A JOURNEY BEYOND THE BARS:

PARTICIPANTS' EXPERIENCES OF PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT IN A PRISON SETTING

A thesis

submitted in fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Social Science

at

The University of Waikato

by

DAMIAN TERRILL

THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

The University of Waikato

2010

It is said that no one truly knows a nation until one has been inside its jails

– Nelson Mandela

Abstract

This study explored the experiences of high-risk male offenders at varying stages of a prison-based residential rehabilitation programme. Information was elicited by means of 1:1 semi-structured interviews with three adult offenders: one programme completer, one approaching completion and one non-completer. The opinions of three members of unit staff (two programme facilitators and one custodial officer) were also included. Having identified a lack of process-focused qualitative research in the criminological literature, this thesis has attempted to provide an insight into the lived experiences of offenders undergoing a residential rehabilitative intervention. The results are presented through a combined postmodernist, social constructionist discourse. They identify a series of coherent themes which emphasise the importance of numerous contextual, linguistic and communicative variables in dictating the participants' self-perspectives and engagement with treatment. I will examine in particular, the role of motivation, the importance of the therapeutic bond established between participants and therapists, the relevance of the therapeutic environment, and the impact of both bi-cultural therapy and notions of individual stigmatisation. The overall findings are related to the broader penological literature in order to inspire further experiential analyses of offenders undergoing treatment, and to offer points for consideration in the application of prison-based rehabilitative interventions.

Acknowledgments

Dedication

To Dr. Marianne Lammers

For picking me up and keeping me running

Table of Contents

Chapter One - Introduction

Societal Violence

According to figures from Statistics New Zealand, violent crime rose from 45,229 recorded offences in 2004 to 59,935 in 2008, an increase of 25% in 4 years (Statistics New Zealand, 2009).

In this context violent crime includes a variety of offences from murder to common assault (Statistics New Zealand, 2009).

Violent criminal acts attract a great deal of media attention, particularly when they are committed by high-risk parolees and other community-based offenders. The actions of these individuals have inspired uncompromising political rhetoric concerning the optimal approach for addressing violent recidivism. For example, National's Action Plan for Violent Crime. The objectives of which comprise: raising police numbers, reviewing the Parole process and the adoption of a firm stance on organised gangs – in particular, their trading of illegal drugs (National Party, 2008). In conjunction with the Government's proactive approach to crime prevention, the Police are reviewing their operational policies. Police are advocating a nationwide increase in intelligence led operations, the specific targeting of the alcohol-related aspects of violent offending, the formation of the Australasian Prevention and Reduction of Family Violence Policy and the introduction of the Police Violence Reduction Unit (New Zealand Police, 2009).

Despite these positive indications from both Government and Police respectively, political rhetoric and detection methodologies provide only limited relief from the ever-present spectre of criminality. A recurrent question which has continued to burden academics, practitioners and the general public for many years is how do we, as a society, contain, manage, rehabilitate and re-integrate the most prolific recidivists? In short: What works?

Addressing the Problem

In an attempt to answer this complicated question numerous researchers have adopted quantitative, outcome focused evaluations of prison-based psychotherapeutic rehabilitation programmes (Friendship, Blud, Erikson, & Travers, 2002; Friendship, Blud, Erikson, Travers & Thornton, 2003; McGuire, 2002 and Polaschek, Wilson and Townsend, 2005) and have consistently argued in favour of the efficacy of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) interventions in reducing re-offending rates. These studies provide evidence of treatment efficacy.

Some may contend; however, that the reductionist view favoured by these studies fails to acknowledge the complexities of idiographic human dynamics. Such research may overlook the importance of a number of discreet relationships, for

example, those between staff, the contextual environment and the participants. According to Davidson and Tolich (1999) reductionist logic fails to provide a detailed insight into the relevance of these critical phenomena. This circumstance holds valid, real-world, implications to the canon of rehabilitative psychological intervention as it highlights the incapacity of quantitative studies to illuminate a considerable portion of the therapeutic relationship.

A Qualitative Lens

As a scientific paradigm devoted to the study of behaviour, Psychology has dedicated much of its attention to developing insights into the behaviours, opinions and worldviews of humans in a variety of contextual settings. One may contend, therefore, that to understand the meaning of an event, behaviour, opinion or worldview one must understand the context in which it has taken place.

A great deal of psychological research remains firmly in the modernist, quantitative school and is, therefore, less concerned with notions of contextualisation. With an emphasis on meaning, as opposed to quantification (Millward, 2006), qualitative research opens up a channel for exploration. It enables the researcher to delve into those areas, rich in obscurities, which exists between people, objects and knowledge and subtly fuse them in a synergistic union.

As qualitative research embraces a number of broad philosophical paradigms and interpretative lenses it is necessary to select those which are deemed most appropriate for a study which emphasises the importance of an individual world view in expressing the inherent *truth*(*s*) in a particular context or setting. To this end, in this section I provide a brief orientation to two paradigms which have informed my approach.

Postmodernism

From a methodological standpoint, postmodernism opposes numerous commonly held modernist positions, most notably, the belief in the existence of an independent reality which may be understood through the utilisation of objective research methodologies (Proctor & Capaldi, 2006). Postmodern thinkers (for example Guba, 1990) occupy the dual position that reality exists solely in the mind, whilst absolute objectivity is a fallacy. As a died-in-the-wool relativist, Guba (1990) maintains that "Realit*ies* exist in the form of multiple mental constructions, socially and experimentally based, local and specific, dependent for their form and content on the persons who hold them" (p.20). Guba takes his position further by proposing that the source of these various composed realities can only be understood by assessing the nature of mans" social relations. By acknowledging the socially constructed nature of mans' understanding, and the proposed absence of an all-encompassing, observable, objective reality, one is

2

forced to accept that no one methodology is more apposite than any another at the task of addressing and observing nature. According to Guba "The constructivist chooses to take a *subjectivist* position. Subjectivity is not only forced on us by the human condition … but because it is the only means of unlocking the constructions held by individuals. If realities exist only in respondents' minds, subjective interaction seems to be the only way to access them" (p.22)

Social Constructionism

The term Social Constructionism or Constructivism, as some commentators prefer, is currently experiencing broad usage amongst the realms of social commentary, being commonly applied in a variety of conceptual domains, including: gender, race, sex, hetro and homo-sexual relations, mental illness, reality and truth (Mallon, 2008). Whilst some commentators consider social constructionism to be a form of postmodern thought (Proctor & Capaldi, 2006) others (Creswell, 2007) readily acknowledge the proximity of its relationship with postmodernism, but credit it for its distinct epistemological and ontological principles. Theorists are in agreement; nonetheless, that the primary facets of social constructionism are concerned with the idiographic creation of reality through exposure to group dynamics and social relations. This view is somewhat oppositional to the naturalistic perspective which regards science as the most dependable (if occasionally flawed) foundation for knowledge relating to the world. Given its express emphasis on the significance of social relations, research conducted under the banner of social constructionism is chiefly concerned with exposing or representing the inter-relational aspects of human behaviour as a means of most accurately depicting the realities of the participants it is following. For the social constructionist, it is the collective agreement of the people that determines *the real* in a particular circumstance or statement; not the degree to which it concurs with an external reality (Proctor & Capaldi).

The postmodernist influence of social constructionism is expressed, unmistakably, in the importance it places upon peoples' use of language; more specifically, that the principles we commonly acknowledge to be objective truth, actually result from the ways in which we generate, define and express our individual consciousness through language (Proctor & Capaldi, 2006). Proctor and Capaldi observe how the epistemological position of the social constuctionist (emphasising the importance of interpreted linguistic meaning) is in stark contrast to the positivist view, which favours a focus upon sensory awareness of the external world. Consistent with this view, Mallon (2008) refers to what has come to be known, in the rhetoric of social constructionism, as the *science wars.* According to Mallon, social constructionism has invested heavily in critical analyses of the conclusions drawn by the proponents of the various accepted scientific theories, including rationality, realism and process. Social constructionists frequently take issue with the *facts* these theories profess as,

according to Laudan (1996) and Kukla (2000) science has failed to acknowledge the socially constructed environment from which they were spawned.

Having broadly outlined the philosophical lenses through which this research will be focused it is appropriate at this stage to examine its specific aims.

Aims of the Present Study

The principal aim is to obtain a detailed understanding of the experiences of high-risk offenders who have recently completed, or are soon to complete, an intensive rehabilitation programme in the Karaka Unit – Waikeria Prison. This will be achieved by examining the following domains:

The nature of the participants' motivation to undertake treatment

- The role of the relationship between therapist and client (the therapeutic alliance) in respect of programme engagement.

- The impact of the wider institutional context upon the therapeutic alliance.

Thesis Outline

This thesis offers an insight into the experiences of high-risk offenders undergoing an intensive rehabilitation programme within the New Zealand penal system. Chapter Two offers a detailed analysis of the contemporary literature concerning the rehabilitation of offenders. Chapter Three highlights the broader research problem and describes my approach to the research. Chapter Four consists of an overview of the principal research findings. Both full and partial transcriptions of interview data are included so as to illustrate the key themes and patterns which emerged. In Chapter Five, I draw conclusions which highlight the key findings of this research and relate them to particular aspects of the broader literature. The limitations of this research are presented and recommendations for further inquiry are offered.

Chapter Two - Literature Review

This chapter will examine much of the contemporary literature surrounding criminogenic treatment. Studies from both New Zealand and other international sources will be considered. Having discussed the discrepancy between quantitative and qualitative research paradigms I will explore the outcomes of three qualitative studies involving the criminal population. Two of these studies are UK-based and look specifically at prison-based cognitive-behavioural treatment programmes; the third is New Zealand-based and considers the experiences of Tikanga Maori programme participants. At this point I will introduce my own thoughts concerning the interaction between prison staff members (facilitators and custodial staff) and the participants, and the cumulative effect of these upon the participants faith in the institution to provide effective treatment (circular causality and the Edifice Complex). I will also examine the role played by participant motivation and its interplay with therapeutic engagement.

New Zealand-based Criminogenic Treatment

The Risk Needs Responsivity (RNR) Model (Andrews & Bonta, 1998, 2003, 2006) has played a significant role in the identification of risk and delivery of treatment within the New Zealand penal system.

Having conducted a thorough review of the literature concerning the psychological processes underpinning effective rehabilitative interventions, Andrews and Bonta (2006) emphasised a shift away from punishment, identifying this as the *zeitgeist* which dominated the rehabilitative arena throughout the 1960-1970s. Instead, Andrews and Bonta favour a more contemporary view of rehabilitative engagement, one which emphasises the role of positive reinforcement. In defence of what some may describe as a non-punitive 'soft option', Andrews and Bonta insist that for many offenders, especially those with restricted interpersonal skills, punishments alone will not empower them to cultivate new coping mechanisms or interpersonal skills and are instead, more likely to induce feelings of helplessness, anger, and resentment towards the wider community. In further defence of their rehabilitative stance, Andrews and Bonta maintain that by favouring reinforcement over and above punishment, authorities circumvent the myriad ethical humanitarian quandaries allied with the deliberate imposition of state-sanctioned punitive action. Andrews and Bonta remain resolute in their stance that punishment alone will only serve to suppress existing behaviours; whereas, the reinforcement of desired behaviours holds the key to determining new ones.

According to the RNR model, treatment should be delivered on an aggregated basis so that those individuals posing the most serious risk are afforded the most intensive intervention. The process of matching risk level to degree of treatment is crucial in the rehabilitative format as it essentially bridges the gap between assessment and effective treatment (Andrews & Bonta, 2006).

Assessing Risk

In accordance with the contemporary approach to risk assessment it would be erroneous to assume that an individual's risk is a static phenomenon derived from unchanging idiographic variables; therefore, regular assessments of dynamic variables of risk need to be undertaken is prominent.

The value of appropriate risk assessment is empirically well supported with numerous authors emphasising its role in determining treatment allocation. Lowenkamp, Latessa and Holsinger (2006) examined the evidence sourced from 13,676 offenders comprising a total of 97 residential and non-residential programmes throughout the US. These programmes were assessed as to how closely they aligned to the aggregated risk principle. Information relating to a number of discrete variables such as: length of time in the programme, the range of services offered to high-risk offenders and the incorporation of a cognitive behavioural treatment modality was included. Lowenkamp *et al* concluded that the provision of intensive services to those offenders deemed to be at the higher end of the risk continuum resulted in a reduction in recidivism by 18 percent for those offenders in residential treatment, and nine percent for those in an open programme.

It follows, therefore, that an accurate, updated assessment of risk should be undertaken for all offenders, most especially those undergoing treatment. Risk assessment protocols have developed dramatically since their initial 'First Generation' conception. First generation risk assessment essentially consisted of practitioners reaching hypotheses of an individual's risk by means of their clinical judgement (Grove & Meehl, 1996, as cited in Wilson, Tamatea & Riley, 2007). The rise of structured, actuarial risk assessment tools, such as the RoC*RoI (Bakker, Riley & O'Malley, 1999), led the way in what is now referred to as the 'Second Generation' of risk assessment (Wilson *et al,* 2007, p.430), whereby, an idiographic, categorical risk assessment is derived for a particular offender based upon empirically validated static factors such as: age of first offence, number of previous convictions and current chronological age etc. Static risk factors are those which are unchangeable, or will only change with the progression of time (G. Kilgour, personal communication, August, 30, 2008). Given its emphasis upon static factors, second generation risk assessment offers a baseline assessment of risk.

Third generation risk assessments are the most recent addition to the risk assessment family. In conjunction with the second generation, third generation risk assessments are empirically validated in their approach and have been deliberately designed to offer insight beyond the baseline indicator of the second generation as they incorporate wider, contextually dependent variables deemed to have been focal during the build-up to and commission of the offence(s) in question. They include such factors as: intimacy deficits, social influences, attitudes and self regulation – both sexual and non-sexual (Stable) and substance abuse, negative mood, anger/hostility and victim access (Acute) (Hanson & Harris, 2000).

Identifying Treatment Needs

Once a participant's eligibility for treatment has been established it is necessary to identify their most prominent needs. In New Zealand this is accomplished through the administration of a structured, offence-focused interview (generally carried out pre and post sentencing) which examines the cognitive-behavioural patterns of the offender at the period leading up to and the commission of their index offending. This interview is known as the Criminogenic Needs Inventory or CNI (Department of Corrections, 2006).

An evolution of the original works by Coebergh, Bakker, Anstiss, Maynard and Percy (1999), and Maynard, Coebergh, Anstiss, Bakker and Huriwai (1999) (as cited in Department of Corrections, 2006, p.23), the CNI is a cognitive-behavioural theory-styled interview which provides an accurate overview of the offender's thoughts, feelings, actions and somatic responses throughout the period in question. In addition, it identifies any historical behaviour which may have influenced the primary behaviour(s) under scrutiny (Coebergh *et al,* 1999, as cited in Department of Corrections, 2006). According to Coebergh *et al* (ND, as cited in the Department of Corrections, 2006) the CNI is normed against a New Zealand sample, with a reliability value at the upper end of the continuum (r = 0.82).

The CNI is designed to screen for the following Offending Period Criminogenic Needs (OCNs) in the 24-hours leading up to the offence commission: offence-related emotions and cognitions, violence propensity, criminal associates, relationships, alcohol and drugs, risk-taking arousal, impulsivity and gambling. Further to these OCNs, three other needs are investigated, which if detected, will require the offender to be referred to either a Departmental Psychologist or the Forensic Mental Health Services, these include: psychiatric or organic disorders and offence-related sexual arousal (Department of Corrections, 2006).

