although it was unfair to move a prisoner to another prison once they were partaking in a non-accredited programme, they only removed prisoners for security reasons. This group agreed that this had little bearing on prisoner’s decisions to volunteer for a non-accredited programme in the future nor did it impact on how they viewed these programmes in terms of their value and status.

The second group of participants, facilitators, discussed the fact that a lack of ‘detainment’ for non-accredited programmes affected greatly on rates of completion. FA5 stated:

> The failure to complete by some participants was solely because they got transferred to another prison during the programme; however, with accredited programmes once they are on them they cannot be taken off them and transferred. (FA5, 12-5-14)

Facilitators also felt that as a result of this discrepancy these programmes were being viewed by the prison as less significant. As a consequence of this prisoners then too viewed these programmes as less important which may impact on participation, engagement and completion of the course. When discussing this point with the prisoners, all but one participant agreed that non-accredited programmes were seen as less important because they could be ‘shipped out’ at any time during participation and as a result of this they felt that there was no point in volunteering for a course that you might not get to complete. The remaining one participant felt that if there was a course
that interested him then he would participate for that reason alone regardless of detainment.

Ex-prisoners also expressed strong opinions in relation to this point. Each participant felt that the uncertainty regarding the possibility of transferral impacted greatly on their decisions to participate, engage, their experience and how useful and valuable the programme was to them in the past. EXP 1 stated:

This has a massive effect on the individual. A prisoner may have been very troublesome and then the staff work with him to calm him down and put him on a useful course and then all of a sudden they come along and say right you’re moving and going to a prison that doesn’t run that programme.

(EXPR 1, 11-8-14)

Each of the participants stated that there was no point in volunteering for a course for this reason and admitted that they viewed non-accredited interventions, which failed to guarantee detainment, as less significant than accredited programmes as a result. Some also observed the prisons disregard for these programmes because of transferrals and lack of detainment regardless of the participants’ progress. EXP 6 commented:

If a prison wants to move you for whatever reason, you’re gone, even if you’re getting on well on that course. You being on that course is at the bottom of their priority list.

(EXPR 6, 17-12-14)

It is clear to see from the above that once again the perspectives of each of the sample groups differed on the impact of this issue on programme participants and future participants. It is also apparent that detainment within a prison for those who are successfully participating in a course is important to offenders and essential to their
successful completion. It was also found that a lack of this practice damaged their perspective on the usefulness and value of such a course.

**Conclusion: The Rehabilitation Lottery**

This chapter considered many factors, which contribute to the effective delivery of an intervention, which emerged from the data obtained for my research. Who the facilitator is is central to how a participant will engage with the programme. The importance of interpersonal skills and good relationships are highlighted within the literature and also arose from the data. The need for knowledge and understanding of the course subject area should not be undervalued as this too is emphasised as essential along with other characteristics such as confidence, fairness and passion. The level of training a facilitator received along with their qualifications was another area explored within this chapter. Here it was found that facilitators of accredited programmes seemed to receive more training than those delivering non-accredited programmes. It was also observed that those who facilitated the programme observed for my research obtained very little training and believed that the reason for this was probably because the course was non-accredited.

The next issue explored was that of the differences between ‘insiders’ or prison officers and ‘outsiders’ or non-prison officers delivering programmes. The different perspectives among the sample groups were observed and once again, a lack of consistency was found. A range of reasons as to why participants and ex-prisoners preferred prison officers or outsiders were explored and it was found that overall the sample groups had
a preference for ‘outsiders’ due to their passion and dedication to work towards rehabilitating them.

Following that an investigation into ‘how’ a programme is delivered and in what way this contributes to successful engagement and contribution in an intervention was carried out. Here it was found that many participants longed for more challenging courses and were at times insulted by the lack of control afforded to them in the delivery of the programme. This related to previous discussions on content, innovation and flexibility as seen in Chapter Six. It led to an examination of teaching techniques and approaches, which highlighted a lack of resources and the need for a range of teaching styles. The power of dialogue was discussed and it was found that participants valued the opportunity to speak, be heard and to listen to others. This resonates with earlier findings on issues of flexibility as discussed in Chapter Six and highlighted the need for flexibility and the effects of strict and rigid programme manuals. The importance of the right location for a programme was also considered and it was found that finding the correct setting increased concentration levels and heightened participants’ overall rehabilitative experience. Finally, the last main area explored related to transfers and detainment. Here it was observed that the prison treats the two main types of offending behaviour programmes differently which impacts on prison culture and thus negatively impacts on prisoners’ perceptions towards non-accredited programmes and their participation in future rehabilitative interventions.

Overall this chapter demonstrates that whether or not a facilitator is flexible in their approach prioritising the needs of the offender rather than programme integrity can
make a huge difference to the atmosphere created, the opportunities for offenders to express themselves and the chance to listen and learn from others. If facilitators are lucky enough they will facilitate a programme having received the necessary and appropriate level of training. If participants are lucky enough they will work with a facilitator who is passionate, motivated, approachable and caring, otherwise they may be taught by a facilitator who lacks these qualities, is inexperienced, untrained or unsupportive of rehabilitation. If participants are fortunate, sufficient resources, appropriate facilities and classroom will be available, otherwise they will have limited resources afforded to them and will be distracted by noise and other prisoners within the prison.

Therefore, in order to increase the likelihood of successful rehabilitation more attention needs to be directed towards what prisoners want and need and where they must go in order to increase the possibilities of them achieving this. More focus needs to be directed towards the type of programmes being delivered in prisons, the range of programmes being offered, the people delivering such programmes and the flexibility afforded to them. Once again, the concept of a ‘rehabilitation lottery’ is present.
CHAPTER EIGHT
ENGAGEMENT: WHO PLAYS THE REHABILITATION LOTTERY?

Introduction

The preceding chapters have discussed the main findings of the research and have highlighted the views and opinions of all those involved in relation to rehabilitation, and more specifically, offending behaviour programmes delivered in prisons at the micro-level. Although my research did not set out to carry out a comparative study between accredited and non-accredited programmes, it was impossible not to link them as most participants judged one against the other and many differences were observed from one target group to the next. As a result, this final findings chapter considers the implications of both accredited and non-accredited offending behaviour programmes. Themes such as accreditation, creativity, flexibility, integrity and motivation have been explored and have demonstrated that many factors impact on an offender’s journey towards rehabilitation and their opportunity to achieve positive outcomes. The probability and possibility of improving one’s lifestyle and potential to desist from crime altogether has been referred to as a ‘lottery’ from the start of this thesis. This chapter considers the various levels of engagement by each of the target groups in the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ and illustrates how the human component is a factor that makes the micro-level ‘rehabilitation lottery’ even more complicated. It demonstrates that factors such as prison culture, available resources and prisoners’ attitudes surrounding interventions, especially those ‘accredited’ in nature, have turned rehabilitation into a game; a box-ticking charade where everyone involved is fully aware of how to play the game, how to
get from one level to the next and what hoops to jump through in order to obtain the desired outcomes.

The chapter is divided into three main sections: (1) ‘In it to win it’; (2) ‘Weighing down the balls’ and; (3) ‘Deflated Balls’. Throughout, the chapter refers to the management, facilitation and participation in OBPs as partaking (in one-way or another) in ‘the game’. A typology of players is proposed based on how each of the sample groups contribute and engage with the game. These consist of ‘managers’, ‘professional players’, ‘amateur players’ and ‘spectators’ (See Mawby (2002) for a not dissimilar typology example). The ‘managers’ create the game and ensure that the rules (often drawn up by them) are followed. The ‘professional players’ are focused on targets, administrative and bureaucratic processes and ‘play’ for financial or other individual reasons. The ‘amateur players’ participate out of a genuine interest and desire to progress and develop. The ‘spectators’ are aware of the game, understand the rules but choose not to partake at present. This chapter aims to highlight prison culture in relation to rehabilitation and expose the many flaws and game-like characteristics that exist. It proposes the need to take into consideration the views and opinions of those who are subjected to monotonous and old-fashioned interventions and inject excitement and enthusiasm in order to capture prisoners’ interest and produce positive outcomes.

‘In It To Win It’: Prison Priorities and Bureaucratic Requirements

The Private Finance Initiative (PFI) was announced by the Conservative Government in 1992 which increased private sector involvement in the provision of public services (Roe and Craig, 2004). The Criminal Justice Act 1991 was amended which now means that the
private sector can be involved with the construction and management of prisons (Panchamia, n.d.). This allows for private companies (currently Sodexo, G4S and Serco) to tender for contracts to Design, Construct, Manage and Finance (DCMF) or manage and maintain a prison. Whichever sector (private or public) wins the bid is subject to a range of measures or targets. For PFIs and privately managed prisons these are monitored against contractual performance measures and the contractor is subject to financial penalties if they fail to meet these measures. However, the targets are also based on a Payment by Results scheme which means that if the company does comply with its performance measures and results are achieved then the company will receive a predetermined payment. The public sector equivalents of these measures are Key Performance Targets (KPTs) and Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). KPIs are established by the Home Office in consultation with the Director General of the Prison Service (Solomon, 2004) and KPTs are supplementary extended outcome measures requested internally. These indicators and targets monitor and measure an establishment’s performance against ‘objectives outlined in corporate and business plans and priorities set by the Prison Service Management Board’ (Solomon, 2004: 2). Areas monitored include the following: escapes; serious assaults; drug testing; purposeful activity; overcrowding; self-inflicted deaths /suicides; offending behaviour; staff sickness; race equality; education; resettlement and; prisoner escorts (ibid). Prison managers and staff are pressured into ensuring that they are constantly working towards meeting these targets. Part of the reason for this is because establishments are subject to financial penalties, based on the reward/penalty model, if they fail in any of these respects.
There are positive and negative aspects surrounding this system of measuring performance. On the one hand, it allows for consistency in monitoring and measuring from one establishment to the next. It also ensures that prisons remain focused on keeping prisoners securely, registering them for drug, alcohol and/or offending behaviour courses, educating and training them to increase their employability and aiding them with their resettlement needs for when they are released from prison. On the other hand, there are many disadvantages, two of which include: (1) Demoralised staff which impacts on productivity and (2) neglecting the needs of the prisoners.