The CNI is also designed to be used (through a separate interview format) as a means of identifying the following Pre-disposing Criminogenic Needs (PCNs), which may have occurred during the month leading to the offence commission:

emotions, offence-related cognitions, violence propensity, criminal associates, relationships, alcohol and drugs, risk-taking arousal, impulsivity, gambling and lifestyle balance (Department of Corrections, 2006).

Research (Maynard *et al*, 1999 & Coebergh *et al*, 1999 as cited in Department of Corrections, 2006) suggests that those offenders who identify as Maori are susceptible to a variety of culturally significant circumstances that can influence their risk of offending in addition to the standard OCNs and PCNs. These needs referred to as Maori Cultural Related Needs (MaCRNs) include: cultural identity, cultural tension, whanau and whakawhanaungatanga.

It is a combination of these specific OCNs, PCNs and MaCRNs which determine the structural content of treatment within the New Zealand Department of Corrections.

The Matter of Responsivity

Returning, once again, to consider the principles of the RNR Model; Andrews and Bonta (2006) insist that treatment delivery must take into consideration any idiographic responsivity barriers with which the participant(s) may present. Responsivity barriers include such interpersonal dynamics as motivation, substance abuse or any psychiatric or organic thought disorders which may negatively impact upon the learning process. Furthermore, central to the idea of responsivity, is the view that for treatment content to maximise its impact it should be delivered in a manner best suited to the learning styles and skills of the participants; for example, if the group has a particular passion for art or music, these media should be incorporated as the primary mode of content dissemination.

Andrews and Bonta (2006) emphasise the interplay between cognition and behaviour as a fundamental human characteristic to support their view that the rehabilitative treatment of all criminogenic needs is most effectively delivered in a cognitive-behavioural format. They advocate the use of social learning and cognitive-behavioural paradigms to deliver course content via specially designed rehearsal activities such as role plays, behaviour modelling and skill development.

Andrews and Bonta (2006) highlight the importance of direct human services in offender rehabilitation. Consistent with the aforementioned observations, the authors insist that punitive interventions alone are unlikely to make a significant impact in the reduction of long-term recidivism rates; moreover, that in order to increase their effectiveness, corrective interventions need to include specific rehabilitative treatment into their overall approach. It follows, therefore, that considerable attention must be paid to the formulation of structured treatment approaches for (high-risk) offenders, so as to take into consideration, firstly, the deliberate targeting of the most suitable individuals and, secondly, that those persons receiving treatment do so in a manner directly suited to their particular

needs. Andrews and Bonta stress that whilst their model provides treatment guidelines, it remains the skill of the individual facilitator to adapt their approach in order to best engage with the finite cognitive styles of their participants.

Taking into consideration the principles of the RNR Model and the specific requirements of Maori offenders, the programme at the heart of this research, the Special Treatment Unit Rehabilitation Programme (STU-RP), is formulated in accordance with the principles of Effective Interventions (EI). EI is a direct response to the type of reconviction data (Friendship, Thornton, Erikson, & Beech, 2001, as cited in Department of Corrections, 2006, p.12) which, according to the Department Of Corrections "… give a biased picture of offending activity …" (p.12). EI affirms that in order to maximise the likelihood of an offender reducing their risk of re-offending, it is essential for the intervention to be deliberately targeted to the treatment of the risk and needs of the client group. EI also states that treatment should be evidence based, there should be continuity between the treatment delivered and the overall services provided to the offender, and that the integrity of the programme should be maintained and supported at all times by regular supervisory input (Department of Corrections).

It is widely acknowledged that offenders, especially those with a high-risk rating, have a multitude of complex inter-related needs. Moreover, that these needs can be subdivided into two specific categories. Criminogenic needs are dynamic in nature, having a direct impact upon offending (e.g. Impulsivity) and, therefore, offer a positive indication of potential treatment targets. On the other hand non-crimongenic neds, which may also be dynamic, hamper the maintenance of an offence-free lifestyle, but are not directly correlated with offending (e.g. low self esteem) (Lammers, 2009). Because of their close proximity of to offending, specific criminogenic needs should be targeted in rehabilitative programmes (Andrews & Bonta, 2006). This is not to discredit the value of assisting offenders to deal with other, non-crimongenic, needs: rather, it is to ensure that those needs which are empirically linked with recidivism are addressed as a matter of priority and delivered through the rehabilitative intervention.

Delivering Treatment

The Department of Corrections (2006) observe that, despite the rigours of an evidence-based approach to offender rehabilitation, no one programme can effectively target the entire web of complex needs with which offenders often present. Therefore, it is recommended that careful attention is applied to all aspects of the intervention process, beginning with the initial research and development phase and continuing into the delivery of the course objectives by the practitioners on the ground.

The Department of Corrections acknowledge the possibility that the delivery of treatment may, on occasions, be inconsistent with the original research design.

9

They cite Hollin's (1995) observation that circumstances of this nature are collectively referred to as programme drift, or programme degradation (Hollin, 1995, as cited in Department of Corrections, 2006, p.12). Because this is likely to have a corrosive impact upon programme efficacy, the Department of Corrections' EI initiative maintains that all aspects of programme delivery should be consistent with their original research design. It is, therefore, of the utmost importance that treatment within the STU-RP is delivered with high fidelity.

Cognitive-behavioural Interventions – the Empirical Evidence

It is apparent that cognitive-behavioural interventions are the preferred means of psychological treatment within the New Zealand prison system. With the exception of a study by Polaschek, Wilson and Townsend (2005), there is little research into the effects of this approach upon New Zealand offenders. In order to obtain an insight into the effects of these interventions it is necessary to examine the international research portfolio.

During the early-mid 2000s (2003-2004) the UK Home Office commissioned a series of reviews into the cognitive skills programmes being delivered in prisons throughout the United Kingdom, including Reasoning and Rehabilitation (R&R) (Ross, Fabino and Ewles, 1988) and Enhanced Thinking Skills (ETS) (Clark, 2000, as cited in Clarke, Simmonds & Wydall, 2004). These reviews were compiled by a number of Home Office researchers and independent analysts working in unison to formulate a comprehensive, ecologically valid research portfolio offering detailed insight into the various socio-cognitive domains associated with offender rehabilitation.

According to Clarke *et al* (2004) cognitive, or thinking skills interventions, were introduced into the prison curriculum during the early 1990s. By 2003 they had become the standard rehabilitative tool utilised by over three-quarters of the prisons throughout England and Wales. Consistent with the conventional trend in evaluative studies, preliminary reviews of these programmes had been outcome-focused, quasi-experimental, or randomised controlled trials centred on statistical analysis as the primary tenet by which to judge their effectiveness. These quantitative studies returned mixed results ranging from no obvious impact to a 14%reduction in re-offending rates over 24 months (Cann, Falshaw, Nugent & Friendship, 2003; Falshaw, Friendship, Travers & Nugent, 2003; Friendship *et al,* (2003).

In addition to the quantitative outcome results offered by the Home Office, Tong and Farrington (2006) undertook an exhaustive meta-analysis comprising numerous quantitative outcome studies of a variety of R&R programmes from the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom and Sweden. Tong and Farrington deliberately elected to analyse those studies with a large sample size and small confidence interval, in order to present data that offered a strong estimate of effect

size. Tong and Farrington's meta-analysis returned favourable results for the efficacy of R&R programmes in those countries which had carried out broad evaluative studies (US, Canada and the UK), with an overall 14% decrease in offending for programme participants, compared to control groups. Despite having been targeted towards medium to high-risk offenders, Tong and Farrington concluded that the R&R programme was most effective within the low-risk categories. Tong and Farrington attribute this to a greater attrition rate within the higher risk populations. This finding is consistent with that of Palmer *et al* (2008, as cited in Hollin & Palmer, 2009, p.155). These findings may bring into question Andrews and Bonta's (2006) conclusions on the targeting of structured interventions at high-risk offenders.

Meta analyses and large-scale outcome studies, such as those previously discussed add tangible support to the argument that cognitive programmes are effective in reducing re-offending. However, in accordance with the age-old principles of Occam's razor[1], these conclusions should not be taken as guarantor for the unconditional effectiveness of all prison-based cognitive interventions. Ergo, researchers (Hollin & Palmer, 2009) support the ongoing inclusion of detailed evaluations of individual programmes in order to inform best practice.

The Evolution of Rehabilitative Treatment

In 1974, Martinson's (1974) paper "What Works: Questions and Answers on Prison Reform", painted a bleak picture of offender rehabilitation, concluding that the process is fundamentally flawed "…education…or psychotherapy at its best, cannot overcome, or even appreciably reduce the powerful tendency for offenders to continue in criminal behaviour…" (Martinson 1974, cited in Anstiss, 2003, p.84).

Since then, prison-based interventions have undergone a marked development both in terms of their methodological approach and epistemological standing. The consensus amongst more contemporary penologists and psychologists (e.g. Andrews, 1995; Andrews, Zinger, Hodge, Gendreau & Cullen, 1990; Cann, Falshaw, Nugent & Friendship, 2003; Dowden & Andrews, 1999; Falshaw, Friendship, Travers & Nugent, 2003; Garrett, 1985; Hollin & Palmer, 2009; Izzo & Ross, 1990; Lipsey, 1992; Lipsey, Chapman & Landenberger, 2001; Lipton, Martinson & Wilks, 1975; McGuire & Priestley, 1995; Polaschek *et al* (2005); Tong & Farrington, 2006; Wexler, Falkin & Lipton, 1990 and Whitehead & Lab, 1989) is, that through the correct identification and targeting of an offender's specific criminogenic (offence related) psychological determinants, and the implementation of appropriately targeted cognitive behavioural interventions, the

---

[1] The principle of parsimony or ontological economy. According to Occam's razor simplicity is deemed favourable in theory construction, thus, entities are not to be multiplied beyond necessity (Reber & Reber, 2001).

likelihood of that offender reducing their proclivity for antisocial conduct is significantly increased.

The New Zealand Department of Corrections undoubtedly favours a contemporary proactive outlook of offender rehabilitation. According to Anstiss (2003), the Department has invested heavily in the development of intervention programmes designed to target particular offender populations and offence typologies. These interventions are generally focused upon those individuals who have committed crimes against the person (sexual and violent offenders). Despite the advances made by the New Zealand Department of Corrections, and other New Zealand-based criminological researchers, it is apparent that an opportunity exists within the literature to bring New Zealand on a par with the international academic community in respect of evaluative studies of prison-based cognitive rehabilitation programmes; whether these are essentially qualitative, quantitative or from a mixed methodological approach.

The Qualitative – Quantitative (Im)balance

Having examined much of the literature it is apparent that current research dynamics within both the Department of Corrections and the international research community mirrors a trend which is consistent within the broader context of psychology as an academic discipline; one which sees qualitative research occupying the place of 'little brother' to its more boisterous, well renowned, quantitative, sibling. Although it is still early days, the Department of Corrections is beginning to develop its commitment to qualitative research, as can be evidenced in Whitehead, Ward and Collie's (2007) single-case study exploring the impact of the Good Lives Model upon a high-risk violent offender.

Despite the generally held consensus that qualitative and quantitative research are diametrically opposed, it has been proposed (Friedman 2008) that there is no clear delineation between quantitative and qualitative research. Moreover, that all research, regardless of its rigorous attempts to the contrary, will inevitably incorporate aspects of both dimensions. For some, Friedman's point may be a highly contentious one. However, to maximise the breadth of their conceptual understanding it is prudent for researchers to explore, or at the very least be open to, as many aspects of research as is practicable and reasonable.

Given the reciprocal status of a rise in violent crime and the Department of Corrections' policy of developing treatment programmes which target violent offenders; it is prudent for the Department of Corrections to undertake regular reviews and programme evaluations. Whilst quantitative evaluations and meta analyses of New Zealand-based criminogenic rehabilitation programmes and international offence-related treatment interventions are in abundance Hollin & Palmer, 2009; McGuire, 2002; Polaschek *et al* 2005; Smith, Goggin & Gendreau,

2001 and Tong & Farrington, 2006) the same cannot be said for qualitative methodologies.

Chwalisz, Shah and Hand (2008) observed that "Qualitative research methods have much to contribute to theoretical and applied knowledge in rehabilitation psychology. However, as a discipline, rehabilitation psychology has been behind the curve in employing qualitative methods" (p.387). In addition, Pattenaude (2004) noted that research regarding correctional facilities is, for the most part, quantitative in nature. Pattenaude suggests that as a consequence of the methodological and epistemological paradigms underpinning it, research of this nature overlooks the "... richness of meaning, depth of understanding, and flexibility that are the hallmarks of qualitative research..." (p.70s). Pattenaude further identifies the need for prison-based research to be "...pragmatic and policy-orientated..." (*ibid*) in order for it to be beneficial to practitioners. Drawing from Sabatier (1993), Pattenaude suggests a methodological shift, emphasising the point that qualitative research is ideally suited to obtaining the subjective understanding inherent in policy-orientated learning.

Despite their relative paucity in comparison to more quantitative, outcome-focused studies of prison-based offending-related-intervention programmes, it is essential not to overlook the potential value of qualitative evaluations of interventions. Research of this nature provides insight into the 'big questions' - the delicate processes, characteristics and interactions which occur during treatment. Qualitative analyses of offender rehabilitation programmes explore the intricate themes of offender treatment; themes which are critical in establishing a holistic understanding of offender rehabilitation. To neglect qualitative studies is to foster a potentially detrimental void in the overall credibility of the penological research discipline.

Current Qualitative Studies

Quantitative analyses of rehabilitation programme are crucial for researchers intent on making interpretations of raw data in order to affirm categorical, clinical judgement of treatment effectiveness. Such evaluations give an indication of what works, but not necessarily the bigger question of "… what works for whom, under what conditions and in what type of setting …" (Clarke *et* al, 2004 p.242 - 2).

Clarke *et al* (2004) conducted a study, on behalf of the UK Home Office, in which they endeavoured not only to shed light on the socio-cognitive processes inherent within cognitive skills programmes, but, more specifically, to explore how these processes were recognised and received by the participants. Clarke *et al* were concerned with addressing the fundamental question of 'what works' contextually, *in vivo*. Of particular interest to Clarke *et al* were the motivational and institutional factors which enabled the participants of the cognitive skills

programmes to utilise their newly discovered skills to greatest effect, in respect of both their offence-related and day-to-day psychosocial interactions and cognitive-behavioural processes.

The methodology utilised by Clarke *et al* (2004) involved a semi-structured interview (varying in length from fifteen-minutes to 1.5 hours) with 113 participants (>21-years). This sample comprised sixty-two serving inmates who had successfully completed either ETS or R&R interventions (programme graduates), ten prisoners who had re-offended and been sentenced since completing either ETS or R&R programmes (reconvicted graduates), five community-based offenders who had been released post-completion (desisting graduates), thirty-three staff members closely associated with programme delivery (programme staff), and a further eight who were not directly related to the programme (non-programme staff). The participants were recruited from six institutional settings. Despite adding some logistical complication, the breadth of the study was deemed necessary in order to build a comprehensive sample encompassing both offenders and staff from prisons at opposing ends of the Implementation Quality Rating (IQR) continuum, and to allow for variation in their Institutional Support Rating (ISR) scores.