Considering the first point more closely, strict and rigid targets can be detrimental to staff morale resulting in staff feeling discouraged due to their lack of involvement in drawing up targets (House of Commons, 2003; Solomon, 2004; HM Chief Inspector of Prisons, 2015b). Solomon (2004: 5) also comments that ‘staff can feel that proprieties are being distorted and they are being pressed to meet unrealistic targets that can stifle innovation’. The second drawback relates to prisoner individuality and the lack of consideration directed towards this. These targets fail to reflect the services prisoners require as they are imposed from the centre to improve prison performance measures more generally (Prison Reform Trust, 2003). Solomon (2004: 5) notes that ‘this can result in prisoners being placed on programmes in order to get numbers up and meet KPIs rather than as a result of a prisoner’s actual needs’. The targets aim to measure and

---

19 See Chapter Two (section subtitled ‘Importance of Technique –How?’) for a discussion surrounding Crewe’s (2009) research into the impact of performance targets.

Chapter Six also analyses the perceptions of programme participants interviewed for this thesis in relation to performance measures and targets. See the subtitled section ‘Content’ for more information.
ultimately improve the performance of a prison; however, instead they distort priorities, diminish innovation, dishearten staff and, fuel cynicism, distrust and pessimism amongst prisoners (Prison Reform Trust, 2002; Solomon, 2004; The House of Commons, 2015). Poor staff morale, lack of faith and confidence in certain interventions and pressures to assist in meeting targets was also evident from my data:

According to psychologists they [accredited programmes] work. ETS and TSP work we’re told but then again they would say that wouldn’t they? Me, I think it’s [about] putting the right people on the right course. Are they ready to change? (M1, 2-6-14)

Other facilitators referred to the fact that some accredited programmes are so rigid and strict that often the atmosphere is uncomfortable for both participants and facilitators, impacting on staff morale and productivity. The group size also influences the effectiveness of interventions as often facilitators are forced to increase the group size in order to improve the completion rate, even when both groups (programme participants and facilitators) felt smaller groups were more effective:

Managers push for 12 [participants on a course] but with eight to nine the dynamics are good. They get time to think and talk and they need that. (FA6, 13-5-14)

This highlights that the prison’s main priority is the achievement of targets at the expense of quality, motivated and enthusiastic staff and the production of positive outcomes. As a result, the focus on priorities and targets set the wheels in motion and ‘the game’ commences.
Managers, programme facilitators, ex and current prisoners all play a role in satisfying bureaucratic administrative requirements. Managers in particular must ensure that interventions are in place that satisfy the criteria set out by NOMS and meet the needs of the offenders accommodating their establishment. M2 was asked how and why the non-accredited programme had been chosen for implementation in the prison. Her response focused primarily on adhering to government strategies and policies:

‘Inclusion’ [her employer] as an organisation produced IRP in response to the introduction of the Government’s new National Drug Strategy ‘Reducing demand, restricting supply, building recovery: supporting people to live a drug-free life’. It also incorporates changes to NOMS set out in the Ministry of Justice Green paper ‘Breaking the Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders’. (M2, 3-6-14)

External facilitators also referred to administrative duties and bureaucratic processes during the interviews; however, their viewpoints were different. Here it was observed that NOMS also fitted into the ‘managers’ category within this typology as its use of power and control were elements strongly detected by these external facilitators. Crewe’s (2007) conceptualisation of ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ power echoed in a response obtained by one facilitator when discussing the commissioning of a programme. Here she stated:

You have to play the game to stay in the game. (FA 1, 11-2-14)

When prompted to further explain such a statement the respondent said:

There isn’t a harder, more unreasonable or less progressive place to possibly start. You need to tick all their boxes even if they don’t really apply to you...Commissioning is like black magic, but if you don’t do what they want, you haven’t a chance; You have to do it their way. (FA 1, 11-2-14)
As previously mentioned, FA 2 too aired his opinion in relation to NOMS and the power it possessed:

NOMS muscle in and change it to what they want and not what the prisoner needs. They have all these rules and regulations and want to change it to their type of programme. What is the point in that? (FA 2, 30-1-14)

It is clear, then, that managers and lead facilitators are aware of the bureaucratic requirements set out by NOMS, which must be met in order to receive commissioning, become an accredited programme or obtain the label of Effective Regime Intervention.

It also became apparent from this data that creators and facilitators of rehabilitative interventions view NOMS as having the monopoly over prison programmes (a viewpoint shared by Chambers (2010)) and that they must abide by its rules whether or not they agree with them in order to be part of the rehabilitation process. This material demonstrated that some facilitators feel that they have no choice but become ‘professional players’ even if they only wish to be ‘amateurs’. 20

The Courts: Allocation and Rehabilitation
The Court is another authoritative body that plays a crucial role in ‘the game’ often overlooked by researchers. Not only does it possess the power to determine the type of punishment one should receive but it also is responsible for the allocation of a prisoner to an institution. Usually a court will allocate a prisoner to a prison within their local area (Offenders’ Families Helpline, 2015). However, on occasions, the local establishment

20 Prisoners (current and past) are also aware of the governmental/organisational requirements in place. Many participants referred to ‘the system’, ‘targets’, ‘bums on seats’, ‘jumping through hoops’ and other similar phrases when discussing these issues (explored in more detail later on).
may be above its Certified Normal Accommodation and thus unable to accommodate an offender or the prisoner may be a high risk of escaping thus allocated elsewhere. Offenders are referred to a security category based on their likelihood of escaping and causing harm to themselves, other prisoners or prison staff (Ministry of Justice, 2011b). The purpose of allocation is set out in the Prison Service Instruction (40): Categorisation

Function - Categorisation and Recategorisation Of Adult Male Prisoners:

To assess the risks posed by a prisoner in terms of: likelihood of escape or abscond, the risk of harm to the public in the event of an escape or abscond and, any control issues that impact on the security and good order of the prison and the safety of those within it. (Ministry of Justice, 2011b: 6)

From this section, risk and security seem to be the main purpose behind categorisation.

When explored further, the instruction refers to the principles of categorisation:

All prisoners must have assigned to them, the lowest security category consistent with managing their needs in terms of security and control and must meet all the criteria of the category for which they are being assessed (i.e. for Category D this will mean that they are low risk of harm, can be reasonably trusted not to abscond and for whom open conditions are appropriate i.e. will usually be within the time to serve limit) .... A prisoner's security category must never be adjusted to achieve a better match with available spaces within the estate. However, it should be noted that where population pressures exist or where it is in the prisoner’s own best interests (for example, to access or complete an offender behaviour programme), he may be allocated to or retained in a prison of a higher security category than that assigned to him. (Ministry of Justice, 2011b: 6)

The focus is primarily on harm and risk. Sending a prisoner to a particular prison solely because of vacancies is not permitted; however, exceptions will be made where a prison offers a particular course that the offender is required is complete. The process that
takes place following categorisation is as follows: once categorisation has been confirmed, a prisoner is then sent to a prison within that category. Consideration is then given to the suitability of the allocation. Here factors such as their needs, the services on offer and the proximity to their family are taken into account. However, the increasing prison population has since affected this process and has resulted in prisoners being placed in prisons within their security category and not necessarily prisons which best met their needs (Jewkes and Bennett, 2013).

When discussing prison allocations with respondents for this thesis, it became apparent that some participants (current and ex-prisoners) were aware that the prison they were sent to could have a huge impact on their chances of rehabilitation, future re-offending and state of mind. This group of participants seemed to correspond to those in the ‘amateur’ typology as they genuinely seemed to care about the establishment they were sent to and the range of programmes it had to offer. EXP 7 discussed the fact that there was a course on his sentence plan he never got to complete:

> I didn’t start it [ETS] ‘cause the course wasn’t running in the prison I was in which makes a bit of a mockery of it really doesn’t it? I was then moved to Stocken and they put me down for it again there and I think perhaps I missed the first course\(^{21}\) and by the time the next course came around I was released so I never did it. (EXP 7, 30-1-15)

This response questions the quality of the choices made by the governing bodies or ‘professional players’ and ‘managers’ as the participant was brought into the game yet...

\(^{21}\) This participant later went on to explain how he struggled to settle into prison life, which meant that his only coping mechanism at the time was shutting himself away hence failing to participate in any rehabilitative programmes.
was not given the opportunity to play. This may have impacted negatively on the prisoner’s future perception of the game and whether or not they chose to become ‘professional players’, ‘amateurs ‘or simply ‘spectators’ in the future.\footnote{Chapter One discusses how participation in certain types of interventions can act as a doorway to the involvement with other educational and rehabilitative programmes (Langelid, Maki, Raundnip, Svenson, 2009; Bamford and Skipper, 2007).}

One participant could be viewed as a genuine amateur as he differentiated between two categories of prison and the range of programmes offered in each. He stated:

I’d rather go to a B Cat any day, forget C Cats as nothing happens there, C Cats are dead time nothing’s going on. B Cats, depending on where you are sent, you can hit the lottery and win the jackpot. (EXP 6, 17-12-14)

Another ex-prisoner commented on how he was transferred to various prisons in order to get a place on a programme and how this extended his prison sentence:

There was a big backlog when they were transferring me. They sent me to Moorland to do TSP and there were no spaces on the course and then I turned 21 so I had to get transferred again and so in the end I did 18 months over my tariff. They don’t seem to understand the system very well. They should look more deeply into what a prisoner needs to do for his sentence and where he needs to go ‘cause it seems as though they just wanna get you out of their prison and into another one and let them deal with you […].