Commencing Treatment

Clarke *et al* (2004) concluded that the means by which cognitive skills training was made available to potential participants and the manner in which the aims and objectives of the programmes were expressed to them was instrumental in determining their motivation to participate. Sadly, Clarke *et al* did not provide a detailed description of this relationship; however, they did suggest that the prisoners' preliminary views of the programmes were affected by a number of factors such as, unconfirmed reports or 'rumours' from other inmates, official documentation and verbal communications from staff. A common theme identified by the prisoners in respect of the information emanating from staff was that participation was non-negotiable, particularly if they wished to obtain a favourable Parole report. Clarke *et al* identified how this approach is in direct contrast to the theories of motivation proposed by leading motivational experts Miller and Rollnick (1991, 2002) who contend that self-initiated or *intrinsic* motivation is crucial for establishing behavioural change. Miller and Rollnick stipulate "intrinsic motivation is enhanced by the perception that one has freely chosen a course of action, without significant external influence or coercion" (1991, 22, as cited in Clarke *et al*, p.36). Nevertheless, Clarke *et al* suggest that the essentially extrinsic form of motivational influence they observed in respect of participant recruitment did result in some of their participants experiencing degrees of personal growth; a point which will be further discussed below.

That certain participants viewed programme participation as mandatory raises another issue; that of free and informed consent.

The ethical principle that, wherever possible, the participant should offer his or her free and informed consent (to undertake psychological assessment or intervention) is universally accepted amongst psychological practitioners. Moreover, practitioners generally acknowledge that by virtue of their status they hold considerable influence over a potential participant, a point which is magnified in an environment, such as a penal institution, which decrees harsh punitive measures to curtail conduct deemed to be disobedient or dissident. Wilson *et al* (2007) emphasise how informed consent is of particular relevance in correctional psychology, as those persons receiving treatment are, in the majority of cases, mandated to attend. Therefore, the responsibility lies firmly with the psychologist/practitioner to clarify the nature of the intervention (including the extent of the consequences of non-participation) so as to ensure the client fully understands the commitment they are making, and so enters into treatment of their own free will. Although exceptions do exist to this ruling (in the form of a judicial request for Health Assessor's report – section 88, Sentencing Act 2002, as cited in Wilson *et al, ibid*) these are in cases of extreme risk and, even then, the individual retains the right to decline participation (whereupon a report is constructed from relevant file information).

The issue of free and informed consent is a complex one. One may justly question weather it is possible for a person considering participating in any procedure to give their consent in a manner that is entirely uninfluenced by an external source. What is crucial in this circumstance, however, is the need for potential participants to be briefed in detail of the possible implications of participation versus non-participation, and for them to be given time to consider their decision in a manner that is not subject to direct coercion.

Positive Responses to Cognitive-behavioural Treatment

According to Clarke *et al* (2004) the general feedback from participants and facilitators alike was exceptionally positive. Participants noted constructive changes in their attitudes and behaviours since commencing the intervention. These comments were echoed by the facilitation staff. There was a consistent message from the majority of staff members (regardless of their occupational status or position within the prisons) as to the overall credibility of the programme. They placed particular value of the 'stop and think', problem solving, victim-empathy based and social skills modules.

Clarke *et al* (2004) observed that the majority of the programme graduates emphasised the support they received from facilitation staff in addressing their maladaptive thought patterns, noting a marked increase in the incidence of pro-social behaviour they had begun to demonstrate amongst their peers, in an array of circumstances, since completing the programme. Furthermore, Clarke *et al* point out that the majority of the interviewees readily acknowledged how their newly-discovered cognitive strategies would not only lead them away from past

behaviours which may have resulted in a criminal conviction, but were applicable to all aspects of their lives.

McMurran and McCulloch (2007) conducted a similar study to that of Clarke *et al* (2004); however, McMurran and McCulloch turned their attention towards programme non-completers. McMurran and McCulloch interviewed eighteen programme non-completers; who, despite their failure to graduate from a rehabilitative intervention, revealed a considerable amount of positive feedback for the intervention they had begun (either R&R or ETS). Almost half of those interviewed (8/18) believed the programme was appropriate for them; nevertheless, two indicated that the timing was not ideal. Although McMurran and McCulloch did not directly clarify this point in respect of the two participants in question, a thorough reading of their paper suggests that some of the participants felt that they would have benefited from other, in their eyes, more pressing issues such as alcohol and drug abuse being targeted prior to their offence-related cognition. Nevertheless, twelve of the eighteen interviewees contended that the programme had given them insight into extremely pertinent aspects of their personality, for example, problem solving and impulse control.

An additional control group of six successful programme completers were recruited to enable between group comparisons to be made. All of those who successfully completed the intervention expressed a great deal of satisfaction, particularly in regards to the skills they had learnt, such as: stop and think, problem solving, considering aims, goals and objectives, considering the opinions of others, debating issues and sharing ideas and appropriate group participation. In fact, one participant was so impressed with the course content that he suggested private companies should offer it to their employees (McMurran & McCulloch, 2007).

All of the graduates alluded to developments made in what may be described as their theory of mind skills. They acknowledged, as a group, how the programme would be of considerable assistance to them in reducing future offending as they now had a greater awareness of the effects of their actions upon those around them. The graduates contended that they had begun to practice, *in vivo*, the various skills which they had acquired in the classroom – one having stopped smoking and another having prevented a physical altercation in the prison (McMurran & McCulloch, 2007). Three graduates explicitly stated that completing the programme had affected the manner in which others perceive them. Each of them noticed marked improvements in their relationships with their programme peers, other inmates, prison and probation staff and their families. The participants reported having received positive feedback on their abilities to listen and respect external points of view from one or more of these groups of people.

From McMurran and McCulloch's (2007) original sample of eighteen non-completers, four were withdrawn by prison authorities, ten elected to withdraw of their own free will, two had to be removed due to poor health and two were released from prison prior to completion. On average, participants completed seven sessions (with a range of 1-18) from a total of twenty-one. Those who voluntarily withdrew (ten participants) cited the following reasons for their decision: personal circumstances (four), drug use (one), group dynamics (three), group members failing to take the sessions seriously (one), did not like the course (one), problems with tutors (one), out of sessions work too demanding (one) and other commitments (two). The majority of the participants who failed to complete the programme (either through voluntary withdrawal or having been removed by Prison authorities) expressed regret for their circumstance. Only two non-completers reflected positively, one stating they 'felt a lot better' and the other that they were 'happy to come off'; two more appeared unmoved by their non completion, one affirming they 'did not mind' and the other that they were 'not bothered'. However, the remaining fourteen were candid in their negative feelings towards non-completion using terms including 'gutted', 'devastated' and 'de-motivated' to describe their affect (pp.348-349).

Similar results were identified in the Department of Corrections-funded review of Tikanga Maori programmes conducted by Kahui Tautoko Consulting Limited (KTCL) (2008). Although Tikanga Maori programmes are not considered cognitive-behavioural in the formal western sense they are designed to assist participants reflect upon the interactions between their thoughts, feelings and conduct. Tikanga Maori programmes are delivered through a format that emphasises the cultural paradigms of its participants.

Evaluators of the Tikanga Maori programme interviewed twenty-seven Tikanga Maori programme graduates from an original cohort of sixty-one (thirty-four potential participants failed to complete the course, citing the following reasons: unawareness of enrolment (referrals made via Probation Officer), having no transport, unable to take time off of work and no desire to participate). Participants were chosen from five carefully selected regions within New Zealand: Christchurch, Manawatu, Napier, Hamilton and Auckland. These regions were preferred by the assessors as they had all delivered recognised Tikanga programmes over a number of years.

Data was obtained through a variety of methods which included: 1:1 interviews with participants (incorporating the administration of a formal assessment tool), interviews with programme facilitators and interviews with whanau members of the participants. The following areas were canvassed: knowledge of Whakapapa, knowledge of Tikanga Maori concepts, knowledge of Tikanga Maori activities, quality of immediate whanau relationships, quality of extended whanau relationships, motivation to learn more about Tikanga Maori, motivation to learn

about Whakapapa, motivation to be a positive role model for whanau, motivation to participate in other rehabilitative programmes(s), motivation to participate in training/other learning, motivation to be in employment and motivation to cease offending, Whanau interviews were conducted at the conclusion of the course and at a follow-up stage of three-months.

The formal assessment tool used was not specifically identified, although the authors maintain that is was adapted from an earlier tool used to measure an individual's learning and motivation in respect of cultural and offence-related dynamics via a five-point rating scale. The assessors identified a possible limitation in the transparency of the formal assessment tool, suggesting that it may have been too easy for interviewees to deliberately confabulate their answers in order to fake good. Precisely how the interviewers attempted to overcome this circumstance is not entirely clear, although they did indicate that they "…posed specific questions relating to the items on the scale as a means of ensuring offenders' responses were reasonably aligned to their current level of functioning…" (Department of Corrections, 2008, p.3). This would suggest that the interviewers may have deviated from the standard format, improvising questions they believed to be relevant to the original scaled items. Whilst this approach may have assisted in preventing the interviewees deliberately selecting what they perceived to be the most socially desirable answers; interviewers reconfiguring the questions of a formal assessment tool is contrary to the tool's intended design. Therefore, this may throw some doubt upon the reliability of the final data.

Although the interview served as a primary source of data, it is important to note that additional data was collected from a variety of sources including participant observations, discussions with course providers and relevant Department of Corrections employees and interviews with whanau. The inclusion of this cross-referencing serves as an important means of corroborating the interview data, going some way to counterbalance the confidence lost through adaptation of scaled items, and adding reassurance to the conclusions drawn.

The findings of the review were extremely positive, with participants demonstrating a notable improvement across the majority of the domains assessed. Prior to undertaking the course, participants self-rated average to moderate levels of knowledge, skills and motivation across most of the areas – exceptions were identified in quality of immediate and extended whanau relationships, motivation to desist offending and motivation to find employment, all of these domains were rated towards the higher end of the continuum. Improvements were identified in all of the areas assessed immediately post-graduation; moreover, these improvements had been further advanced by the three-month follow-up period. However, motivation to participate in other rehabilitative programmes and motivation to cease offending had dropped at the

three-month review period, but the levels were still higher than when they were initially assessed (prior to the intervention).

It is important to note that the authors describe the Tikanga Maori programme as having a "…primarily motivational purpose…" (Department of Corrections, 2008, p.4). As a corollary, interpretation of reconviction data was considered, but was not taken as the primary means of assessing the effectiveness of the Tikanga programme. The authors observe, however, that more than half of the individuals who failed to complete the course had either been charged with further offending or had been served with a Court Summons to answer a Breach of Sentence (laid by their Probation Officer). These findings raise significant questions about the efficacy of the programmes in reducing reoffending, an issue which will be further discussed below.

Although the authors were not expressly concerned with reconviction data they did observe that none of the successful graduates had been charged with further offending up to the three-month review. Whilst the authors affirm that this is a relatively short period of time, this finding supports the consensus view that completion of structured interventions is advantageous in reducing re-offending. Although presenting some possible logistical difficulties, an additional follow-up interview with this group would have been advantageous as it would enable a richer insight into the possible long-term reconviction patterns of the successful graduates whilst adding greater credibility to the overall results.

These three studies also identified problems which needed to be addressed. Amongst the less positive feedback received by Clarke *et al* (2004) were remarks regarding the timing of the intervention, with certain interviewees observing how access to the programme had been granted too late in their sentences; therefore, limiting the time available for them to rehearse the strategies they had learnt in a familiar, stable environment. It is important to note that all of the prisons associated with this research utilise the same policy in regard to an individual's appointment onto a cognitive-skills programmes, in that the priority wait-listing is biased in favour of those prisoners with the most imminent Parole dates. Ross, Polaschek and Ward (2008) contend that the problem of rehabilitative programmes being scheduled towards the latter part of a person's sentence is a common one. They note how scheduling interventions in this manner has a negative impact upon the effective collaboration of goals and tasks between client and participant (as part of the therapeutic alliance), and as such, increases the likelihood of treatment dropout. Ross *et al* hypothesise that offenders who are referred for interventions long after committing their index offence may no longer concur with the statements they made at the time of their arrest regarding finite offence antecedents. Conversely, they may uphold the importance of their original goal, but maintain, given the passage of time, they have successfully addressed it. Ross *et al* draw upon two particular theories to explain this phenomenon: firstly,

temporal self-appraisal theory, which proposes that individuals believe they have made significant improvements to disordered cognitive-behavioural processes simply by abstaining from such over a prolonged period (Ross & Wilson, 2003 as cited in Ross *et al*, 2008, p.470). Secondly, it is not uncommon for individuals (both from the offending and general populations) to employ logic akin to that of the *fundamental attribution error* to justify their perceived inter-personal advances. Consequently, positive achievements are attributed to internal process: negative ones to various external, contextual factors. Ergo, change in behaviour i.e. abstinence from alcohol and the problems associated with excessive alcohol consumption are attributed to intrinsic personal development, with little or no regard for the constraints placed upon alcohol consumption by the prison environment.

Negative experiences during rehabilitation programmes have a profound impact upon the maintenance of a strong therapeutic alliance. These experiences are influenced by a number of factors in addition to the scheduling of programmes or interventions. The role of the therapeutic alliance will be discussed in greater detail later.

In accordance with the findings of Clarke *et al* (2004), McMurran and McCulloch (2007) noted that a proportion of the offenders in their study of eighteen unsuccessful R&R and ETS participants cited the inappropriate timing of the intervention as contributing to their inability to successfully graduate. Participants stated that, for example, alcohol and drug use was causing the most discord in their lives at that particular time, and, as a corollary, hoped to address this aspect of their functioning before attempting cognitive-skills/offending-related interventions. Many of the participants interviewed by Clarke *et al* and McMurran and McCulloch felt priority of placements was given to those offenders with the most proximal Parole hearings; therefore, limiting the time available for them to practice their newly acquired skills. In addition to earlier access onto the intervention programme, prisoners interviewed by Clarke *et al* requested post-graduation support sessions in order to reinforce and bolster their knowledge.

Issues around Treatment Engagement

Presenting course material to the participants in a manner that will maximise the probability of them responding to it is a crucial determinant in effective programme delivery. Those participants interviewed by Clarke *et al* (2004) stated clearly that they feel a more individually tailored approach to interventions would have been beneficial as the current framework was somewhat unresponsive to the particular needs of certain participants, for example, those who may experience intellectual impairments or for whom English is a second language. Participants commented on the adverse effects of the 'one size fits all' scenario which they felt was the current norm.

In conjunction with a number of the participants surveyed in Clarke *et al'*s (2004) study, certain participants from the McMurran and McCulloch (2007) sample also cited the 'one size fits all' approach to programme content and delivery and a lack of wider institutional support as major treatment barriers. Half of McMurran and McCulloch's sample cited difficulties in comprehending the course content describing how they felt the course was not right for them due to a failure to understand the material presented and, on occasions feeling patronised by the facilitator. Eleven participants suggested that the programme's effectiveness would be increased by making it more engaging, less patronising, more direct and open-minded, and of greater relevance to additional lifestyle difficulties i.e. alcohol and drug abuse. Two of the participants interviewed by McMurran and McCulloch felt that greater financial remuneration would have ensured they completed the programme. The notion of paying participants to engage in treatment raises many questions, especially around the roles played by extrinsic and intrinsic motivation in programme participation. These are issues I return to later.