(EXP 8, 22-1-15)

He then explained how he was given a choice of where to serve the remainder of his sentence. The response demonstrates how important this decision was in terms of aiding or hindering his rehabilitation. It also highlights how the prison failed to fully
inform the participant of the significance of his decision and the opportunities that would be available:

When I turned 21 they said to me ‘Lowdham Grange or Dovegate?’ and I didn’t know which one to pick so I picked Lowdham and I’m so glad I did ‘cause it’s so different to Dovegate ‘cause that is where I spent all my time and done everything. Now when I look back I think how different things could have been if I hadn’t picked Lowdham. It had all the courses. Some jails are absolute tips but then others are like Lowdham where they are nice and there are lots of courses that you can go on if you want.

(EXP 8, 22-1-15)

He too could be referred to as an ‘amateur’ as he realised how fortunate he was to choose a prison that had a range of interventions on offer. This quote demonstrates the importance of prisoner allocations and transfers. It also highlights how vital it is that prisoners make an informed decision based on their individual needs and what an establishment might have to offer. It emphasises the fact this offender was responsible for his own rehabilitation when this should have been the role and priority of the prison service.

One ex-prisoner was viewed as a ‘professional player’ when he discussed the financial benefits of participating in courses. He explained how many prisoners took part in ETS to get time out the cell and obtain the £10 incentive. He pointed out that some prisons offered £25 for participation in this course and expressed his disappointment that this

---

23 Here the participant mentions two Serco-run prisons, yet is making a distinction between the range of courses on offer in each of the prisons.
was not the case in the prison he had been allocated to. He also considered the future implications of participation in the course. He commented:

[Participation in ETS] knackers you up for the future ‘cause when you do it you go on the national registry for the course so if you get in trouble further down the line it comes up and they say well you have done the ETS programme so you should have known better. (EXP3, 1-10-14)

**Prisoners: Playing the Game**

As previously mentioned, offenders imprisoned for 12 months or more receive a sentence plan which they must adhere to in order to satisfy the parole board and ultimately be released\(^{24}\) (OASys) (PRT, n.d.). Prisoners are aware of the parole board process and have no option but to conform to the bureaucratic and administrative requirements and obtain the necessary number of ‘ticks in the box’. ‘Game theory’ claims that ‘prison behaviour is the product of rational persons who calculate the consequences of their actions and try to maximise their payoffs subject to the environmental constraints’ (Kaminski, 2004: 4). ‘A clever move can shorten one’s sentence, save one from rape or a beating, keep one’s spirit high, or increase one’s access to resources’ (ibid:1). Therefore, some prisoners choose to play the game in order to achieve or avoid a particular outcome.

The importance of participant motivations and the impact of deprivation of autonomy was discussed in Chapter Two. Clarke et al (2004) considered the use of power and control when affording prisoners with the right to choose which programmes to
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\(^{24}\) See Chapters One and Five for further information regarding OASys and sentence plans.
participate in themselves. Often offenders’ readiness and desire to change is replaced with pressures to partake (Hörnqvist, 2010). Compulsory and voluntary choices in relation to programme participation was discussed with current and ex-prisoners for this thesis. Here the rational decision-making process was evident along with offenders’ awareness of their role in ‘the game’. Many participants were found to fit within the ‘professional players’ category along with those who were forced down this route by ‘managers’ and bureaucratic requirements. Some participants spoke about their frustrations at having to ‘play the game’ and satisfy such administrative goals:

It’s just annoying when you know yourself you don’t need to go on a course, for example, Thinking Skills, and they make you do it anyway. I got the highest score on that course, I think I got something like 98% so I actually proved to them that I didn’t need to do that course but got my tick in the box anyway. (EXP 1, 11-8-14)

OBPs are sometimes referred to as ‘cynical box-ticking exercise[s]’ (Schinkel, 2014: 153 and Fletcher and Batty, 2012) and often paying for outputs leads to a “‘bums on seats’ or ‘tick-box’ culture’ (Champion, 2013: 17). Phrases such as ‘box-ticking’, ‘jumping through the hoops’ and ‘meeting targets’ echoed from one interview carried out for the thesis to the next. Current and ex-prisoners recognised the flaws in the system but also understood that the rules of the game had already been established and there was very little they could do to change this. Instead, prisoners had to become involved and play the game according to rules rather than spectate or play their own amateur game. EXP 6 explained his understanding of the process as follows:

It’s a box ticking thing so in the end I passed it ‘cause I had to ‘cause it was on my sentence plan and I was in an A Cat and I needed to move to a B Cat and in order to do that I had to pass this course so I did [...]. I think there are
people that don’t care about us [...] and then I think there is another set of people that think that we have disadvantages. We come from disadvantaged communities [...] education is a massive one so that when we go to jail they are so focused on trying to address this issue, thinking that everyone needs to be able to read and write, [...] ‘cause if you can’t [read or write] then you can’t go on TSP or ETS you can’t go on CALM. They can’t put a barrier in front of a course they say is there to help somebody. So they think we get money for you to do that and then we get money for you to do that and we’ll get the numbers up and you’ll come out with a certificate but we’ll put all the answers up on the board for ya. It’s a cattle market.

(EXP 6, 17-12-14)

He further stated:

Victim Awareness I volunteered for as I thought I’m going to get all these courses out of the way and get my B Cat. [...] So you end up doing it for the system, the prison ‘cause it looks good, for you and for them. They are putting prisoners through risk reduction courses. Then they can say: ‘Look, we have put 80,000 prisoners through these courses’. But then you get the [re-offending] statistics back and you see that more than half of them are back in prison...

(EXP 6, 17-12-14)

What is apparent from the above is the participant’s lack of confidence, respect and trust in the system. However, regardless of this, he still ‘played the game’ because he had to. CP8 (13-5-14) summarises this point nicely:

When you have to do a course to get out of jail you will do it but when you don’t you will just opt out of it.

Apart from lack of autonomy, there are many other reasons why prisoners ‘play the game’. These motivations were highlighted in Chapter Two in which research conducted by Braggins and Talbot (2003), The Select Committee Report (2005) and the All-Party
Parliamentary Report (2004) were explored. Such research considered the influences of incentives, time out of cells and other perks. The data obtained for this thesis found two main reasons for prisoners ‘playing the game’, which mirrors previous literature. The first related to transfers to another establishment while the other was to improve one’s standard of living inside. Here participants referred to money, time out of cells, perks such as extra food and extra gym time. When EXP 2 was asked; ‘did you have the opportunity to volunteer for any programmes when you were in prison?’ he responded:

No not really. It was sort of mandatory when I was inside. You sort of had to do education or else you lost your T.V. or if you didn’t go workshop or a course you lost your T.V. and to lose your T.V. in prison is pretty much everything ‘cause that’s the only thing you’ve got to do. (EXP 2, 26-8-14)

Another participant commented:

I did ETS to get extra time out of cell and extra £10 although some jails give ya £25. I wonder how many people think that’s actually benefited them. The system isn’t working. (EXP 3, 1-10-14)

CP5 (12-5-14) stated:

I volunteered so that I had money for the canteen every week. Also I was turning into a vegetable sitting in the cell all day. I had to complete this course first before I could go to a workshop, but now that I have completed the course I am getting released so cannot go on to the workshop now.

Other participants could be viewed as ‘spectators of ‘the game’ as they either opted out or were sceptical about becoming involved at all. This group considered the consequences of participating in the programme and raised concerns about visits and
about the distance they would be from their families if there were to partake in a programme in another establishment:

Some of the D Cats are miles away – so I opted to stay in a Cat C instead of getting transferred to a D Cat for a programme. (EXP 3, 1-10-14)

EXP 4 (2-9-14) commented:

You’re thinking when you’re deciding whether or not to sign up for a programme, what’s going to happen if I sign up for this programme, am I going to get shipped out half ways through this programme and if you are then you think well then there is no point in me doing so. So the programme seems less important because of this.

This quote highlights the participant’s thought process and their understanding of what the process of rehabilitation involvement might mean. Another (CP4, 12-5-14) explained why he had opted out of the game:

I began an Anger Management course but only lasted a couple of weeks as it was not interactive enough, there was no group work and the lads weren’t listening. I didn’t feel I was gaining anything from it and so packed it in.

Distance from family, uncertainty surrounding completion (of non-accredited programmes in particular) and the quality and usefulness of a programme were the main reasons why some rationally choose not to play or abandon the game altogether. While on the other hand, engagement, interaction and cooperation all link to the game theory in terms of making calculated moves in order to achieve the most lucrative outcome given the circumstances and environment.
What may be considered most interesting about these findings is that they highlight the fact that the ‘managers’ were also very aware of the ‘professional players’ and the reasons behind their participation:

[Prisoners participate] because it puts a tick in the box and looks good to probation. (M2, 3-6-14)

This type of response was common among managers and facilitators. They were fully aware that some prisoners participated in certain courses solely to obtain a ‘tick in the box’. These programme participants did not mention the benefits of the course; nor did they refer to having a genuine interest in the course content, which had led to their involvement. This game playing demonstrates the fact that they were clearly not ‘amateurs’. It also, arguably more importantly, highlights the prison culture and the faith managers, facilitators have in these ‘recognised’, and ‘accredited’ programmes.

‘Weighing Down the Balls’: Cheats and Flaws

There are many techniques that facilitators, managers and prisoners can adapt in order to ‘cheat the system’ and become even better ‘professional players’. These methods may be applied in order to meet targets, increase performance indicators, improve profit margins, extend completion rates, satisfy parole boards and/or qualify for early release. The first ‘loop hole’ explored applies to the selection process and the dishonest procedures that may be employed here. Selection bias or ‘cherry-picking’ may be applied in order to ensure targets are met by choosing only the most motivated and well behaved offenders to participate in programmes. This concept is similar to that referred to as ‘creaming and parking’ highlighted by Johnston (2013) who explored the success of ‘The Work Programme’. He found that the welfare-to-work firms helped only those
they considered ‘job ready’ and ignored the rest. Targets and contract clauses pressured firms into working only with the ‘cream’ which resulted in vulnerable people with complex needs being ‘parked’ along the side (ibid). As a result, only those prisoners who are most likely to be rehabilitated are selected for courses designed to rehabilitate. The HLPR (2011: 18) also raised this point and commented that private companies will only be willing to ‘take on limited risks under payment by results’, which will ultimately lead to ‘cherry-picking’. The London Youth Reducing Re-offending Programme (Daedalus) found that 24 out of the 43 men who had participated in the course had not re-offended after release (Nevill and Lumley, 2011). A note of caution stated that although these figures looked positive, it must be remembered that only motivated participants had been transferred to the Heron wing and therefore ‘cherry-picking’ played a central role in the programme. As a result, those who entered this wing were already less likely to re-offend.

This issue of ‘cherry-picking’ is an ongoing problem given the current state of prisons and the growing model of payment by results. Crook (2012) discussed this matter and explained how HMP Oakwood had been sent 40 prisoners but only accommodated 17 whilst the rest were returned to state prisons. The reasoning behind this was said to be because of their assumed lack of compliance and issues regarding manageability. This skewed nature extends further than the selection of prisoners into an establishment and resurfaces when it comes to the selection of participants for a programme. Again, ‘creaming and parking’ can be seen as criteria are drawn up to ensure that the correct type of offender participates in a course. This inevitably affects completion and dropout rates, targets and payment by result schemes.
When discussing the eligibility criteria set out for the participation in programmes with respondents in my study many responses were obtained. Managers and facilitators felt that motivation was one of the key factors in selecting an appropriate participant. What was observed from participants, however, was that their understanding of motivation was subjective and personal to them and that there was no generic definition for the term:

They must also be motivated and be ready and want to change.

(FA4, 12-5-14)

We also select people who actually want to do it. (FA5, 12-5-14)

Gauging whether or not someone is interested in a course and whether or not they are genuinely ‘ready’ to desist from crime is a complex task. Finding such individuals is also problematic if one is not referred to a facilitator of a course by an Offender Manager or the prisoner is lacking in confidence to approach a facilitator themselves. As a result, certain participants are chosen based on criteria set by individual members of staff and their perception of the offender’s commitment and motivations towards the course, thus referring back to the ‘managers’ typology.

It was also observed that the majority of facilitators and managers did not take into account why an offender might be ‘motivated’ towards completing the course. They did not consider whether or not it might impact on their parole board meeting, increase the possibility of early release, result in more time out of their cell or provide them with extra money. From the perspectives of facilitators and managers, they believed that their motivation to participate in the programme was because they were ready to
change. This was found to be the case for only a minority of prisoners and ex-prisoners. For the majority, however, there was always at least one ulterior motive. These loopholes and areas of subjectivity leave many opportunities for selection bias and ‘cherry-picking’ to take place to ensure that the participants chosen will not drop out and instead will help the establishment to meet its targets.

Another area requiring attention could be labelled as ‘score fixing’. This refers to facilitators providing participants with the answers and solutions to problems posed in order to satisfy bureaucratic and administrative pressures in relation to targets and pass rates and avoid financial repercussions. Very little research has explored this area in more detail; however, it was noted regularly by participants (current and ex-prisoners) during this piece of research.

One participant stated:

The Victim Awareness I did was like the CALM I did- they read it all from a book. They wrote the answers on the board, they said for example: ‘What is empathy?’ Then they would write down what empathy is. I was like this is infant school so to me, it was belittling; ridiculous. Every prison has those box ticking courses, like certificate courses. They are targets and they get funding for them. They get £100 per head per person to go on these courses. Funny how I have to do it in every prison I go to and they’re on my case going ‘Oh you have to do your Entry Level Three again’ and I’m like ‘Oh I wonder why that is’. So that kept happening. […] they will put the answers on the board, they will get you to write the answers in your book and then you will hand that book in and get a certificate for that course and that shows that you have paid attention and you’ve learned; well that shows me that I have copied from the board […]

(EXP6, 17-12-14)
As discussed previously, participants of these programmes are aware of how to ‘cheat’ and ‘fix their scores’, echoing the findings of Crewe (2007: 258) in relation to governmental ‘technologies’, assumptions regarding rationality and manipulation to ensure prisoners ‘chose’ the ‘right way’ as prisoners demonstrate their awareness of the fact that they have to ‘play the game’ in order to achieve the ‘right’ outcomes. One participant explained this situation in more detail:

When you’re asked what would you do in this situation, you’re not going to say I would attack him ‘cause then you are not going to pass the course, so you do what they say and write down what you need to pass through. The accredited courses are geared up to get certain answers out of you for as if you want a bit more of a free and liberal course where it’s not so strict and structured you probably might gain a bit more from it. ETS lacked any benefit. I sat in a classroom with 10-12 prisoners and a white board...writing questions on it [white board] and then giving us the answers to the questions. (EXP5, 8-9-14)

Other prisoners (current and ex) admit to further methods of ‘game fixing’ as explained by one ex-prisoner:

You would go on to the wing and the lads would be like I’ve done that course, I’ve got it all in my cell the completed workbook do you want it? (EXP6, 17-12-14)

These quotes reiterate the issues with approaches to rehabilitation and education. They highlight the ‘snags’ and ‘glitches’, especially with accredited programmes, reinforce the problems with prison culture and re-emphasize target pressures and the impact these have on institutional priorities.
‘Deflated Balls’: ‘Nothing Works?’

As already noted, NOMS has a significant role to play when it comes to the design and structure of prison programmes. In Chapter Two, OBPs were explored which noted that programmes originated from Canada in the 1980s and were altered slightly for the implementation and delivery within English prisons. Versions of these programmes are still being delivered in prisons today over thirty years later with very few evident changes. Statistics show that 45% of offenders are reconvicted within one year of release and 58% of those who served a sentence of less than 12 months were re-incarcerated following release (Ministry of Justice, 2015b). Many of these recidivists have thus been subjected to varying editions of the same programme since their first custodial sentence.

The Ministry of Justice considered a review conducted by the Prison and Probation Service in 2005, which highlighted the need to refresh and update the Enhanced Thinking Skills Programme. Since the programmes accreditation, the report identified that developments had taken place in relation to theory and practice, which, needed reflecting in the programmes content, delivery and formatting. As a result, Thinking Skills Programme (TSP) was developed to reflect best practice and enhance and promote effective cognitive skills.

Little research has considered old and outdated prison programmes and the need to refresh them on a regular basis. The significance of external facilitators coming into establishments to connect with prisoners on topics that they are genuinely passionate about is also often missing from existing prison literature. However, when discussing
programmes with participants of my study this matter was reiterated on several occasions. Many understood the value (or lack of) of interventions better than any other sample group, yet their opinions were rarely obtained or acted on. Often participants described interventions as pointless and ineffective which corresponds to Martinson’s (1974) work. During the focus group, one participant commented:

[The programmes on offer are] ...boring. We’re doing the same thing we did years ago. The courses on offer are too old-fashioned, they are way back in time, it’s almost like backward thinking. There are no updates or refresher courses when it comes to your release date and so you forget everything. It’s so easy to forget it all.   (Focus Group Member 2, 3-6-14)

Another participant felt passionate about this issue:

We want people from the outside to come in with fresh ideas and perspectives because at the minute things have been done to death and let’s face it things aren’t getting any better. Half of the staff here have done my sentence with me. The courses are all the same with the only difference being they change the name on the front cover. They take a section out here and there and jiggle it about a little and that’s it, they stick it back together again and give it out to us again [...] Mentoring would be great, talking to someone as no one has time to listen. If I talked to people about my problems or even got into group discussions, I would be much better off [...] nothing is individualised [...] The courses are all the same so why not just have one programme that covers all the main points in it but fresh and new because they are all so old-fashioned and backwards. Courses need to be longer – what do you really expect someone to learn in 20 hours. 20 hours is just not long enough…. again as we all know everyone is too concerned with ticking the right boxes. That is their main goal – what good is that to us when we leave prison? Although most of their intentions are good at the
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25 See Chapter One in particular for more information on Martinson’s (1974) findings.
same time they are just doing their course ‘cause they need to be seen to be offering a drug course. They don’t really care how good or bad it is.

(Focus Group Member 5, 3-6-14)

Facilitators held similar opinions. FA 7 (9-9-14) stated:

Accredited programmes cannot be responsive to the needs of the prisoners as they are too restrictive and not individualised.

Many participants expressed the need for individualisation, flexibility and innovation; however, currently these elements are underdeveloped or perennially missing from interventions. Another area that requires further consideration and updating is the way in which a programme is delivered and the use of technology in prisons. Although over 25 years ago, the Council of Europe (1990: 12) outlined a recommendation that still applies today:

Education for prisoners should be like the education provided for similar age groups in the outside world, and the range of opportunities for prisoners should be as wide as possible.

Information Communication Technologies (ICT) skills were viewed as essential for everyday living by 94% of prison staff (Champion and Edgar, 2013). 88% agreed that offenders needed to be computer literate for the majority of jobs they could apply for on release. 74% agreed that certain prisoners should have access to the internet. However, regardless of these views the majority of ICT is being used in prisons for education in the form of Virtual Campus’ and interactive whiteboards. Research exploring Offending Behaviour Programmes indicates the main approaches to delivery, which utilise group work, flip charts and photocopied handouts and workbooks (Clarke et al 2004). My research obtained similar information; however, participants expressed
their dissatisfaction with the quality and efficiency of these methods. As discussed previously, one participant mentioned the reused flip chart paper and the fact that this piece of equipment was faulty and therefore not fit for purpose. Participants of the study valued group work as explored in Chapter Seven. However, one area that has been reiterated throughout the findings chapters is the structure of a programme and the level of flexibility afforded to facilitators. The approach to delivery requires innovation and imagination. This is impossible when manuals must be rigidly adhered to, which results in boredom, lack of interaction and engagement. It also impacts on desires to participate in further programmes. One facilitator commented:

There needs to be flexibility as you never really know what the lads are going to talk about and what is going to come out. When you deliver an accredited programme you cannot have flexibility which impacts hugely on the lads.