It is interesting to note, that the Tikanga Maori programme evaluation (Department of Corrections, 2008) did not identify any shortcomings in respect of programme delivery, programme timing or course content (including intellectual engagement with material). Facilitators attribute the careful structuring of course content to the overall success of the programme. They reported that all of the participants responded well to the 'hands-on' nature of culturally-based activities (kapa haka, taiaha, raranga and visits to local Marae) designed to help them learn about their cultural history and whanaungatanga. Conversely, the holistic design of the Tikanga programme did engender difficulties in identifying the explicit positive and negative aspects of the intervention. The encouraging findings associated with the Department of Corrections (2008) study may be due to a number of factors: for example, the more egalitarian, culturally-focused approach of the programme (offering self development through cultural insight as opposed to more generic cognitive-behavioural strategies), facilitation to offenders by individuals closely associated with them through cultural ties, and the deliberately planned kinaesthetic learning activities which operate throughout Tikanga Maori programmes.

Whilst the vast majority of the feedback concerning the delivery and content of the Tikanga programmes was exceptionally positive; one area that appears to have been overlooked by programme providers concerns the importance of ensuring appropriate follow-up for its graduates. As a general rule, programme providers made no formal arrangements for structured follow-up with programme graduates. Although some providers did have limited contact with programme graduates this appears to have been on a fairly unstructured, *ad hoc* basis. Certain programme providers indicated that they would happily undertake follow-up meetings with

graduates; if the appropriate funding was to be made available. The principal recommendations made by this review were at a Governmental (Departmental) level. The reviewers criticised the cultural knowledge base of the referring Community Probation & Psychological Services' (CPPS) staff and the basis of the overall funding procedure.

Evidence examined thus far suggests that careful consideration of structured interventions needs to be made in order to ensure the participants' most pressing demands are addressed in a timely manner in order to maximise the probability of their successful completion. Furthermore, particular attention must be invested at a developmental level to ensure the educational aspects of rehabilitation programmes are presented through a medium within which the participants can readily engage. In order for the participants to experience the optimal benefits of participation they must be given ample opportunity to rehearse the skills learnt in a safe, controlled environment before being faced (and potentially overwhelmed) by the additional difficulties of re-adjustment into mainstream society.

That these programmes failed to meet to the educational requirements of their participants is of grave concern. One possible solution would involve a critical review of both the overall course content and the delivery styles of the facilitators, with the intention of introducing a more accessible treatment package for those who are less dexterous with English. This may involve a streaming or tiering of the participant groups.

The institutional context surrounding programme delivery is a particularly salient point, with numerous participants from multiple studies (Clarke *et al*, 2004 & McMurran & McCulloch, 2007) identifying this as crucial to fostering a productive outcome.

Institutional Context

According to Ross *et al* (2008), the various contextual factors within the overall prison matrix play a substantial role in determining positive treatment outcomes. Nevertheless, it appears these factors have been largely overlooked by the research community. Ross *et al* make the pertinent observation that institutional factors can be divided into two distinct groups: firstly, *correctional system factors* – those factors beyond the control of the therapist and, in some cases the programme managers, they include such variables as decisions regarding which prisoners are eligible for treatment and when it will be made available; secondly, *issues in the immediate environment in which therapy is undertaken*. Reflecting upon this second point, it becomes apparent that the prison environment represents something of a dichotomy. On the one hand, prison must serve as an overtly punitive entity – stark and austere so as to instil the necessary desire to deter further offending. It must dictate to the offender that 'society has seen fit to punish and reject you'; thereby serving the publics' hunger for justice and

retribution. Conversely, the milieu of the prison-based therapeutic facility must engender feelings of inspiration and reinforce messages of positive self-regard and communal harmony – an oasis of calm in a world of despair.

As previously discussed, a large number of offenders in these studies commence their rehabilitative therapeutic programme towards the end of their sentences. For the most serious (most at-risk in-need) offenders this is likely to have been after many months, or indeed years, of living in a dangerous and hostile environment in which they were regularly subjected to negative reinforcement. Consequently, many offenders enter treatment with pre-ordained social schemas which prime an entrenched tendency to attribute hostile intent to all those around them. It should come as no surprise; therefore, that many of those persons interviewed by researchers concur with the view that the institutional context plays a key role in determining treatment outcome.

From the work of Clarke *et al* (2004) it is clear that the overall institutional context within which a programme is framed not only determines the manner in which it is received, but also has a significant impact upon its success. Clarke *et al* raise the point that successful programme completion is not due entirely to the characteristics of the intervention alone, but is instead, mediated by a number of interrelated factors, motivational, contextual and intra-psychic. A number of the programme facilitators interviewed by Clarke *et al* expressed their frustrations regarding the apparent lack of concern for the programme demonstrated by certain custodial officers who prevented prisoners from attending sessions in a timely manner by failing to release them from their cells as required. Ross *et al* (2008) discussed the findings of Qunisey, Harris, Rice and Cormier (1998) which maintain that the positive therapeutic work undertaken by both therapist and client during session can be drastically undermined in the wider prison environment by the misguided actions of certain custodial officers. Moreover, Ross *et al* draw upon the evidence of Dear, Beers, Dastyar, Hall, Kordanovski and Pritchard (2002) and Hobbs and Dear (2000) (*ibid*) which concludes that prisoners are unlikely to perceive custodial officers as an appropriate basis for support, particularly in regard to emotional difficulties. Ross *et al* observed that certain custodial personnel exhibit restricted interpersonal dexterity, even colluding, on occasion, with prisoners' antisocial principles. They made light of violence and distorted cognitions, for example, by referring to psychological interventions in terms of deceptive mind-trickery, or by trivializing the achievements made by offenders during interventions by remarking either to the offender, the therapist, or both that they are unlikely to change/affect change.

Clarke *et al* (2004) observed that within those custodial institutions which either failed to endorse, or deliberately impeded the efforts of the facilitation staff, morale amongst facilitators fell drastically, contributing to retention difficulties and extended sick leave. At the opposite end of the spectrum, the explicit support

of rehabilitation programmes by unit managers was deemed by all persons associated with the programmes to be fundamental in the preservation of their morale. Central to this pro-active approach to programme endorsement was the provision of regular staff-awareness training sessions to inform support staff (custodial officers and administration personnel) on the purpose of the programmes and the importance of continuing to reinforce their value.

McMurran and McCulloch (2007) made a number of pertinent observations regarding the relevance of both the overall context of the prison environment and the attitudes of prison staff in terms of their cumulative effects upon the participants' willingness to engage with the rehabilitative programme. As previously discussed, half of the participants interviewed by McMurran and McCulloch (9/18) cited difficulties grasping the programme content - in combination with feelings of belittlement, as having contributing to their non-completion. Furthermore, of particular concern is the observation by five of these nine participants that failing to complete their allocated programme resulted in staff members viewing them in a negative light. This position is especially alarming as it has the potential to be detrimental to the participants' opinions of (and future engagement with) rehabilitative interventions. The relationship between the various dynamics which underpin the contextual setting and the participants' overall engagement with the programme is a robust one. A finding of this nature highlights the importance of staff members creating and maintaining an environment conducive to the furtherance of treatment. Accordingly, both the inter-personal and environmental variables which determine the contextual setting within which my study is set will be carefully considered.

Circular Causality and the Edifice Complex

To fully appreciate the association between the efficacy of prison-based intervention programmes and the contextual factors which surround them it is useful to consider two inter-related phenomena: Circular Causality (akin to that defined in family systems theory, Galvin and Brommel, 1996) and the Edifice Complex. Torrey (1972) describes the Edifice Complex as the patient's (or in this case participant's) faith in the institution, therapy or practitioner to successfully address their disorder. After careful consideration, Torrey cites the Psychiatrist, Jerome Frank's conclusion that

The apparent success of healing methods based on all sorts of ideologies and methods, compels the conclusion that the healing power of faith resides in the patient's state of mind, not in the validity of its objects; moreover …efforts to heighten the patient's positive expectations may be as genuinely therapeutic as free association or habit training. (Frank, 1968, as cited in Torrey, 1972, p.46)

In a review of the literature concerning the correlation between clients' attitudes towards treatment, and successful outcomes (the Edifice Complex), Prochaska and

Norcross (2007) concluded that treatment results are notably influenced by the degree to which the client expects the treatment to be effective and, as a direct consequence, the motivational consonance they bring to the treatment. Therefore, it is appropriate to examine the affective position of the unsuccessful rehabilitation candidates interviewed by McMurran and McCulloch (2007).

McMurran and McCulloch (2007) stated clearly that five of the eighteen participants described how, having failed to complete the rehabilitative programme, they found themselves living within an institutional context which they perceive views them negatively "…staff think you won't change if you don't do the course…" (p.349). Given the reciprocal effects of the interactions between client and facilitator it is fitting to consider how, in accordance with the Edifice Complex, this institutional outlook may impact upon the participants' likelihood of undertaking further programmes. This is most appropriately achieved by applying the logic of circular causality. Firstly, the participant fails to complete the course: McMurran and McCulloch observed how, for many of them this position carries personal feelings of apathy and disinterest in prison-based interventions. Secondly, as a result of this pessimistic outlook, participants are more likely to view their broader contextual circumstances in a negative light, a circumstance which is then reinforced by the apparent negative attitudes held by certain members of prison staff towards 'programme non-completers.' Thirdly, the non-completer begins to process this destructive feedback and attribute negative or even hostile intent from the accusatory prison staff. This in turn, lowers the participant's emotional state and affirms their negative appraisal of the institutional context even further; and so, the cycle is precipitated.

The Interaction between the Edifice Complex and the Principle of Circular Causality - their Cumulative effect upon Treatment Outcomes

```
        ┌─────────────────────────┐
        │ Offender's negative     │
        │ emotional state (having │
        │ failed to complete      │
        │ treatment). Apathy and  │
        │ disinterest in current  │
        │ or future treatment     │
        └─────────────────────────┘

┌──────────────┐      ╭─────────────╮      ┌─────────────────────┐
│ Offender's   │      │             │      │ Offender begins to  │
│ lowered      │      │ The Edifice │      │ view the            │
│ emotional    │◄───► │ Complex     │◄───► │ institutional       │
│ state        │      │             │      │ context in a        │
│ (affect)     │      ╰─────────────╯      │ negative light –    │
└──────────────┘                           │ reinforced by       │
                                           │ negative attitudes  │
                                           │ from certain staff  │
                                           │ members             │
                                           └─────────────────────┘

        ┌─────────────────────────┐
        │ Offender's attribution  │
        │ of negative intent      │
        │ from (certain) staff    │
        │ members                 │
        └─────────────────────────┘
```

Note, that at any one point the Edifice Complex shares a reciprocal obligation with the elements of circular causality to affect the delicate balance established between therapist (and therapeutic environment) and offender/participant as part of the therapeutic alliance.

Extrinsic Incentives to attend Treatment

Given the current focus on the role of the institutional setting in determining treatment outcomes, I will look briefly at the comments made by two of McMurran and McCulloch's (2007) interviewees regarding the effects of prison-initiated financial incentives upon their attendance at intervention programmes. Although the notion of payment to attend interventions runs contrary to the opinions of key motivational theorists such as Miller and Rollnick (1991, 2002), who argue that a more intrinsic, self-motivated approach as necessary to sustaining behavioural change, the two interviewees in question maintained that increased financial incentives would have encouraged them to complete their intervention. This circumstance raises interesting questions about the role of extrinsic motivation as a catalyst for treatment attendance.

Whilst some critics conclude that the statement made by these two participants shows a lack of insight or motivational consonance, others may take into consideration the employment status of the participants and suggest they be fairly recompensed for time away from their job. According to numerous theorists (Clarke *et al*, 2004; Deci & Ryan, 2000) extrinsic motivation holds particular value in triggering programme attendance. Furthermore, this initial extrinsic trigger has, in many cases, pre-empted positive treatment outcomes.

Nevertheless, caution is urged in respect of payment to attend prison-based interventions as this practice lacks ecological validity. It is highly unlikely that a participant would receive any financial incentives to attend programmes post-release, or for that matter, their potential employers will agree to them attending programmes during their paid work hours. Therefore, prison authorities must consider carefully the underlying messages sent to prisoners through the approaches they use to initiate treatment attendance, as these approaches must remain congruous with the methodologies employed by the re-integrative, rehabilitative probation services, as it is likely that offenders will be required to continue with therapeutic interventions post-release. In order for prison-based offenders to attain the optimal psychological position prior to (re)-engaging with rehabilitative programmes it is essential for them to approach interventions with the appropriate motivational consonance – motivation which compels them to complete treatment regardless of the potential 'obstacles' which may hamper their progress. To facilitate this, the correctional staff must take advantage of every opportunity to complement the work of programme staff in enabling participants to build their intrinsic motivation. The achievement of this can be supported by ensuring the environment is responsive to the participants' emotional needs. The position occupied by motivation in the matter of treatment adherence is a substantial one, and as a corollary, will be discussed in greater detail subsequently.

The Importance of the Staff, the Environment and Group-based Treatment

It stands to reason that the institutional context plays a crucial part in determining a participant's willingness to undertake, complete and, in certain circumstances, re-enrol on further programmes. As tangible proponents of the overall prison context, prison staff members must remain acutely aware of the importance of the contextual framing of the prison environment. For certain staff, the prison represents a functional, sterile phenomenon. For some it may be little more than the place of work which they visit for eight to ten hours per day. However, for the inmates and potential programme participants, prison dictates their day to day lives and influences their existing worldview. Consequently, the responsibility placed upon the shoulders of prison staff is by no means a trivial one – staff members embody the ethos of the unit and as a consequence have a detrimental role in influencing treatment adherence through their part in the circular reinforcement of the Edifice Complex.

The participants interviewed as part of the Department of Corrections (2008) assessment of Tikanga Maori programmes provided a useful insight into the role of the organisational context in determining positive outcomes. Successful graduates emphasised the importance of establishing a positive working environment within the wider context of treatment. Programme graduates attributed a great deal of their success to the atmosphere created by the facilitators through their explicit knowledge of Tikanga. Moreover, they noted how the involvement of kuia and kaumata enhanced the value of the course content. In relation to this point, course providers highlighted the significance of promptly establishing coherence within the group dynamics. The course providers affirm they were able to ameliorate this process by employing facilitators well versed in their subject and highly regarded within the Maori community. Course providers recognised the additional support of whanau and Probation Officers in encouraging the participants to remain in the programme. They commented that their attendance at final graduation ceremonies provided considerable validation of the efforts made by participants and was tangible evidence of their support for the course *per se*. I consider these finding pertinent to my study as they demonstrate the value of appropriately skilled staff in creating an environment conducive to therapeutic rapport. Furthermore, they exemplify the important role played by support persons in empowering offenders to develop the motivation standpoint necessary for long-term behavioural change.

Having discussed some of the features hat appear to contribute to treatment retention I will examine the issue of completion, dropout and reconviction in more detail.

Completion and Dropout/Reconviction

The consistent message amongst researchers (Andrews & Bonta, 1998, 2003, Hollin & Palmer, 2009, McMurran & Theodosi, 2007 and Tong & Farrington, 2006) is that failure to complete rehabilitative programmes is detrimental to the long-term wellbeing of the former participants, as it correlates with re-offending.