(FA 4, 12-5-14)

Another stated:

With accreditation my only reservation is that it will became too strict with no time for flexibility, time or reflection which, are all really important factors.

(FA 5, 12-5-14)

Ex-prisoner 6 (17-12-14) similarly emphasised innovation and flexibility:

‘[There is a need for innovation]. It’s only going to come from younger people who aint brainwashed into thinking of teaching in the way they were taught. Young people have fresh ideas if they are given the freedom to explore them a bit. However, in prison there is only a certain amount of things and ideas you can bring to the table. Programmes are more useful when the facilitator encourages us to challenge them and what helps you is the fact that they were more flexible […]

He went on to comment:
We weren’t allowed to challenge anything. [...] I was going back to my cell to learn what exactly they were doing to me, they were so critical and so you couldn’t challenge anything so I got into a lot of trouble in that course ‘cause they were saying, ‘This is why you are the way you are’ and I was saying ‘No it aint ’and so I was saying, ‘Why is it’ and they were saying ‘Cause it is’ and then they would come up with glossy reasons to say well basically ‘cause that is what I read in my book and its says why you did this. A course has to be tailor-made, what might work for me would not work for him or him, theirs has to be tailor-made too. Whoever is the facilitator of these courses has to have the flexibility to be able to change it depending on the individual in front of them to be able to deliver what they need or address their issues.

(EXP 6, 17-12-14)

These quotes highlight the desire participants have to challenge the content of a programme. However, in order to be able to do this, it is essential that programme facilitators possess sufficient flexibility and time for reflection and discussions. Individualisation is another key theme that echoes through from these quotes. Rigid structures and predetermined answers do not allow for spontaneity, the creation of pertinent discussions and inevitability the targeting of individual needs.

The Rehabilitation Lottery: Against the Odds?

From the discussion above, it can be seen that the system in its entirety can be viewed as a game. It is a game that everyone involved plays, whether they want to or not, a game where success or outcome is governed by chance and luck. This chapter began by exploring how the prison establishment as a whole, the staff within the prison and prisoners themselves ‘play the game’. This section demonstrated that as a result of the prison culture, for many, rehabilitation is seen as nothing more than a process of
satisfying bureaucratic administrative requirements, again especially in relation to accredited programmes. It highlighted the fact that the game commenced right at the start when a bid for a contract to manage a prison was offered. Who ‘wins or loses’ whether it is a private company or publically funded, depends on many factors which has many future consequences. It discussed the reaction of an establishment to government targets and referred to the manipulative ways in which the prison meets these targets by offering incentives in the form of money and ‘earned privileges’. The role of the courts in ‘the game’ was also explored as a prisoner can ‘win or lose’ depending on where they are sent, the type of establishment they find themselves in (e.g. dispersal or local prison) and the range of interventions that are on offer to them. Prison security categories were brought into the discussion as often offenders have different needs depending on their offence and sentence length. Such factors can be affected by waiting lists and what prison managers believe are the needs of the prisoners. How prisoners were involved in ‘the game’ was also explored. Here their motivations behind programme participation was reiterated. It also demonstrated their awareness of how to progress from ‘one level to the next’ and in doing so portrayed them as professionals at ‘playing the game’.

The following section looked at how the establishment and programme participants ‘fix the game’. The skewed nature and practice of ‘cherry-picking’ highlighted the fact that often certain prisoners are neglected and instead a particular set of offenders ‘meet the criteria’ and are given more opportunities to become rehabilitated. This assists the establishment in meeting their targets yet fails those requiring higher levels of support and attention. It considered ‘score-fixing’ and methods of ‘cheating’ when it came to the
facilitators approach to ‘educating’ and ‘teaching’ its participants. It then examined the part prisoner’s play in this ‘game of rehabilitation’ by exploring their contribution, engagement and commitment to a programme.

The next area explored the fact that many programmes are old and out-dated, having been originally formulated in the 1970s. It should also be noted that many of these interventions are accredited in nature. It discussed the role and power of NOMS in producing programmes that are strict and rigid in their layout and lacking in imagination and creativity. Here evidence from facilitators who deliver non-accredited programmes was used to demonstrate their lack of interest in achieving the ‘accredited’ status as this, in their opinion, would threaten their programmes’ innovation and originality. It referred to ‘the grind’ in explaining how these types of programmes force participants to perform mindlessly repetitive tasks in order proceed to the next level or game (i.e. participation in the next intervention on their sentence plan). It referred to the fact that both prison staff and prisoners are aware that the titles of programmes change from time-to-time but their content always remains the same.

Here it has been argued that where a prisoner is sent, the range of programmes on offer, their status in relation to accreditation or lack of accreditation, the characteristics of the person that is delivering the programme, the method of delivery, the flexibility afforded to the facilitator, the ability and opportunity to challenge the course content, the amount of innovation and creativity utilised and many other factors all significantly contribute towards an offender’s opportunity of rehabilitation. Prison programme provision is therefore described as a ‘rehabilitation lottery’. The following and final
chapter considers the practical implications of my research and the associated recommendations.
CHAPTER NINE: CONCLUSION

Introduction

It has been noted that much research within the field of offender rehabilitation has tended to focus on what ‘works’ or fails to ‘work’ in attempting to reduce re-offending (Cullen and Gendreau, 2000; Merrington and Stanley, 2004; Ward and Maruna, 2007). Although it is an important area of research, it tends to focus primarily on interventions of an accredited nature therefore side-lining those lacking such status and inevitably restricting the amount of evidence to support of the effectiveness of non-accredited programmes. More emphasis needs to be placed on the value and usefulness of non-accredited programmes as these are offered and delivered to prisoners nationwide with significant economic implications in a time of constrained resources. My research aimed to provide a snapshot of the selection, management, implementation and reception of non-accredited programmes delivered in a particular prison at a moment in time allowing for a sociological insight to be gained into an aspect of prison rehabilitation that is under-researched. An exploration of these types of programmes needed to be carried out in order to establish the following: The rationale behind staff selection and implementation of such programmes; the perspectives of participants and prison staff in relation to the range, purpose and delivery of such interventions; and the significance of innovation and imaginative programmes on prisoners’ participation, engagement, completion and ability to achieve positive outcomes.

The four ‘findings’ chapters brought together the key themes explored and developed throughout this thesis in order to propose ways of further developing research and
policy. This chapter relates to each research area outlined at the beginning of this thesis in order to highlight the findings obtained through the empirical research. It then puts forward its final viewpoint concerning the ‘rehabilitation lottery’ and offers some recommendations to improve the design and delivery of non-accredited programmes, promote the locating of prisoners in establishments that are best equipped to assist them on their journey towards desistance and highlights the need to develop more effective ways of promoting the work of prison researchers.

**Overview**

In order to address the first research area, which related to the selection and delivery of non-accredited interventions, prison/programme managers were questioned on the selection process. The procedure for choosing accredited programmes was clear from existing literature, yet very little research explored the reasons behind the selection and implementation of non-accredited programmes. Due to their lack of accreditation and insufficient evidence of effectiveness it was therefore unclear why establishments chose to deliver such programmes to prisoners whilst attempting to rehabilitate them and ultimately reduce recidivism.

Chapter Five predominately focused on this research topic (however, other chapters, including Chapter Eight also emphasised the findings). Here it was found that the choices made by the establishment have many significant consequences for its prisoners. The data showed a general lack of basic regulation and provision. The different responses from participants signified this. Some participants claimed that programmes were introduced as a direct result of government strategies, others emphasised the role of
NOMS in reaching their decisions, while the stimulus of cost effectiveness also plays a crucial role according to the remaining participants. There was a general consensus, however, in relation to facilitators’ perspectives of the programme implementation process. This group strongly agreed that the provisions in place were insufficient and that a clear, structured and fair process was required.

Another point relating to this research area was the idea that interventions attempt to target a specific type of offender. Although some consideration was given to selecting appropriate participants once in prison, the data found that risk assessment tests and other practices of this nature were usually conducted after a prisoner had been allocated to an establishment to serve their sentence. As a result, the prisoner was then required to meet the eligibility criteria for the existing programmes regardless of whether or not such courses would be of most value to them. This issue ideally required further deliberation immediately after an offender’s prosecution (this point will be discussed in more detail later).

In order to explore the views and opinions of prison managers, programme facilitators, participating offenders and ex-prisoners towards the range, purpose and delivery of interventions, each of the target groups were interviewed and observed. This particular research area was vast in that it was referred to in more than one of the findings chapter. In fact, the views and opinions of all targets groups were considered from the start of this thesis; however, Chapters Six and Seven focused on the range, purpose and delivery of non-accredited programmes in particular. Chapter Six looked at the differences between accredited and non-accredited programmes and obtained the perspectives of
each of the sample groups in order to formulate a wider picture of how the two types of programmes differ. It was interesting to find here that over half (11) of the current prisoner sample claimed to have no understanding of the differences; however, when these responses were compared with their thoughts on previously completed programmes, the participants clearly differentiated between the two. The research demonstrated that, although the label of ‘accreditation’ is not necessarily understood by participants, they still had the ability to explain from their own experiences how each type of programme differs.

The range of accredited and non-accredited programmes was also examined and it was found that repetition of (both types of) programme content was high while innovation and creativity remained low. Prisoners lacked motivation, inspiration and curiosity in becoming involved in the programmes on offer, as previous experiences haunted them. They found accredited programmes old-fashioned, out-dated and too generic for them to be of any rehabilitative use. Current and ex-prisoners also noted that the range of programmes on offer in certain establishments was often poor and sometimes failed to meet the requirements set out in their sentence plan. This called into question the prison’s culture and attitude towards rehabilitation through accredited and non-accredited interventions. This negativity was also found to impact on prisoners’ willingness to participate in programmes, as discussed below.