McMurran and McCulloch (2007) contend that, in addition to the adverse interpersonal effects of non-completion for the individual participant, non-completion holds particular relevance on a macro-level. McMurran and McCulloch observe how non-completion results in programmes operating with reduced numbers; consequently, the cost-effectiveness of the overall programme is impaired. This is an incredibly pertinent observation given the ever-increasing accountability of government departments to the critical public eye. It is essential for publically funded interventions to justify their position and prove their worth in bold statistical terms.

McMurran and McCulloch emphasise the importance of analysing carefully offenders' reasons for non-completion, as, in their opinion, this is the optimal approach for obtaining the information necessary to reduce programme attrition rates. Somewhat paradoxically, none of the programme non-completers interviewed by McMurrann and McCulloch believed that failing to complete the programme had influenced their opinions regarding future offending. Nevertheless, one could argue that this perspective is indicative of Ross and Fabiano, 1985 (as cited in Clarke *et al*, 2004, p.242 – 2) micro-level analysis of criminality which postulates that an offender's lack of insight stems from their failure to acquire the necessary cognitive-developmental skills.

Numerous studies (Clarke *et al*, 2004, McMurran & McCulloch, 2007 and Department of Corrections, 2008) have compared those individuals who (a) dropped out of programmes and re-offended, (b) graduated but still re-offended, and (c) graduated and did not reoffend. The consensus view amongst participants was that a combination of factors including: reintegration problems, issues with addiction and an inability to actively apply their classroom-based skills *in vivo* contributed to their re-offending. Conversely, programme graduates on conditional release (in close contact with the Probation Service and other community-based support networks) who had established themselves in regular employment and acquired secure stable accommodation, appeared to have an acute awareness of the need to take responsibility for 'self-monitoring' – actively applying the skills learnt, in order to remain offence-free. Therefore, providing a comprehensive follow-up package to graduates of cognitive skills based and other related interventions is of critical importance in bolstering their opportunities for established behavioural change.   Of the participants studied by Clarke *et al* there was a clear indication that those who appeared to be maintaining an offence-free lifestyle had reached a point in their lives whereby they no longer wished to

undertake a criminal lifestyle, with a number of them stating that they had "…realised they genuinely wanted to change …" (p. 242 - 3).

An additional observation which can be made from the results of Clarke *et al*'s (2004) study concerns the participants' statements that *they* 'genuinely wanted to change'. Clarke *et al* noted that those participants who presented with a genuine desire to address their offending behaviour managed, quite successfully, to do so. The notion of firmly ordained intra-psychic commitment to change is consistent with the conclusions of Miller and Rollnick (2002), who concur that deep-seated intrinsic motivation is imperative to securing long-term behavioural modification. Of course, what constitutes a 'genuine' desire to change and how to measure it remains a matter for debate. Nevertheless, the role of motivation in behavioural change is a critical one.

The Role of Motivation and the Working Alliance in the Processes of Change

As highlighted earlier, given the problems associated with the attrition rates of rehabilitation programmes (an increased likelihood of further offending and a reduction in the perceived fiscal merit of the programme itself) it is imperative to consider carefully the factors pertaining to an individual's motivation to remain in attendance on rehabilitative and other related programmes.

A great deal of the material discussed in this section is taken from the general psychotherapeutic literature. Whilst I acknowledge that this may attract some criticism (given that my study is focused on offender population) the decision to include these studies is attributed the overall parsimony of empirical studies specifically examining motivation in offender populations in comparison to those of the general population.

Rehabilitative programmes and the individuals who attend them do not exist in isolation of one another. Participation requires a series of complex psycho-social inter-personal interactions between the individual participant (in some cases the participant group) and the facilitator(s). The nature of these interactions is deemed to be fundamental in determining the overall outcome of the intervention; in recent years the term 'working alliance' (Bordin, 1979) has been assimilated to define these interactions. In order to fully comprehend the role of the working alliance it is necessary to take a step backwards so that we may fully comprehend the psychological dynamics a client introduces into the therapeutic arena.

The cognitive processes through which an individual demonstrates the extent of their commitment to the programme in question are often referred to collectively as his or her motivation. As a corollary, it is not uncommon for participants to be assessed, both qualitatively and quantitatively, in respect of the motivational characteristics they demonstrate.

According to Joe, Simpson and Broome (1998) a client's motivation to change is associated with a variety of dynamic factors, including: age, marital status, employment status, previous offence history etc and remains a crucial factor in determining treatment engagement. Joe *et al* maintain that motivation (in particular pre-treatment motivation) is crucial in determining treatment outcome. Therefore, they insist that motivational consonance represents a valid treatment target in itself. This perspective is shared by other researchers (Kemshall & Canton, 2002), who conclude that motivation, in its various incarnations, plays a crucial role in programme attrition. Given the integral role of client motivation, numerous researchers have invested heavily in critical explorations of the motivational positions of participants undertaking structured interventions (both of a criminogenic and non-criminogenic nature).

McMuran and McCulloch (2007) carried out a detailed analysis of their participants' motivation; surveying, at length, their motivation to attend their respective rehabilitation programmes. Mcmurran and McCulloch also assessed their participants' motivation to discontinue with the offence-related aspects of their lifestyles. McMurran and McCulloch employed a twenty-two-item self-report measure to canvass the nature of their participants' motivation for participation at the commencement of the course, asking them to rate their motivation for attending their allotted programme on a scale ranging from 0 - 100%. In order to differentiate intrinsic from extrinsic motivation participants were requested to comment on their genuine motivation i.e. the primary reason for their participation - "having a real interest in doing the programme" (McMurran & McCulloch, 2007, p.248) versus completing the programme with instrumental intent, in order to acquire a positive outcome – "how much their motivation was driven by being seen to do the right thing" (McMurran & McCulloch *ibid*). It is, however, important to note that *real* and *genuine* are dynamic, abstract, morally laden terms. They present challenges to the critical reader in terms of their meaning. Accordingly, caution is advised in the affirmation of concrete suppositions being drawn from these terms. McMurran and McCulloch offered no statistical analysis or detailed description of their participants' motivation to discontinue with the offence-related aspects of their lifestyles. However, they did suggest that motivation to cease offending was generally high and, somewhat paradoxically, that programme non-completers demonstrated a higher degree of motivation to attend programmes than completers did. Interestingly, McMurran and McCulloch conclude that programme completers expressed a greater number of incentives to change than did non-completers (incentives include factors such as family, employment or housing awaiting them upon release). This would suggest that the role of intrinsic, self-determined motivation was less significant than the prospect of encouraging post-release lifestyle dynamics within the programme completers group.

In order to obtain a more robust insight into treatment motivation I will discuss the opinions of practitioners from outside of the criminogenic arena. The consensus amongst humanistic practitioners (DiClemente & Prochaska, 1985, Maslow, 1962, 1970; Miller & Rollnick, 1991, 2002 & Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983) is that the various facets associated with the nature of a person's inherent motivation will determine their success in achieving long-term behavioural change. Humanistic psychologists are in agreement that intrinsic motivation is essential in establishing enduring behavioural change. Nevertheless, there remains some dispute within this field as to the importance of the role of extrinsic motivation. Leading motivational experts Miller and Rollnick (1991, 2002) suggest, through the doctrine of self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000), that intrinsic motivation is much more important in facilitating behavioural change than extrinsic motivation. However, Ryan and Deci maintain that extrinsic motivation is an important determinant in behavioural change, especially during the early stages (which Miller & Rollnick (2002) would describe as ambivalence). Nevertheless, they and Ryan and Deci contend that whilst extrinsic motivation can be instrumental in triggering behavioural change, intrinsic motivation is the best predictor for the long-term maintenance of change. Ryan and Deci's position can be evidenced in the disclosures of the majority of the successful programme participants interviewed by McMurran and McCulloch (2007). Five of the six completers openly acknowledged that they commenced the ETS programme for the express purpose of gaining a positive Parole Assessment. However, these men remained on the course after realising its greater benefits to their overall lifestyle: reducing recidivism, learning new skills, controlling their anger and raising their self-esteem.

Regardless of the finite roles played by intrinsic and extrinsic motivational forces, psychologists agree that the dynamics of the therapeutic relationship are of paramount importance in facilitating change. According to Miller and Rollnick (2002), motivation is not merely the premise of the client – 'no one is *unmotivated*' B. Miller personal communication, July, 2007. Accordingly, it is the role of the facilitator or therapist to assess and utilise their client's pre-existing motivational consonance to guide them into the realms of established behavioural change through a delicate blend of collaboration, evocation and autonomy. Miller and Rollnick maintain that this is most successfully achieved by the formation of a close, egalitarian, partner-like relationship between client and therapist. The successful graduates interviewed in the Department of Corrections (2008) review of Tikanga programmes identified how forming a relationship of this nature with their programme facilitators ensured their experiences of therapy were highly rewarding and held substantial personal meaning.

As noted earlier, leading motivational theorists contend that no one is *unmotivated* and that motivation is the outwardly perceptible result of a series of intra-psychic

variables and inter-personal interactions. Consistent with this view, Clarke *et al* (2004) identified four distinct motivational 'types' within their participant group:

The Hostile Participant – presents with 'deviant' motivation throughout their encounters with the programme frequently disrupting the flow of the course (discussions and activities), the Hostile Participants' input is essentially confrontational, often making deliberately inflammatory remarks such as those from racist or homophobic domains in order to de-rail the group processes by aggravating group members. The Hostile Participants are, in most cases, younger males, attempting to demonstrate an overtly masculine demeanour (Clarke *et al*, 2004). Although the Hostile Participant appeared to have only a marginal effect upon the facilitators, a number of the group members commented on the negative impacts of their corrosive input. The Hostile Participants are deemed to be at the lower end of the continuum of motivational consonance having expressed how they felt pressured into programme and, as such, reacted against it. Clarke *et al* observe how, in particular cases, an offender deemed to be a Hostile Participants may be demonstrating symptoms of a more complex underlying psychological condition, for example, Psychopathy.

The Instrumentalist – has undertaken the programme essentially 'as a means-to-an-end'; with the hope of achieving a specific goal - i.e. a positive pre-release assessment, as opposed to a profound desire for cognitive-behavioural change. Programme facilitators suggest that Instrumentalists are simply 'going through the motions' of participation, without taking any genuine interest in addressing their psycho-social processes. Nevertheless, some of the participants regarded as Instrumentalists offered positive feedback in relation to programme completion stating how they had successfully achieved an important goal. Clarke *et al* (2004) observe how these traits are more closely akin to that of the Self-developer. Accordingly, whilst the Instrumentalist is primarily egocentric in their desires, some evidence exists to suggest they are beginning to undertake a review of their perspectives on behavioural change.

Although not identified by Clarke *et al*, the presentation styles of the Instrumentalist are not markedly dissimilar to a number of the traits evident in a Psychopathy diagnosis, including: glibness/superficial charm, pathological lying conning/manipulative and criminal versatility (Hare, 2003) accordingly; Psychopathy may have a noticeable prevalence within this sub-group, as well as the more overt Hostile Participants.

The Sceptic – began the programme as an Instrumentalist; however, through exposure to the course content, and with time to reflect upon its meaning, has begun to demonstrate positive indications of engagement. Instrumental intent served as a catalyst for an interest in self-advancement.

Similarities exist between the Hostile Participant and the Sceptic in so far as they both tended to be younger in age and shared an antagonistic view of treatment, seemingly emanating from their need to project an overtly masculine image. However, whilst the Hostile Participant maintained a combative attitude towards the programme; the Sceptic commonly relinquished this position after acknowledging the benefits of participation. A particular point of interest relating to the Sceptic concerns their tendency towards a definition of individual identity through their social context (Clarke *et al,* 2004), a circumstance often referred to as social identity theory. Clarke *et al* recognise how the formation and preservation of identity through these means can have a detrimental effect upon the manner in which experiences of prison-based rehabilitation are discussed amongst participants and, on occasion, how they are relayed to researchers.

The Self-developer – has, since before commencing the programme, consistently maintained an apparent drive to engage in cognitive-behavioural strategies to address their current lifestyle choices. Clarke *et al* (2004) suggest that it is not uncommon for offenders in this demographic to have recognised how their offending has caused them to reach an 'all time low' or 'rock bottom'; consequently, they accept that the time is upon them to make a significant change in their lifestyles. Many of the offenders classed as Self-developers were driven by a 'primary motivational factor' i.e. the birth of a child or the desire to become a counsellor themselves; as such, they have acquired a greater sense of accountability to the world and re-directed their energy into more altruistic pursuits (Clarke *et al*).

The findings of contemporary prison-based and related research (Clarke *et al*, 2004; Department of Corrections, 2008 & McMurran & McCulloch, 2007) are analogous with broader contextual thinking regarding motivation and behavioural change, in so far as they concur that motivation is affected by numerous contextual factors. Clarke *et al* observed how motivational interviewing had proven to be highly beneficial in reducing resistance and addressing so called 'poor' motivation. They suggest that given the critical role of motivation in treatment adherence it should be considered as one of the foremost indications of programme efficacy and assessed as such.

Researchers readily identified how a participant's motivation to engage in rehabilitative programmes interacts with numerous other variables including: the institutional context and levels of engagement with facilitators and the wider prison staff. The nature and extent of a participant's motivational consonance plays a fundamental role in determining treatment outcome; as such the institutional setting has a responsibility to the continued development of its therapeutic programmes to ensure that the interventions they provide are best suited to accommodate the individual approach of their clients and that an expectation of the converse does not become the accepted norm.

It is apparent that motivation is a complex entity and is of paramount importance to treatment engagement. Moreover, it appears to influence the individual participant across a number of contextual domains. Having provided the rationale for the detailed consideration of motivational factors I will now discuss the working alliance in closer detail.

It is universally accepted that psychotherapeutic or psycho-educational relationships are, at their core interpersonal. Numerous theorists have discussed the dynamics of the interpersonal relationship or working alliance which develops between client and therapist. Freud (ND as cited in Ross *et al,* 2008, p.463) maintained the therapeutic alliance serves as a mantle which envelops the therapist in a shroud of authority. Greenson (1965) developed the original Freudian position suggesting that the most favourable therapeutic alliance should harbour a further three components: transference, a working relationship and the 'real' relationship. The matter of transference is a crucial one and, as such, will be re-visited in greater detail later in this sub-section. Suffice to say, at this point, the Freudian notion of transference is primarily concerned with the unconscious processes between therapist and client in which anxieties, fears or desires are projected from one party to another – in its purest sense, from the client onto the therapist. The proposition of a 'real' relationship invites considerable epistemological, ontological and semantic debate; nevertheless, it can be juxtaposed neatly against the principle of transference. Ross *et al,* (p.463) contend that whilst the Freudian premise of transference satisfactorily addresses the unconscious features of the therapeutic alliance; in contrast, the 'real' relationship is concerned with the practical interactions between client and therapist during the actual therapeutic encounter.

According to Ross *et al'*s, (p.463) reflections, the therapeutic (or working) alliance remained ensconced within the psychodynamic realm until the work of Edward Bordin (1979). Bordin wrote extensively on the integral nature of the client-therapist interaction (working alliance) in determining optimal therapeutic outcomes. Bordin maintained that the working alliance between the person approaching change and the change facilitator constitutes the basis of all successful outcomes in any therapeutic context.

Bordin's (1979) opinions are consistent with the findings of Horvath and Bedi (2002), who deduce that the therapeutic relationship has repeatedly proven to be one of the predominant factors determining successful psychotherapeutic outcomes, with an incidence measure of over 12% across numerous strains of psychotherapy.

Numerous studies (Clarke *et al*, 2004; Department of Corrections, 2008 & McMurran & McCulloch, 2007) affirm that positive interpersonal dynamics and the creation of positive experiences (through a strong working alliance) foster

behavioural change. Of the eighteen programme non-completers interviewed by McMurran and McCulloch, eight cited circumstances pertaining to a breakdown in the working alliance with the facilitators as having been the primary reason for their motivational decline and resultant non-completion; these included: feelings of belittlement, a lack of authority and 'difficulties' – not further defined. Clarke *et al* (2004) spoke at length about the importance of participant engagement, noting how some of their participants criticised the 'one size fits all' approach of the programme. Although the Department of Corrections (2008) observed how more than half of their Tikanga programme non-completers were convicted of further offending, they did not offer a clear indication of the participants' reasons for non-completion.

By examining participant motivation and the dynamics of the working alliance it is possible to obtain a greater insight into the relationships which exist between clients and practitioners. The literature suggests that although external variables can be useful in triggering the initial engagement with behavioural change programmes, the degree to which a client's motivation is deemed intrinsic (driven by their internal desire for change) is likely to influence the long-term maintenance of their behavioural change. Having established their motivational position and commenced their intervention, the working alliance between client and practitioner then plays a fundamental role in determining treatment engagement. Studies (Clarke *et al*, 2004; Department of Corrections, 2008 & McMurran & McCulloch, 2007) support the role of the working alliance in maintaining the type of interpersonal conditions supportive of treatment engagement. Given the proximity of the works of Clarke *et al*; Department of Corrections and McMurran and McCulloch to this study, the authors' observations regarding participant motivation and the working alliance will be taken into consideration.

Setting the Scene

The Karaka Unit and the Special Treatment Unit – Rehabilitation Programme (STU-RP)

The site chosen to conduct this piece of research was The Karaka Unit at Waikeria Prison, New Zealand. This is a multi-occupancy, medium-security facility housing 80 inmates who are participating in the Karaka Special Treatment Unit-Rehabilitative Programme (STU-RP) – the focus of my research. Other inmates in the Unit are participating in other programmes, namely the Dependency Treatment Unit (DTU) programme and the Adult Sex Offenders Programme (ASTOP).

STU-RP became fully operational in February, 2008. It is an intensive, group based Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT); Dialectical Behavioural Therapy (DBT) criminogenic rehabilitation programme delivered over an eight-month

period. STU-RP participants receive approximately 12-hours per-week of therapy facilitated through a group-based modality; as well as complementary individual treatment, as necessary (Lammers, 2009). The STU-RP offers a standard cumulative total of 400 treatment hours (Lammers).

At full strength, the STU-RP can accommodate 30 participants divided over three treatment groups, with each group being overseen by two treatment facilitators. Prior to commencing formal treatment an additional ten participants undertake preliminary, preparatory activities, most of which are centred on psychometric testing. The initial pre-assessment phase of the STU-RP is scheduled to last for four-weeks. Once this phase has been completed participants will commence formal treatment. The STU-RP adopts an holistic approach, actively encouraging its participants to involve themselves in additional activities including: the National Certificate of Educational Standards (NCES), work programmes, cultural pursuits and the completion of additional course work (Department of Corrections ND).

Access onto the programme is subject to the individual meeting stringent entry criteria; they must be aged 20-years or above, sentenced to a term of imprisonment two-years or greater and be carrying an individual risk rating of 0.7 or above (high-risk) on the Departmental risk assessment tool (RoC*RoI, Bakker *et al*, 1999). They must have a minimum of eighteen-months remaining on their sentence at the commencement of the programme. Offenders under the age of twenty may be considered eligible for participation; however, they are required to undertake an individual assessment to confirm their eligibility. For entry into the STU-RP, participants must have a history of at least two prior violence offences (Lammers, 2009). Those persons wishing to enrol on the STU-RP must also return a negative drug test (or two negative tests within eight-weeks prior to commencement) and consent to random drug testing procedures for the duration of their time on the programme (Department of Corrections, ND).

The STU is staffed by therapeutic facilitators who hold postgraduate qualifications in Psychology, or a closely related discipline. Facilitators work alongside an array of additional staff including: cultural consultants, a reintegration co-ordinator and numerous custodial officers. The therapeutic team is overseen by a Clinical Psychologist and Principal Psychologist, both situated in the unit, and supported by professional supervisors – Department of Corrections' Psychologists based outside of the unit (Lammers, 2009).

Formulated by psychological researchers and practitioners from within the New Zealand Department of Corrections, the STU-RP is the brainchild of The Department of Corrections' Senior Psychologist and Principal Advisor, Lucy King. The STU-RP evolved from a number of sources, most prominent among them being the work of Andrews and Bonta (1998, 2003, 2006), in particular their

RNR Model, which has been deliberately incorporated to inform the identification of suitable participants, to maximise the effective targeting of resources and to guide the delivery of session content.

According to the Department of Corrections (2006) the STU-RP harbours a distinct approach which sets it apart from the more mainstream criminogenic programmes. As, in addition to explicitly targeting the discreet factors which led to the commission of the participants' index (and other related) offences, the STU-RP acknowledges that criminal behaviour does not exist in isolation, formulating instead, a part of the offenders' broader lifestyles. Accordingly, a sole focus on finite offence-related variables may not provide the most comprehensive insight possible into the inter-personal problems its participants are experiencing. Therefore, it was considered necessary to recognise the impact of such crucial aspects of a person's character as cultural identity, communication skills and familial relations. Whilst they are not to be considered direct offence antecedents in themselves, difficulties in these areas are likely to compound the more anti-social modes of behaviour for which recidivist offenders have consistently demonstrated a proclivity. It is intended, that by supporting the STU-RP participants to develop these deficits they are more likely to widen their adaptive, pro-social support networks; thereby, distancing themselves from re-offending.

As previously mentioned, culturally-significant personality variables are of importance to treatment provision in the Karaka Unit. The Department maintain that the cultural foundations of the STU-RP are addressed through the use of the Specialist Maori Cultural Assessment (SMCA; Department of Corrections, Policy Development, 2004, as cited in Department of Corrections, 2006, p.98) which delivers treatment in accordance with the Maori holistic model of health, or Te Whare Tapa Fa Model (Durie, 1994). Te Whare Tapa Fa has been deliberately designed to assist offenders in developing motivation to explore the cultural aspects of their lives.

In addition to the SMCA, the STU-RP is informed by the principles of the Framework for Reducing Reoffending by Maori (FReMO) initiative (McFarlane-Nathan, 1999) which suggest that there is a requirement to improve the understanding Maori offenders possess in respect of concepts such as: mana, te reo, tikanga, whanaungatanga and turangawaewae. Consequently, the STU-RP endeavours to promote Maori protocol and activities and philosophical paradigms including: Te Whare Tapa Wha (Durie, 1994), whakawhanaungatanga (establishing connections and relationships), karakia (or forms of to ensure safety, ensuring sessions begin and end in a meaningful manner), te reo (including whakatauki, waiata, concepts etc) and tikanga (involvement with mihi whakatau and poroporoaki (Department of Corrections, 2006).

Having acknowledged that Maori are susceptible to a variety of unique circumstances which may influence their risk of re-offending (Maynard *et al*, 1999 and Coebergh *et al*, 1999 as cited in Department of Corrections, 2006) and in accordance with its obligations to honour the Treaty of Waitangi by offering treatment in a culturally responsive manner, the Department of Corrections has policies in place to enable its staff to work in close collaboration with specialist Maori service providers (Department of Corrections, 2010).

The Karaka Unit offers its Maori residents the opportunity to voluntarily undertake a therapeutic intervention which runs parallel to the mainstream rehabilitative programme. This intervention, known as the Bi-cultural Therapy Model (BTM), provides treatment for offending-related issues such as alcohol and drug use through an approach that is dedicated to the principles and protocols of the Maori world (Department of Corrections, 2010).

In addition to the considerations they have given the contextual framework of treatment delivery, the Department of Corrections has considered the importance of providing treatment in the type of atmospheric setting conducive to behavioural change

Therapeutic Community

According to Lammers (2009), the Karaka Unit runs in accordance with the Community of Change paradigm. The Community of Change has been designed to mirror the principles of the Therapeutic Communities (TC) approach to residential treatment. My findings raise doubts as to the efficacy of the implementation of the TC within the Karaka Unit, nevertheless, as this appeared to be an important component of the Karaka Unit I will briefly discuss the origins of, and the rationale behind, the TC.

The TC was conceptualised during the latter years of World War Two to assist in the re-settlement of those institutionally-housed service personnel who had been diagnosed with psychoneurotic, depressive or psychosomatic symptoms (Clark, 1999). The popularity of the TC approach truly took effect throughout the years encompassing the 1950s and 1970s, becoming increasingly popular throughout numerous British and North American psychiatric facilities. This epoch, sometimes referred to by the phrase 'social psychiatry' (Clark), was instrumental in determining the treatment milieu for many of today's mentally ill persons, particularly those diagnosed with psychosis. The introduction of the TC has proven to be a seminal event in the history of Western treatment modalities for mental illness and psychological dysfunction. The TC sparked a systemic move away from an atmosphere dominated by containment, to one enlightened by the curative processes of therapeutic engagement. According to Ware, Frost and Hoy

(2009), an appropriately functioning TC enables the intensity of the therapeutic experience to extend beyond the finite restrictions of the classroom/intervention room and into the broader treatment setting.

The values behind the TC paradigm are described most eloquently in the conclusions of the Third Report of the Expert Committee (WHO), during an excerpt of which they described the importance of the atmosphere within the treatment facility:

The most important single factor in the efficacy of the treatment given in a mental hospital appears to the committee to be an intangible element which can only be described as its atmosphere, and in attempting to describe some of the influences which go to the creation of this atmosphere, it must be said at the outset that the more the psychiatric hospital imitates the general hospital as it at present exists, the less successful it will be in creating the atmosphere it needs. Too many psychiatric hospitals give the impression of being an uneasy compromise between a general hospital and a prison. Whereas, in fact, the role they have to play is different from either; it is that of a therapeutic community. (WHO, 1953, as cited in Clark, 1999, p.33)

According to the WHO (1953, as cited in Clark, 1999, p.33) the TC paradigm is underpinned by a number of key suppositions which are deliberately designed to increase the patients' exposure to pro-social behaviours, they include: the preservation of the client's individuality, the belief that patients are truthful and dependable, the advocacy of constructive behaviour, patient empowered through the retention of a notable degree of responsibility and initiative, and, finally, a productive, structured working day.

The WHO report concluded that:

The creation of the atmosphere of a therapeutic community is in itself one of the most important types of treatment which the psychiatric hospital can provide. (WHO, 1953, as cited in Clark, 1999, p.33)

Clark (1999), observed how the TC philosophy holds unprecedented value for patients' recoveries as the inter-personal environment created in the therapeutic setting holds greater sway over their long-term wellbeing than the medication they are prescribed or any other treatments they might receive. This is due, predominantly, to one of the fundamental objectives of the TC, which is to assist its target population in developing functional real-world life-skills. These skills are achieved through the development and implementation of an interim social setting that parallels the dynamics of real-world (post-release) living and is put into practice through the day-to-day enactment of the key suppositions of the TC (discussed above) (Ware *et al*, 2009).

Dolan (2003), citing Clark (1965), identifies a clear distinction within the TC discourse, that of the TC proper and the TC approach. Whilst both paradigms denote a collaborative philosophy, the categorical distinction becomes a procedural one. Dolan draws upon the original findings of Rapoport (1960), which suggest the TC proper has wholly embraced the four core tenets of the approach (permissiveness, communalism, democratisation and reality confrontation, Rapoport, 1960, as cited in Dolan, 2003, p.410), ensuring they are fully operationalised as the driving force behind the therapeutic setting. Conversely, the TC approach (commonly evidenced in the 'concept houses' of the United States, *op cit*) endeavours to function in accordance with the TC proper, yet relies more heavily upon an authoritarian structure (Dolan).

Therapeutic Communities within a Prison Setting

The implementation of a TC within a penal institution is a complex issue. Woodward (1999) suggests that the introduction of TCs into custodial settings is somewhat paradoxical, given that prisons are principally designed with an overt punitive intent. Moreover, prisons are run through the strict enforcement of externally driven, hierarchically enforced, non-negotiable rules. This appears contrary to the collectivist, non-hierarchical expectation of the TC. However, the international research community (Cullen, 1993, Cullen, 1994, Newton, 1997, Rawlings, 1998) has returned positive results for prison units operating in accordance with the TC approach. Ware *et al* (2009) contend that the primary goal of the penal TC is to facilitate an environment which creates a state of equipoise between autonomy and dependence (interdependence), one in which personal growth can flourish and the relative freedoms participants experience enable them to make the types of mistakes and discoveries that will serve them well in later, post-release, situations. Clearly, the prison must be corrective and the clients afforded every opportunity to remain on track with their treatment targets; therefore, any correctional aspects of treatment must emanate from within the group and be mediated through the group, thereby enabling the individual to experience a direct sense of accountability (Ware *et al*).

In the Karaka Unit, processes of inter-group accountability are enacted through weekly community of change meetings. Constituted by formal arrangement and operated through all of the expected protocols of a mainstream, non-custodial community meeting, the community of change meeting is overseen by an inmate-elected panel which takes full responsibility for the running of proceedings (under the guidance of a programme facilitator). The meetings serve as an opportunity for programme participants to discuss pressing issues (either individual or collective) with one another and with the various staff teams, to explain any incidences of misconduct or inappropriate behaviour which may have occurred during the week, and, as a corollary, to ask for assistance from their peers in managing these circumstances should they arise on a future occasion.

Temperance and moderation are required in the implementation of the TC within a penal community. It is to be expected that the unit will run in accordance with the overarching rules of the prison; nevertheless, in order to balance the need for safe, humane containment with positive therapeutic effects it is necessary for the emphasis upon penal reform through punishment and retribution to evolve. Prisons must move away from out of the draconian, authoritarian mould into a collaborative, multi-disciplinary framework which sees the participants, therapeutic staff and custodial officers working in a mutually supportive, harmonious manner to create one, all-encompassing, functional community; a community that appreciates the need for clearly defined rules, but makes its decisions in a collaborative, egalitarian manner – a community analogous with the *real* external world for which the participants are being prepared.

Conclusion

An analytical review of the literature has identified a number of the intricacies and complexities involved in the delivery of prison-based cognitive behavioural rehabilitation programmes. Many of these are directly relevant to my study.

It appears that a participant's engagement with prison-based rehabilitative treatment can be understood by considering a series of mutually dependent, closely interrelated domains. Most prominent amongst these are: motivation, the working alliance, rapport and the relationships established between client, practitioner, support staff and the wider prison environment. It appears that the various components which contribute to the overall contextual setting of treatment delivery are particularly relevant. Accordingly, the relationship between the atmosphere created in the wider prison environment and the participants' views of treatment engagement will be examined in detail in this study.

Whilst all three of the qualitative studies commented on the role of the contextual setting, it is clear that the New Zealand-based Tikanga Maori programme study (Department of Corrections, 2008) utilised this to greatest effect. The proximity between the Department of Corrections study and my investigation provide further support for the consideration of contextual variables in my research.