Chapter Seven primarily focused on the delivery of non-accredited programmes. Here it was found that many elements had an impact on the effectiveness of a rehabilitative intervention and that there are many components to the efficient delivery of a
programme. One of the key findings related to the programme facilitator and whether or not these were ‘outsiders’ coming in to the establishment purposefully to solely deliver the intervention, or alternatively were trained prison officers wearing their uniform. The perspectives obtained from each of the sample groups highlighted how ‘out of touch’ managers and lead facilitators were when it came to what prisoners actually required/desired and their reasons for such decisions.

My research also discovered the different levels of training facilitators of accredited and non-accredited programmes receive before delivering the intervention. A stark difference was seen between the two-day training that facilitators of a non-accredited programme received (for a course they did not know the name of), in comparison with the one to three weeks’ training that facilitators of accredited programmes received for a particular intervention. What was even more surprising about these findings was the attitude of the participants when they were questioned about it. Here they simply accepted their lack of training and preparation and seemed resigned to the fact that this was simply the result of the programme being non-accredited. Another finding related to the way in which an intervention was delivered. Here flexibility was found to be crucial in delivering an effective programme whilst strict and rigid programme manuals were detrimental to capturing the imagination and enthusiasm of participants, contrary to the findings of Maguire et al (2010) discussed in Chapters One and Two.

Finally, in Chapters Five through to Chapter Eight, the third research area considered the significance of innovative and imaginative programmes on offenders’ participating, engaging, completing and achieving positive outcomes. Chapters Three and Four also
explain why only one non-accredited programme was observed. The examination of a more innovative and creative intervention would have been preferred; however, due to the many difficulties encountered whilst attempting to carry out the fieldwork for this thesis, this was not possible. Ironically, such obstacles to research reflect the problems prisoners’ encounter attempting to gain access to particular interventions and meeting the eligibility requirements.

As previously mentioned, this research found that the majority of prisoners (current and ex) were wholly dissatisfied with the level of innovation and creativity underpinning rehabilitative programmes. The lack of imagination invested in them was found to influence prisoners’ decisions whether or not to participate in a programme. The dull and repetitive content and uninteresting method of delivery also affected prisoners’ level of engagement and concentration.

The data produced and analysed in Chapter Six differentiates between the two types of programmes and demonstrates that offenders’ understanding of the labels ‘accredited’ and ‘non-accredited’ affect their decision to partake in a programme and engage fully with its content. As discussed above, other programmes delivered elsewhere in the prison also impact on participants’ experiences, learning outcomes and willingness to partake in new or further programmes. This factor influences their thoughts towards the usefulness of a programme, which sounds similar to another programme delivered elsewhere in the prison. This can act as a barrier or a doorway to participation in other interventions depending on the whether the experience was positive or negative.
**Research Contribution and Policy Implications**

The aims of my study required an in-depth exploration of perceptions and opinions rather than an examination of data, which was generalizable and less detailed; therefore, a qualitative approach was deemed the most appropriate methodology. This is in line with most other prison research investigating prison staff culture, the use of authority, prisoner quality of life, experiences of respect and general day-to-day running of public and private sector prisons (please see Chapters One and Two and in particular; Shefer and Liebling, 2008; Crewe, Liebling and Hulley, 2011; Hulley, Liebling and Crewe, 2011). The reason for this may be because qualitative research aims to gain an understanding of ‘nuances, motivations, attitudes and feelings’ (Braggins and Talbot, 2003:11). These studies along with the research conducted for this thesis employed semi-structured interviews and ethnographic research in order to obtain the necessary data. Liebling et al (2011:3) comment that:

> It is often the case that exploratory, innovative, and curiosity-driven research is, in the end, of most value to policy and practice, particularly because it avoids the narrow limits set by ‘working assumptions’ or policy needs, and it follows leads originating in ‘the real world’ (this has also been true of other prison research projects conducted ‘off the policy agenda’; e.g. Liebling et al. 2010).

However, regardless of the potential value and timeliness of this research (given the changing context of penal policy following the Queens Speech and awarding of greater autonomy to prison governors), problems with access to the field severely hampered and threatened the completion of this thesis. Chapter Three and Four in particular, discuss the difficulties involved in gaining access to an establishment to conduct the
empirical research. It detailed the many refusals, which ultimately impacted on the sample, the programme choice/range and number of participants. A larger study investigating a range of innovative non-accredited programmes with more participants in more establishments would have illuminated the significant issues and tested the concept of a ‘rehabilitation lottery’ to a greater extent. However, this was not possible and in turn highlighted the need for gatekeepers to practice a more inclusive approach to prison research in order to expose fundamental issues and work towards improving the system.

From my experience, I believe it is very important for practitioners and researchers to develop a more effective working relationship and eradicate the culture of ‘us’ and ‘them’. This need is more established in relation to police-academic partnership:

[Academics and practitioners] have to learn to work together in kind of intellectual and practical partnerships to solve problems as best they cannot compete with each other over whose knowledge is more authoritative.

(Moore, 2010: 335)

Developing knowledge co-productively has many benefits including greater quality, rigour and relevance. The creation, exchange and integration of knowledge can contribute to prison policy and practice. This shared infrastructure promotes a culture of engagement, supports sustained interaction, and stimulates co-identification of problems, co-design and co-delivery of research (Fyfe, 2015). It also contributes to disciplinary research. This thesis recognises the need for a research-based practitioner model, which encourages practitioner fellowships, graduate programmes and professional/practitioner doctorates (ibid).
This point of co-productivity extends further and includes the relationship between the researcher and those being researched. The concept not only ensures greater mutual understanding but it also gives a voice to those who are often hard to reach or marginalised and, in this case, those who are incarcerated. Information on topics that researchers find difficult to access is central to this production of knowledge and highlights the two-way gain; being listened to and hearing. This thesis recognises the importance of this co-production and proposes less complex and time-consuming approaches to obtaining this knowledge.

The ‘rehabilitation lottery’ has been a dominant theme observed throughout the thesis. It has been demonstrated throughout the chapters that many factors contribute to or inhibit the successful rehabilitation of an offender. It has also been shown that the ‘lottery’ begins from the moment a prison is selected for an offender. The chart below summarises the main themes observed and discussed throughout this thesis.
**The Prison Establishment**

Type of Establishment (i.e. Dispersal Prison, Local) influences many factors such as:
- Type and length of programme
- Waiting list
- Range of ‘accredited’ and ‘non-accredited’ programmes on offer
- Variety of interventions on offer
- Resource available
- Advertisement of courses
- Prison culture

**The Characteristics of the Programme:**
- Label – Accredited or non-accredited
- Detainment/Transfer
- Content: Usefulness/relevance
- Location
- Group size
- Duration
- Flexibility
- Teaching Methods/Style - innovative, creative

**The Prisoner**
- Motivations behind participation
- Understanding of terms (‘accredited’ and ‘non-accredited’)
- Readiness to change
- Knowledge of what is on offer
- Past involvement in interventions
- Previous experiences of positive outcomes

**The Facilitator**
- Inside V. Outsider
- Background qualifications, skills, experience
- Personal characteristics
- Motivations
- Resources
- Flexibility
- Legitimacy

**The Programme**

'Rehabilitation Lottery'

JACKPOT:

Positive Outcomes

1. The Prison Establishment
2. The Programme
3. The Facilitator
4. The Prisoner

Figure 9.1: Key Contributing Factors to the Production and Procurement of Positive Outcomes and Reduced Recidivism
It can be seen from Figure 9.1 that many factors affect successful rehabilitation and the production of positive outcomes (see Chapters One and Two and in particular the work of: Howard, 1777; Fry, 1780-1845; Hulley, Liebling and Crewe, 2011; Crewe, Liebling and Hulley, 2011 and Rex and Hosking, 2013) yet often many of these elements are overlooked by everyone involved (policy-makers, programme managers/facilitators, the prison system, the courts and prisoners).

When sentencing an offender, the courts follow sentencing guidelines relevant to that offender’s case. When determining where the offender should serve their custodial sentence the principles of categorisation ensure that the offender is placed in the lowest security category consistent with managing their needs in terms of security and control (Ministry of Justice, 2011). Where possible, they will then be allocated to a prison within the vicinity of their friends and family in order to stimulate social rehabilitation and maintain family ties (Jewkes and Bennett, 2013). Although sentence plans (made through OASys) establish why an individual offends and outlines what can be done in order to reduce or end their offending behaviour (House of Commons, 2009; HM Prison Service, 2002; Braggins et al 2003), there seems to be a link missing between having this information and being aware of the most suitable establishment to provide offenders with the best chance of becoming rehabilitated.

This thesis proposes that prisoners are sent to establishments that offer interventions which are appropriate for their sentence type and length, where waiting lists do not affect offenders’ opportunity to benefit from a programme before they are released, where there is a range of accredited and non-accredited programmes for them to...
choose from (that best suit their needs) and where the prison culture is positive and reinforces the benefits of prison rehabilitation (Braggins and Talbot, 2006; Clarke, 2004; Crewe, 2009; Crewe et al 2011; Irwin, 2008). Support should be given to developing a range of high quality interventions from one establishment to the next that focus on the actual offender rather than meeting targets.