Another important theme within the literature concerns the value of the therapeutic bond (working alliance) established between therapist and client. Given the amount of emphasis placed upon this dynamic, I will be exploring the nature of the working alliance between the participants and treatment staff in my research.

In addition to the importance of contextual and interpersonal variables, the literature clearly identifies the significance of the relationship between an individual's motivational position and their likelihood of treatment completion. Although its definition is infused with some obscurities, motivation is considered

to be imperative in affecting treatment compliance. As a corollary, detailed consideration will be given to my participants' motivational positions, including any development which may have occurred in their motivation throughout their time on the programme.

A robust case is made (within both the New Zealand and international literature) to aggregate treatment so that those offenders with the highest risk ratings are given priority placement in rehabilitative interventions. In addition, it is apparent that criminogenic interventions are most effective when purposefully designed to addresses an offender's cognitive processing. As my research deliberately samples a group of men assessed as high-risk, who are undergoing criminogenic treatment, the dual perspectives of risk rating and course content will be explored in this thesis.

The Department of Corrections (2008) inquiry into Tikanga Maori programmes was the only study reviewed which directly explored the relevance of culturally responsive intervention strategies. I am of the opinion that the incorporation of therapeutic activities expressly designed to meet the needs of Maori offenders are relevant on two levels. Firstly, the observation that a substantial proportion of the high-risk offender community identify as New Zealand Maori. Secondly, being a New Zealand-based study it is imperative that this thesis reflects the cultural distinctiveness of Aotearoa New Zealand. Therefore, those aspects of treatment unique to Maori culture will be deliberately explored.

It is my intention that by examining the above points in this thesis I will provide the reader with a comprehensive New Zealand-based insight into those aspects of treatment deemed pertinent by the wider academic literature. Over and above this, however, is my desire to give a personal feel to this research; for the reader to acquire an understanding of the experiences of my participants. I hope to achieve this by expressing those areas that the participants themselves consider to be most relevant to their wellbeing and by emphasising those points which I consider to offer the most holistic reflection of the individuality of their characters.

Chapter Three - Method

I will begin this chapter by discussing the research problem I am intending to address.   Having clarified the intended position of this research in the wider literature I will provide an outline of my research methodology and the potential dynamics created by my professional position (a former Probation Officer) before examining, in closer detail, the recruitment of participants. As part my discussion around recruitment I will put forward an argument for the careful consideration of the term 'high-risk' when referring to persons undergoing criminogenic treatment. This section is followed by an explanation of the specific aspects of my data collection method and my analytical protocol. Chapter Three is brought to a close with the identification of the ethical consideration which underpinned this study.

The Research Problem

The overarching objective of this research is to provide a detailed insight into the impact of an intensive rehabilitation programme upon the participants.   As previously discussed, research (Pattenaude, 2004 & Chwalisz *et al*, 2008) has criticised the field of criminology for its reliance upon quantitative analysis to evaluate rehabilitative interventions. Authors (Pattenaude & Chwalisz) observe how quantitative analyses limit the depth of subjective understanding available to the critical thinker. The concern here is that policy advisors and the wider academic community *per se* are at risk of receiving only a partial insight into best practice. It is envisaged that further qualitative studies into the experiences of offenders undergoing intensive rehabilitative treatment will provide an increased awareness through a broadening of the overall discourse within the field. A deeper knowledge of the experiences of offenders undergoing treatment should advance both the implementation of treatment and the policies which govern it.

Research Outline and Professional Considerations

This research gathered qualitative information via semi-structured 1:1 interviews with high-risk offenders who had either completed or were approaching completion of the intensive rehabilitation programme in the Karaka Unit, Waikeria Prison. The timing of the data collection is deemed to be of paramount importance, given that particular commentators (McMurran & McCulloch, 2007) have highlighted the need for future studies to be undertaken prospectively. Moreover, as an outsider, I fulfil another recommendation made by these authors: that researchers should be unconnected with the programme to reduce the possibility of bias and ensure the information obtained is a true reflection of the participants' current perspectives.

I considered carefully my status as a former Probation Officer (2006-2008) before commencing and throughout this research. I felt that it was likely to affect the

manner in which I was perceived by the participants. I acknowledged that whilst disclosing this information to the participants may have initially triggered hesitation and formulated a psychological barrier, I maintained that it was necessary for me to be forthright about my status and the nature of my former employment if I was to establish and maintain a positive rapport in the long-term. This point is of particular relevance when considering the close-knit nature of the prison environment, especially so, given the fact that I was based in the Bay of Plenty and, as part of my role, prosecuted a number of Recall hearings in Waikeria Prison.

Conversely, I also reflected upon the view that my training and experience as Probation Officer would be beneficial as it had empowered me with the skills and experience necessary to facilitate the rapport building processes with those offenders who did agree to participate. For additional insight into this circumstance I consulted the work of Pattenaude (2004).

Patenaude (2004), a former Prison Officer turned academic, has remarked on the challenges facing qualitative researchers in correctional environments. Patenaude was somewhat speculative about how his professional standing could have impacted upon his acceptance by both the staff and inmates alike, noting that difficulties could have arisen in the event either party may have perceived him to be holding a particular bias. Patenaude emphasised the importance of the researcher being acutely aware of personal, professional and political loyalties and how these may affect the outcome of the research. Patenaude proposed that researchers in this position consider the points made by Liebling (2001):

... we can-to some extent-describe what "is" without always making explicit what "ought to be," letting the data "speak for itself." The suspension of value judgment through the research (and most of the report writing) process may in the end be a more effective way to play a part in "what ought to be" ... researchers need to be affectively present as well as physically present in a social situation. (Liebling, 2001 as cited in Patenaude, ibid, p.71s)

In order to ensure the integrity of the participants' subjective experiences and to safeguard the underlying principles of qualitative research this study adopted an open (semi-structured) interview format. It was expected that this approach would aid the rapport building process and encourage an exchange of opinions between the interviewer and interviewee that is dynamic, fluid and egalitarian in nature. It was hoped that this approach would enable a flow of detailed information rich in subjective thought and emotion.

Recruitment and Selection of Participants

According to Creswell (2007) it is necessary to consider two important inter-related factors when making decisions about the approach to sampling one

proposes to assume: the purpose of the research, and the nature of the information being sought. Creswell (2007) advocates the use of a small sample (individuals or sites) size in qualitative research; whilst he acknowledges how this approach is likely to restrict the breadth of the sample, Creswell maintains that marginal numbers will enable a greater depth of knowledge to be obtained; 'The intent in qualitative research is not to generalise the information (except in some forms of case study research), but to elucidate the particular, the specific" (Pinnegar & Davies, 2006, as cited in Creswell, 2007, p.126).

I decided to limit this study to a maximum of five participants from an overall sample of men who had either completed or were approaching completion of the intensive rehabilitation programme in the Karaka Unit, Waikeria Prison. I chose to include at least one offender who had failed to complete the intervention in order to maximise the variance of the sample and gain an insight into possible reasons for non-completion. I gave detailed consideration to a number of idiographic variables to ensure that the selections made reflected the multiplicity of characteristics within the overall group; these variables included: age, ethnic origin, offence history, family background (including possible gang affiliations), reasons for undertaking the rehabilitation programme (motivation) and general impressions of the programme.

Recruiting the Participants

The idea that a semi-independent, neutral third party (Prison Chaplain or cultural advisor to the Karaka Unit) should oversee the initial contact with the STU-RP participants and graduates was initially mooted. This proposition was amended upon the advice of the Karaka Unit's Principal Psychologist, who suggested that he and his staff would be best placed to conduct the initial canvassing. After attending a team meeting with the psychologists and programme facilitators at the Karaka Unit to clarify the aims and objectives of the research and to explain the requirements of participation the principal researcher passed the responsibility for participant canvassing and recruitment to the Karaka Unit staff.

The Principal Psychologist initially suggested that four programme completers had expressed interest in participation. Two of them were being held in Waikeria Prison, one had been transferred to another prison and the other had been released into the community.

Positive responses were indicated by the two potential participants being detained in Waikeria Prison. I conducted an Initial 'rapport building' meeting with each of these potential participants. One of the potential participants elected to withdraw: the other confirmed his consent.

Contacting the other two programme graduates proved challenging. The Principal Psychologist provided the contact details of the participant who was being

detained in another prison. Nevertheless, despite repeated attempts to contact the manager of this prison, I received no response. This circumstance was initially rectified by representatives from the Department of Corrections Head Office who contacted the necessary staff to inform them of the research process. Further emails were sent to the Prison Manager and Individual Case Officer advising them of the consent process and research objectives. Despite follow-up telephone messages being left for the Case Officer, I received no response. This line of enquiry was closed.

The Principal Psychologist elected not to disclose details of the community-based programme graduate on the grounds that he suffered with a personality disorder and, as such, may not be a suitable interview candidate.

On the advice of a programme facilitator (and seasoned qualitative researcher) I made direct contact with a group of STU-RP participants who were approaching completion of their programme to canvass their interest in participation in the research. I met with this group to introduce myself, discuss the ideas behind the research and to read through the information sheets. The group was then given a week to consider participating and encouraged to make their consent known to the programme facilitators. Two members of this group elected to participate and offered their full written consent.

Whilst the efforts of the Karaka Unit staff to recruit participants were gratefully received the direct approach to participant recruitment was advantageous. It returned a higher response rate, and enabled me to meet with potential participants face-to-face. Direct canvassing empowered the research with a more authentic feel. By not relying solely upon the influences of a third party and the slightly impersonal features of a generic information sheet, it was possible to bring a human element to data collection from the outset.

In addition to the offender participants I also recruited three members of staff from within the Karaka Unit. Two were programme facilitators, the third a custodial officer. I felt it necessary to include the views of these persons given the explicit references the offender participants made to the roles of the facilitation and treatment staff in determining their experiences in the Karaka Unit.

Introducing the Participants
This piece of research incorporated three participants from the STU-RP delivered in the Karaka Unit, Waikeria prison. All of the participants had met the Departmental entry criteria prior to their acceptance onto the STU-RP. The participants had been transferred to the Karaka Unit from other correctional facilities around New Zealand. All participants had voluntarily agreed to the terms and conditions of participation as decreed by the STU-RP treatment consent form.

The ages of the participants ranged from nineteen to forty with a mean age of 29.3* All of the participants were of New Zealand Maori lineage. Terms of imprisonment ranged between 3.5 years to life, with a mean of eleven-years. None of the participants were diagnosed with a psychiatric condition. The participants were all incarcerated offenders convicted of one or more charges of violence against the person. They had committed a variety of offences including aggravated robbery, and murder. All of the participants were deemed high-risk by the Department of Corrections RoC*RoI tool (Bakker *et al*, 1999).

Participant One – *'Jerry'*

An initial *ice breaker* session was conducted with Jerry a few days prior to the formal interview. This served as an opportunity to begin rapport building. It enabled me to introduce myself, to answer any questions and, hopefully, ally any nerves or feelings of uncertainty Jerry may have been experiencing.

Jerry is a 29-year old male of New Zealand Maori origin. Jerry was being detained in the Karaka Unit of Waikeria Prison at the time of his interview. Jerry indicated his consent to being interviewed, in accordance with the guidelines laid out in the *Information for Potential Participants* (Appendix One), by signing a *Consent Form* (Appendix Two). Jerry commenced the STU-RP in 2008; graduating successfully from it in 2009 Jerry was the only participant to hold the status of programme graduate at the time of his interview.

Jerry is a highly versatile offender having disclosed that he acquired his first conviction at the age of 17, since which time he had spent approximately eight-and-a-half years in prison for a variety of offences including: Burglary, Theft, Shoplifting, Driving Whilst Disqualified, Reckless Driving, Common Assault, Resists Police and Aggravated Robbery (in possession of a Firearm). Jerry described himself as a family man, acknowledging his multiple roles within the whanau: Son, Uncle, Cousin, and a Father to two girls.

Jerry conducted himself in a calm, polite manner throughout the interview. He initially appearing somewhat restrained, giving quite succinct answers; however, after a few minutes Jerry appeared to be at a greater sense of ease with the process, offering richer detail in his responses. Jerry explained that his primary motivation for agreeing to participate in the research was to reflect upon his insights from the STU-RP and to assist the Principal Researcher to assist future STU-RP participants.

Participant Two – *'Al'*

Al was initially recruited through a meeting between me and the specific treatment group which was, at the time of data collation, nearest to completion. At the time of his interview Al had served one-and-a-half-years of a three-and-a-

half-year sentence and was approximately two-weeks from graduating from the STU-RP.

Al is a male offender of New Zealand Maori/New Zealand European lineage. Aged nineteen at the time of his interview, Al was the youngest of the participants. For the main part, Al's offending appears to be centred on the handling and procurement of stolen goods, the majority of his offences taking the form of Burglary, both by day and night and Aggravated Robbery (in possession of a knife). In addition, Al has accrued an assortment of less serious driving infringements.

Al recalled that his childhood and early teenage years were positive. He did well at school, both academically and on the sports field, whereby he representing his school and a variety of other local sports teams. Al explained that his parents separated around this time and described how this event impacted heavily upon him. Al recanted that his life began to spiral quickly out of control, and was hastened triggered by an expulsion from school for violence at the age of fifteen. Al found himself leading a transient life and, consequently, "… losing direction of my goals …" Actively seeking acceptance, possibly to fill the void that had been created by his removal from pro-social influence, Al began to associate with a criminally minded peer group, observing how '… crime became a way of life.'

Al reported that his criminal career began in earnest at the age of sixteen, whereby he was convicted of Shoplifting. His offending began to develop as he started to commit higher tariff offences including: Receiving stolen goods, Burglary (by day and night) and ultimately Aggravated Robbery. Al described himself as an opportunist, committing offences on the spur of the moment as a means of sustaining an increasing drug habit. Al's offending suggests a pattern of generalised criminal conduct, underpinned by well-established antisocial beliefs. I am of the opinion that when examined in its entirety, Al's decline into criminality is indicative of the desire for peer validation found in Lemert's (1951) Secondary Deviance (a concept that I will discuss further at a later point).

Al explained that his primary purpose for agreeing to participate in this research was to assist the principal researcher by describing the impact it had had upon him, and, as a result, help those inmates who may undertake future STU Rehabilitation Programmes. Al engaged well with the interview process appearing at ease from the start. Al provided a considerable depth of knowledge in a relaxed, jovial manner.

A short time after completing his interview Al graduated successfully from the STU-RP.

Participant Three – *'Jay'*

Jay was recruited in a similar manner to Al; having initially expressed his interest in participation during a meeting between me and a treatment group nearing completion of the STU-RP. Jay was the only participant to be formally interviewed on more than one occasion.

At the time of his initial interview, Jay was approximately two-weeks from graduation from the STU-RP. Jay presented as highly motivated, expressing a profound knowledge of the STU-RP principles and teachings, describing, with fervour, their intrinsic value and philosophical meaning. Shortly after his interview Jay was found to be in possession of contraband (a cellular telephone). Jay was exited from the course and removed from the Karaka Unit. Given the conflicting nature of this unique circumstance, it was felt that a second interview would be useful to uncover the intra-psychic rationale that led to his expulsion.