Decisions concerning where a prisoner should serve their sentence could be made in court and form part of the principles of categorisation. Currently policy and practice on the categorization of male prisoners focuses primarily on: ‘the likelihood of escape or abscond, the risk of harm to the public in the event of an escape or abscond and, any control issues that impact on the security and good order of the prison and the safety of those within it’ (Ministry of Justice, 2011b: 6). Each element that forms part of this instruction is important, however, this thesis proposes that another factor should be included. The court should also consider the most appropriate establishment for an offender taking into account their individual rehabilitative requirements. The process for allocating an offender to a prison should begin at this early stage to ensure that they are placed in the most appropriate establishment. My research found that often offenders serve their sentence in the first prison they are sent to regardless of whether or not this is a local prison with very limited rehabilitative interventions to offer. My findings also suggested that certain interventions form part of an offender’s sentence plan, yet frequently the establishment they are placed in does not offer the programme. More thought and consideration needs to be given to the allocation of prisoners to establishments. Probation officers need to be aware of the programmes on offer in each and every establishment when drawing up a pre-sentence report and completing an
OASys assessment. The courts too should be educated on the range of programmes on offer from one establishment to the next.

One way of ensuring this information reaches these agencies is by requiring each establishment to collate information on the courses it delivers and then present it to the courts in a manual type guide or be accessible via a database. My research found that often managers and programme facilitators were unaware of the range of courses delivered in other parts of their establishment therefore this approach would increase awareness, encourage communication and highlight any areas lacking rehabilitative interventions. These booklets or database could then be used by the courts, probation officers and prisoners when deciding where an individual should be placed. Prisoners need to be included in this process as my research found that their participation, engagement and completion of (a) programme(s) depend(s) on how interested they are in the course, how exciting and different it is, how useful they feel it will be and many other factors. This approach would emphasis the importance of rehabilitation and promote a positive rehabilitative culture within prisons. My findings also highlighted the fact that the process for implementing non-accredited programmes in prisons was blurred and inconsistent. More guidelines and information are required so that outside organisations and facilitators are aware of what establishments require and what the process for selection of interventions entails. The manual type guides or databases mentioned above could also be of benefit here, as these would highlight what is on offer from one establishment to the next.
This thesis puts forward the importance of sending a prisoner to a prison that not only offers a wide range of relevant interventions but also tailors programmes to suit the needs of prisoners (Clarke, 2004). Therefore, support in developing a more personalised approach to teaching is required. Prisoner perspectives on how long programmes should be and how many participants should take part shape the effectiveness of the intervention and therefore need to be considered instead of solely adhering to the views of managers. The importance of detaining an offender until they have completed the intervention is also crucial as this element impacts on their motivations to participate and affects the overall effectiveness of the programme. This factor also impacts on future decisions to participate in other rehabilitative programmes and creates a definite potentially damaging divide between accredited and non-accredited programmes (Langelid et al 2009; Bamford et al 2007. Prisoners’ attitudes towards non-accredited programmes can also be affected as some see non-accredited programmes as less important because they are not detained until they are completed. This ultimately contributes to a negative prison culture within the establishment.

Support is required in developing more flexible and creative approaches to teaching in prisons. Programme content, especially in relation to accredited programmes, is outdated and fails to excite or engage with participants. Innovative and interesting approaches to teaching need to be supported and programmes designed in such a way as to capture the interests and imagination of the audience. Old and reused flip chart paper will not stimulate or awaken the mind of many. Strict and rigid manuals also affect the ability of facilitators to tailor programmes to meet the needs of the participants (Clarke et al 2004 and Maguire et al 2010). These manuals also contribute to offenders
‘cheating the system’ as every session is exactly the same, increasing the possibility of prisoners exchanging completed workbooks and thus failing to reap any benefits. It is important that NOMS and the Correctional Service Accreditation Panel are made aware of these issues and findings and promote more flexibility and creativity in rehabilitative interventions.

It is recommended that the delivery of rehabilitative programmes be carried out by ‘outsiders’ rather than ‘insiders’ and that facilitators receive sufficient training regardless of whether or not the intervention is accredited. Programmes need to be delivered by those who are qualified and passionate about their work. It is also necessary for offenders to feel sufficiently comfortable to speak honestly and without fear of later repercussions. In order to increase programme effectiveness, rehabilitation needs to have its own identity in prison, removing connections with punishment, prison officers and prison landings. The setting is important and the delivery of interventions on prison wings or cells should be avoided. Instead, prisoners need to do the programmes in an environment that is conducive to learning.

Prisoners need to be fully aware of the different types of programmes on offer to them at the start of their sentence. They also need to understand the differences between accredited and non-accredited programmes to prevent the creation of incorrect assumptions. These terms and the benefits of each course should be explained to prisoners before they partake in a course.
One approach to raising awareness about my findings and impacting policy is by becoming a member of the Magistrates Association. This organisation influences key-decision-makers by: ‘representing the magistracy at the highest levels of government, forming positive public opinion through media engagement, supporting 60 local branches to work locally and regionally to promote the voice of the magistracy and providing robust evidence for policy positions using in-house research’ (2016: n.p). It also provides members with information and training by ‘publishing magazines, email news bulletin and training materials, organising national, regional and local events to help members network and learn from each other and populating an online database with the latest information to keep members up to date’ (ibid: n.p). It also promotes public awareness of the magistracy by ‘delivering over 4,000 presentations to schools and community organisations every year and works with the Probation Association to run a local crime awareness project’ (ibid: n.p).

Another way of distributing my findings is by attending Bar Council conferences (and in particular the Annual Bar and Young Bar Conference 2016, Raising the Bar: Innovation and Global Opportunity for a forward thinking profession) and other practitioner conferences and workshops and by providing feedback/presenting to the voluntary sector, campaigning groups and other organisations (for example Clinks and the Howard League for Penal Reform). The Sentencing Council is another potential approach of distributing my knowledge as it invites the public, professionals in the criminal justice field, and academics to provide them with views and opinions on sentencing in England and Wales.
As part of the NOMS approval process, I agreed to provide a summary of the study’s main findings. This is another way of raising awareness of my research outcomes. Due to the many issues and obstacles faced when attempting to get access to the field, I made links with many different prison establishments. These contacts would welcome a summary of findings and/or prison visit to conduct a presentation to managers and programme facilitators. I have also agreed to provide the research site with a summary of my main findings.

**Concluding Thoughts**

The research is based on the theoretical construct that ‘what works’ in corrections is something of a lottery – at the macro-level of historical policy change; at the contemporary meso-level of prison programme provision being either accredited or non-accredited; and even within a non-accredited programme at the micro level, the Who, the How and the Where are also something of a lottery, made even more complex by the various levels of engagement by offenders, managers and the staff who deliver the programme. The ‘rehabilitation lottery’ conspires to offer some offenders a greater rehabilitation ‘pay-out’ or ‘jackpot’ than others. Some offenders might be advantaged but for others their rehabilitation potential is compromised.

One purpose of criminological research is to make correctional programme delivery more transparent by allowing them to be predicated on sound research that can inform policy and practice. The clear inference drawn from this research is that, however well intentioned, rehabilitative aspirations can be compromised to the extent there are weaknesses at the macro-, meso- and micro-levels. The overall conclusion is that
rehabilitation efforts will be maximised when there is the least evidence of compromising factors, and minimalised when they are present to a significant degree. My research does not consider the precise content of a successful non-accredited programme but it does point to a wide range of limiting factors that could and should be avoided. To this extent, it is seen as enabling of the correctional aspiration without being prescriptive as to its content. More formally, it points to necessary but not sufficient conditions for successful programme delivery – essentially by taking the random factor out of the ‘rehabilitation lottery’.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Interview Schedules

Target Group 1: Managers and Prison Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/type of questions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.D Code</strong></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q.1. Background Information**

What is your role within this establishment?

How long have you been working here?

What experience have you in the field?

What prison(s) have you previously worked in and for how long?

**Q.2. Knowledge of selection process for programmes**

How are rehabilitative interventions, in the form of non-accredited programmes, chosen for implementation in the prison?

How is the process carried out? Who is involved? Do the facilitators approach the prison or does the prison get in contact with the facilitators?

Do you know why Programme X was selected for implementation (above others)?

Do you know how much it costs to run this programme?

Research Area 1

*Understanding the rationale behind the selection and implementation of certain non-accredited innovative programmes in a prison (instead of others programmes)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.3. Opinion towards what is on offer to prisoners here - Range</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you think about the range of programmes (non-accredited) that are offered to prisoners in this prison?</td>
<td>Research Area 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparison to programmes offered in other prisons previously worked in, do you think there is a better, similar or worse range offered here? What is your view and why?</td>
<td>Exploring the views and opinions of staff towards the range, purpose and delivery of these interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the range of programmes offered is important to offenders and their rehabilitation?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long is the waiting list for these courses? Do you believe this is an appropriate waiting time?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel this course should be delivered in all other prisons too?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel prisoners in this prison are fortunate to have this course on offer to them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.4. Opinion towards Programme X - Purpose</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you know about Course X?</td>
<td>Research Area 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the aims and objectives of Programme X?</td>
<td>Exploring the views and opinions of staff towards the range, purpose and delivery of these interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think the advantages/disadvantages of the course are?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who can partake in the course and why? How are participants selected and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.4. Opinion towards Programme X - Delivery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many offenders can partake during one course?</td>
<td>Research Area 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long does the course run for and how long is each individual session?</td>
<td>Exploring the views and opinions of staff towards the range, purpose and delivery of these interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many courses have been delivered so far?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have other prison officers responded to the delivery of the course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is the programme delivered and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your opinion towards the teaching techniques and methods used by the facilitator?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens after the course is carried out?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long will the course be delivered for?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it keep running or is it reviewed for further commissioning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the facilitator begun the accreditation process?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.4. Opinion towards Programme X - Participation</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think this course is innovative in its approach?</td>
<td>Research Area 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many participants have attended/completed/uncompleted the course?</td>
<td>Investigating the significance of innovative and imaginative programmes on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think offenders participate in this particular course and what do you think others do not partake?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know how much do offenders get paid to partake in this course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have offenders responded to the course? (This includes those who</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have already participated, are currently participating, or will</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participate in the future and those who will not participate?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How have other prison officers responded to the course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your view, has there been any negativity towards the course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why might this be?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your opinion towards the facilitators of the course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel they have the appropriate level of experience to deliver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the programme? Why do you think this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.5. Programme Y:</td>
<td>Same Questions – Different Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.6. Programme Z:</td>
<td>Same Questions – Different Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.7. Any other questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Target Group 2: Programme Facilitators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/type of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.D Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. 1. Background Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What course do you deliver?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What exactly does your role within the prison entail?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many years have you been delivering this course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this the first time this course has been delivered to prisoners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has it been delivered in other prisons? How many times and where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What group was this course previously targeted at?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your background within the field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What experience do you have working with offenders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you carry out programmes within the prison?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Q.2. Knowledge of selection process for programmes                                           |
| How was your programme chosen for implementation in the prison?                              |
| What did the process involve? Who did the process involve?                                   |
| Did you approach the prison first or did the prison get in contact with you?                 |

*Research Area 1:*
Understanding the rationale behind the selection and implementation of certain non-accredited innovative programmes in a prison (instead of others programmes)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did you market the programme to the prison, the MOJ, prisoner?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Q.3. Your thoughts towards the course - Range**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do you think about the range of programmes (non-accredited) offered to prisoners in this prison?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the range of programmes offered is important to offenders and their rehabilitation? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long is the waiting list for these courses? Do you believe this is an appropriate waiting time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel this course should be delivered in all other prisons too?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the course available to all offenders? (Why is this so)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel prisoners in this prison are fortunate to have this course on offer to them? Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose**

| What are the aims and objectives of the course? |
| What are the advantages and disadvantages of the course? |
| What targets have been set for the course and when do they need to be achieved? |
| How do you think this course benefits its participants? |

**Exploring the views and opinions of staff towards the range, purpose and delivery of these interventions**

**Concept of a ‘Rehabilitation Lottery’ explored**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Delivery</th>
<th>Exploring the views and opinions of staff towards the range, purpose and delivery of these interventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many facilitators carry out the course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many offenders can partake during one course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long does the course run for and how long is each individual session?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many courses have been delivered so far?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is the programme delivered and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What teaching techniques and methods are used?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens after the course is carried out?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long will the course be delivered for?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does it keep running or is it reviewed for further commissioning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Innovation of Programme X - Participation</th>
<th>Research Area 3: Investigating the significance of innovative and imaginative programmes on offenders participating, engaging, completing and achieving positive outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you think this course is innovative in its approach?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(If so – how; if not - why not?)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What makes it different from other prison programmes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think innovative and creativity are important and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who can partake in the course and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are participants selected and why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many participants have attended/completed/uncompleted the course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think offenders participate in this particular course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think some choose not to partake?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think some offenders fail to complete while others complete the course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know how much offenders get paid to partake in this course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Potential Questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How have offenders responded to the course? (This includes those who have already participated, are currently participating, or will participate in the future and those who will not participate?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How have other prison officers responded to the course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your view, has there been any negativity towards the course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why might this be?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the future of the course?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will there be further developments?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the programme roll out into other prisons?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are your hopes of accreditation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Research has shown that P.O’s can influence offenders decision making process (for example their willingness to participate in certain courses)*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/type of questions</th>
<th>Rationale behind these Q’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I.D Code</strong></td>
<td>XXXXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.1. Background Information

- Age
- Ethnicity
- Marital Status
- Children/Family
- Level of Education (School, GCSE’s, A-Levels, other)
- Employment
- Living Arrangements

### Q.2. Previous Sentences

- Have you previously carried out a custodial sentence?
- How long did you serve?
- Where did you carried out your previous sentence(s)?
- Is this their first time in this prison?

*Relates to Research Area 2 & 3*

### Q.3. Current Sentence(s)

- Sentence length?
- Nature of offence?

*Research Area 3 – Participation and completion can depend on their offence and their sentence length*
### Q.4. Course attended/completed in the past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Research Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your opinion of the range, purpose and delivery of the courses offered in the past?</td>
<td>Research Area 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses which were attended – why attended?</td>
<td>‘Rehabilitation Lottery’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses which were completed – why completed?</td>
<td>Research Area 3 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses which were uncompleted – why failed to complete?</td>
<td>Participating/completion in previous courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the courses easy or difficult to access?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.5. Courses currently attending/due to attend in the future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>RA 1: Reasons behind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think this programme was chosen by the prison instead of other programmes?</td>
<td>implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you understand about accredited and non-accredited programmes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think of the range of courses available here?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think there is a better range in other prisons?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RA 2: Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation Lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>RA 2: Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think range and variety of courses is important?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long did/will you wait to get on to the course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think this time frame is acceptable?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the aim/purpose of this programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think the prison is running this programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why are you participating in Programme X?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long will the programme run for?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you intend to complete it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What factors might affect you completing it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When, how often and where will you participate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the location for the programme is appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do think of the design of the programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you think of the facilitator’s skills when delivering this programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How will you partake or engage in the programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had you heard of this programme before?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think it differs much from other prison programmes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, how/Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you think imaginative and creative programmes are important to offenders? How/why do you think this?

Why did you choose to participate in this programme?

Do you think this programme will benefit you? How/why?

What kind of consequences will this programme have on your prison experience and life thereafter?

What have other offenders said about the course(s) and do you agree with them?

Group 3b: Ex-Prisoners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category/type of questions</th>
<th>Rationale behind these Q’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.D Code</td>
<td>xxxxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.1. Background Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children/Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Education (School, GCSE’s, A-Levels, other)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q.2. Previous Sentences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevant Research Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you previously carried out a custodial sentence?</td>
<td>Relates to Research Areas 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long did you serve?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where did you carried out your previous sentence(s)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was this their first time in this prison?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.3. Current Sentence(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevant Research Area(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sentence length?</td>
<td>Research Area 3 – Participation and completion can depend on their offence and their sentence length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of offence?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q.4. Course attended/completed in the past

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Relevant Research Area(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is your opinion of the range, purpose and delivery of the courses offered in the past?</td>
<td>Research Area 2 ‘Rehabilitation Lottery’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses which were attended – why attended?</td>
<td>Research Area 3 – Participating/completion in previous courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses which were completed – why completed?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses which were uncompleted – why failed to complete?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Relevant Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the courses easy or difficult to access?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.5. Other Relevant Questions depending on Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why do you think these programmes were chosen by the prison instead of other programmes?</td>
<td>RA 1: Reasons behind implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you understand about accredited and non-accredited programmes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think there is a better range of programmes in other prisons?</td>
<td>RA 2: Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think range and variety of courses is important?</td>
<td>Rehabilitation Lottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you have to wait/how long did you wait to get on to the course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you think the programme facilitators within the prison?</td>
<td>RA 2: Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What did you think of the facilitator’s skills when delivering this programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long will the programme run for?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did any factors affect you completing a course?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think the location for the programme is appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think of the design of the programme?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had you heard of this programme before participating in it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think it differs much from other prison programmes? If so, how/Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think imaginative and creative programmes are important to offenders? How/why do you think this?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the programmes you completed benefit you when you were released from prison? How/why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Consent Form

The University of Leicester
University Road
Leicester
LE1 7RH
United Kingdom

The Rehabilitation Lottery: Exploring the delivery and attitudes towards non-accredited programmes in a private prison using a case study approach

Researchers Agreement:
I am a research student at the University of Leicester and I am carrying out a study as part of a PhD thesis. I would like to talk to you about the rehabilitation offered in this prison and ask you some questions about the delivery of programmes and your attitude towards specific course that you X?

_____________________________________
(partaking in/not partaking in/facilitate and deliver/manage/have implemented/selected (depending on the target sample group).

I will provide more information about the research before the interview commences and you will have the chance to ask me any questions before consenting. This will ensure full and informed consent is obtained and will provide you with the choice not to participate in the research if you wish.

The interview should last between 45-75 minutes, but if for any reason you would like to end the interview, you can do so at any time. If there are any questions you do not want to answer, tell me, and we will move on to the next or end the interview straight away if you prefer. The interview may be recorded for my benefit alone; however, only with your consent.

Everything you say to me will be kept confidential and locked away in a secure place in the Criminology Department; no one else will have access to the material or recordings.

No one will have access to these forms except me – they too will be locked away.

Your name will not be identified in any documentation or reports instead you will be given a unique identification code which will appear on all public documentation.

Researchers Agreement: PLEASE TICK THE BOX IF YOU AGREE

The researcher will provide all the necessary information relating to the research in order for the participant to give informed consent.

The researcher will omit any information which may lead to the disclosure of the identity of the participant and instead will give each participant a unique identification code only known to the researcher and the participant.

The researcher will not to disclose the names and contact details of the participants to third parties during and after the study.

If the participant chooses to withdraw from the study no information acquired from that participant will be used for the study.
Participants Agreement:

PLEASE TICK THE BOX IF YOU AGREE

I have read (or listened to) the above information relating to this research and fully understand the nature and purpose of the research.

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason.

I understand that any information I give will be kept confidential (For Group 3: and have no impact on my sentence or remaining time spent inside prison).

I understand that my name will be changed before analysis to a unique identification code and thus my identification will be protected.

I give permission to the researcher to use an audio-recorder and record our interview.

For Offenders: I understand that it is the obligation of the researcher, under Section 51 of the Prison Rules 1999, to pass on any information I provide which may impact on the security of the prison, such as illegal acts, harmful behaviour, intention to self-harm, commit suicide etc.

I am fully informed and I am happy to take part in this project.  Yes  

No

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Participant’s signature ____________________________  Date ____________________________

Interviewer’s signature ________________  Sample Group (circle)  1  2  3

Witnesses signature (if necessary) ____________________________

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Participant Withdrawal: (I.D code provided above)

PLEASE TICK IF YOU AGREE

I wish to terminate this interview; no information already acquired will be used in the study or given to any third parties