Jay is a male offender of New Zealand Maori lineage. Aged 40 at the time of his interviews, Jay was the eldest of the participants. Jay's background had been extensively influenced by criminality. Jay disclosed that he was unable to recall the specific point at which he began offending; however, he estimates that it was between the ages of twelve and fifteen. As a patched gang member and highly versatile offender, Jay has amassed a comprehensive criminal portfolio consisting of: Driving Offences, Possession with Intent to Supply (controlled drugs), various crimes against the person (Assault) and Murder. At the time of his interviews Jay was approximately eleven-years into a Mandatory Life Sentence.

Despite acknowledging his lengthy absence from his family, Jay described himself as a committed family man, holding multiple statuses of Father (to two children), Partner, Son and Uncle. Jay appeared to take great pride in his roles within his family, consistently referring to his partner and children during the interviews.

Jay reported how his reasons for participation in this research revolved around a desire to help others: the principal researcher and future STU-RP participants, and to give something back to the STU-RP community in recognition of the help he has received with his rehabilitation.

Jay appeared eager to discuss his time in the Karaka Unit and his participation in the STU-RP. Jay engaged very well with the interview processes, offering a considerable amount of personal detail, often around highly delicate, emotive subjects.

Facilitator A

With a robust academic background and clinical experience in psychotherapy, Facilitator A has been delivering treatment in the Karaka Unit for two-years.

Facilitator B

Facilitator B has extensive experience in forensic psychology and has been facilitating in the Karaka Unit for fifteen-months.

Senior Corrections Officer

Having worked in a number of units throughout Waikeria Prison (over the past fourteen-years) the Custodial Officer interviewed currently holds the position of Senior Corrections Officer in the Karaka Unit.

Issues with the use of Linguistic Signifiers – the 'High-risk' Situation

Before undertaking an analysis of my data collection method I feel it is important to identify what I consider to be the linguistic controversies inherent in the high-risk label. Whilst the judicially decreed categorical facts pertaining to the offenders' status are clear-cut, and, for the purpose of this research, are above dispute, the position created by the signifier 'high-risk' is one of complexity and critical importance. Representing something of a dichotomy for the participants undertaking the STU-RP, the relative value of this term is worthy of careful consideration. Quite simply, without their high-risk status the offenders would not have been eligible for enrolment onto the STU-RP, and as a consequence would not have benefited from the opportunities it presented them. However, protagonists of the social constructionist approach to criminal deviance are likely to support the view that attaching socially determined, value-laden labels (such as 'high-risk'), which imply the presence of a significant degree of inter-personal deviance, to individuals attempting behavioural modification treatment has the capacity to invoke damaging consequences. As such, it is necessary to consider the notion of deviance, and its potential impact upon the individual, in greater detail.

Many of those theorists who emphasise a socially constructed model of deviance draw upon the conclusions of Tannenbaum (1938). Tannenbaum proposed that in order to understand the essence of criminality it is necessary to accept that its ontological basis is encapsulated in society's inability to accept fluctuation from the norm. It necessarily follows, that as the distinction of acceptable behaviour becomes more heavily infused with notions of consensually agreed, morally decreed, right and wrong; the 'wrong' find themselves further maligned by the righteous norm. Logically, one could incorporate the social constructionist argument to validate the notion that the behaviours exhibited by high-risk offenders are fuelled by societal estrangement. Therefore, having been rejected by the mainstream and burdened by a morally ordained stigma (i.e. high-risk of

reoffending) the individual is inclined to align themselves with those less likely to cast further judgment upon them, seeking out and embracing persons and conduct befitting their shared title.

It seems fitting, at this stage, to introduce the work of Sociologist Edwin Lemert (1951/1972). Lemert's whose detailed studies into the socially constructed nature of deviance led him to a number of conclusions regarding the symbolic interaction between society and the individual(s) it labels deviant.

In accordance with the views of Tannenbaum (1938), Lemert (1951) advocated the view that deviant behaviour, or social pathology, is the product of societal responses to a particular act, and the attribution of a specific label to the individual actor. Acknowledgement of this discreet maxim is crucial to an appreciation of Lemert's work as it governs the context within which the reader can explore the unique, dualistic relationship (one of distinction and interaction) that exists between what he termed primary and secondary deviance.

Lemert (1951) suggested that primary deviance is defined by the commission of an act which causes an authority figure to label the perpetrator as 'deviant'. Although the act may be construed, on a societal level, as undesirable or unacceptable, the primary deviance inherent in it manifests only a trivial impact upon the intra-psychic position of the individual perpetrator. According to Lemert, the actor may respond by normalising or disregarding their conduct by means of an everyday occurrence, one with limited, or indeed no perceived effect, upon the basic fabric of societal congeniality. Lemert maintained that it is "Individuals (who) define themselves as deviant on their own terms and independent of specific societal reactions … the interaction process allows that the individuals court, risk, even create conditions of their own deviance" (Lemert, 1972, p.19). Touching only very briefly on the aetiology of primary deviance; Lemert insisted that it fluctuates markedly, holding little relevance beyond the study of finite societal problems in a given era.

Lemert's (1951) position on the role of individual perception in determining deviance is the corner stone of his theory of secondary deviance. Lemert proposed that secondary deviation arises in those persons labelled 'deviant' who begin to interpret, and then internalise, societal responses to their behaviour as central facts of their existence, essentially, their intra-psychic perspective alters. Over time, the individual begins to adopt a social role befitting their perceived status. This further reinforces their social stigmatisation and in turn, defines their self-regarding attitudes and perspectives. A vicious cycle of deviant attributes, objectionable conduct and social stigmatisation interact, giving way to more highly evolved and deeply entrenched erroneous behaviours.

As a consequence, the secondary deviant becomes a person whose life and identity are organised around the facts of deviance. Through their actions, the deviant thus defines themselves as distinct from the mainstream group (primary deviance) and, as a corollary, seeks interaction and the positive reassurance found in social relations with other likeminded persons espousing a similar intra-psychic position.

Lemert (1972) points out that all, or indeed most, persons possess histories chequered by moral indiscretion; indiscretions of which they are adequately self-conscious as to have cultivated psychological mechanisms which allow them to accept, subvert or invalidate debasing or disciplinary societal consequences. It may be argued that the intra-psychic processes of the nature described in secondary deviance are not uncommon, and feature as consistently amongst the general population as they do within the more marginal, stigmatised, echelons of society (i.e. the criminal fraternity). Therefore, one is encouraged to consider broader contextual questions concerning the ontology of social morality. We must question whether secondary deviation represents the extreme of a tiered system of moral adaptation, or (as Lemert suggests), that in order to fertilise the soil of stigmatisation, in which the seeds of deviation will flourish, it is necessary to attest to the presence of categorically delineated norms and polarised moral opposites.

Lemert (1972) warns against the pitfalls of attending solely to the micro (cognitive) processes of deviation and stigmatisation. Lemert insists that by doing so the critical enquirer may overlook the significant influence of macrocosmic organisational entities of social order (such as the Police and Prison Service) which serve as instruments to define and classify the populace; inflict retribution, control access to rewards, determine limits of social relations and inaugurate deviant persons into regimentally defined environments.

In order to enable the individual to overcome their entrenched intra-psychic position it may be advantageous for the institution which the individual perceives to be restricting them to provide them with considerable, multi-level, support. In any relationship defined by a power imbalance it is necessary for the stronger party of the two to take the initiative, in this case to break the cycle of deviant person seeking out deviance. This may be achieved by reconfiguring the self-regard of the offenders. This reconfiguration could be commenced by assisting offenders to acknowledge and re-evaluate the detrimental self-referencing labelling system which is inherent in a melee of primary and secondary deviance and reinforced through widespread societal condemnation.

Without wishing to absolve the individual of a sense of personal responsibility for their actions, and remaining aware that they have, on at least one occasion, demonstrated the capability to commit acts which seriously contravene the means

of socially ordained, acceptable behaviour; one may extend Lemert's (1951/1972) argument to suggest that consistently referring to or defining programme participants in a manner indicative of their pre-intervention risk status is likely to further reinforce/engender secondary deviance and have a detrimental effect upon the rehabilitative process. The high-risk label is a useful (some would argue essential) classification for the prison authorities to segregate, order and control their detainees. After all, structured risk assessment is a tried and tested means of identifying those persons presenting with the highest likelihood of reoffending and, as such, formulates a central tenet in the appropriate targeting of interventions. Essentially, risk assessment is a fundamental aspect of rehabilitative treatment. These are highly pertinent points and should not be overlooked; however, the sustained reinforcement of such a label on the part of authority figures is likely to engender those feelings of societal alienation described by Tannenbaum (1938); or Lemert's (1951) secondary deviance; should this occur, the resultant impact upon treatment compliance is likely to be telling.

Data Collection

1:1 Interview Process – Semi-structured Interviewing

As previously stated, data was obtained by means of semi-structured 1:1 interviews. Leech (2002) has provided a useful definition of semi-structured (or ethnographic) interviewing by juxtaposing its inherent principles against those of journalistic interviewing. According to Leech, these two interview styles represent extreme polar opposites of the interviewing continuum. With the journalistic interview, the interviewer attempts to verbally corner the interviewee by demonstrating their superior degree of insight and asking question deliberately designed to facilitate a pre-determined result. Conversely, with the ethnographic interview, the interviewer seeks to "… enter the world of the respondent" (Leech, 2002, p.665) by presenting as a naïve enquirer and allowing the interviewee the opportunity to engage in detailed descriptive disclosure. Leech embraces the semi-structured interview as a crucial part of the ethnographic category. Leech considers it to be the optimal approach for generating insight into a particular area of enquiry, and, in certain cases, hypothesis testing and quantitative interpretation. In accordance with the exploratory, investigative ethos of this thesis the semi-structured (ethnographic) interview will be utilised.

Having examined the work of (Day, Howells, Casey, Ward, Chambers & Birgden, 2009; McKendy, 2006 & Whitehead *et al*, 2007) it is clear that 1:1 semi-structured interviewing has proven to be a highly effective means of data collection within custodial settings. All of the studies I considered were centred on high-risk, violent recidivists, and therefore, held relevance to my research. However, Whitehead *et al*'s study is especially pertinent as it is New Zealand-

based. Although Whitehead *et al* were not explicit in their justification for the use of semi-structured 1:1 interviews, it is apparent that this approach was central to their data collection. In my opinion, it accounts for a great deal of the depth of subjective insight which infused their findings.

Having noted the importance of rapport building in an interviewing context (Leech, 2002) I endeavoured not only to put my participants at ease, but to express to them that I was genuinely interested in their comments and reflections. In order to facilitate this it was necessary for me to consider the hierarchical position inherent in the interview situation. I made a deliberate effort to minimise the impact of both conscious and unconscious variables which may have given rise to perceived power dynamics on the part of the participants. Accordingly, I explained (both in the *Information for Potential Participants* – Appendix One and in person) that I was not formally connected to the Department of Corrections or Waikeria Prison. I confirmed that the individual participants would not be distinguishable by their names in any written documentation and as such they were free to disclose without the fear of official consequences on the part of the Department of Corrections or other law enforcement agencies. The exception to this rule related to the disclosure of any offending for which the offender had not been charged, or for which another third party was currently being made accountable.

The interviews were deliberately run in a relaxed, informal manner with both parties referring to one another on first name terms. I paid careful attention to a number of interpersonal variables such as balancing the requirement of appropriate professional conduct (not colluding or validating distorted thinking), with the need to maintain a reassuring demeanour.

In order to safeguard the flexibility of the semi-structured interview process I compiled an interview structure that was illustrative in nature. I utilised a broad, opening, 'Grand Tour Question' (Leech, 2002) to introduce the particular domains that I hoped to cover and to influence the trajectory of the conversation across them. Each Grand Tour Question was followed by series of prompts. These were used on a discretionary basis to influence the narrative flow of the interview within the particular domains (please refer to Appendix Three - *Interview Schedule*).

I envisaged that this approach would enable me to obtain a candid insight into the lived experiences of the participant interviewees. By ensuring an egalitarian relationship and adopting the position of the naïve enquirer egalitarian, I attempted to create an environment in which it was clear to the interviewees that they were the experts, and that their contributions were the cornerstone of my thesis.

I am of the opinion that the need to clarify meaning is crucial to the accurate description of the participants' worldviews. Therefore, the use of audio recording equipment was deemed appropriate on two-levels. Firstly it enabled me to collate a quantity of data that would have been too great to accurately transcribe through written notes. Secondly, by allowing a recording device to capture all of the spoken discourse I was able to demonstrate a depth and integrity of interest to the participants by offering my undivided attention. This I expressed through appropriate eye contact, suitable facial expression and encouraging verbal prompts.

Thematic Discourse Analysis and Naturalistic Observations

Although I had hoped to include thematic discourse analysis in my data collection my participants were reticent in providing materials necessary to have done so. In accordance with the principles of my ethical commitment I did not attempt to coerce any of the participants to engage in this activity.

I initially proposed was to utilise naturalistic observations of treatment sessions in the capacity of observer as participant (Dallos, 2006). I had hoped that this would have enabled me to gain first-hand exposure to the dynamics of a treatment session. The inclusion of naturalistic observations was vetoed by the Principal Psychologist of the Karaka Unit on the grounds that it could have been unsettling to the treatment process.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

The recurrent theme running throughout all of the qualitative evaluations reviewed thus far (Clarke *et al,* 2004; Department of Corrections, 2008 & McMurran & McCulloch, 2007) appears to be one which emphasises the importance of developing an insight into the lived experiences of the individuals in question.

To acquire this level of insight data analysis within this piece of research was underpinned by an amalgamation of three philosophical assumptions or analytical lenses detailed by Creswell (2007). Firstly, ontology, through which I examined the realities of the individuals through direct quotation. It is important to clarify that the ontological paradigm adopted in this research is not consistent with the modernist view of a *strong* ontology (Chia, 1995), which holds that participants be viewed as discrete phenomenal states; rather, it maintains that they be considered transient, emerging entities - a perspective which is more consistent with a *weak* ontology (Chia *ibid*). Secondly, epistemology; to maximise the degree of epistemological accuracy I placed myself as close to the participants as possible using fieldwork to minimise distance and objective separation. Thirdly, axiology; in accordance with this principle I was explicit about personal biases and values and how these might have affected the research. To emphasise this

point I remained resolute in my outlook that that the text alone would not encapsulate the participants' realities; it was, an interpretation of such.

Overarching these specific analytical lenses is an interpretative precedent grounded in two closely related, yet boldly independent, paradigms: Social Constructionism and Postmodernism (described in Chapter One).

Safeguarding Meaning

A critical point of concern for any researcher undertaking contextual analysis is ensuring that the meaning of particular symbols, codes or signifiers is mutually understood. A misunderstanding in interpretation or representation would have confounded the credibility of my study; moreover, it could, within a criminal justice context, compromise the wellbeing of my participants.

Although particular research (McAdams, 2004, as cited in Breakwell, 2006b p.270) suggests that humans share a great deal of understanding of meaning through *archetypal narratives*, a reliance on this principle may lead to a failure to clarify culturally-bound semantic detail, the like of which are common within a prison sub-culture. For example, Patenaude (2004) points out that the term *informant*, when used in mainstream circles, carries a clear, harmless connotation; however, within the criminal justice paradigm the same term holds an extremely negative, potentially life-threatening outcome for the signified person (Patenaude, *ibid*, p.74s).

Given that 74% of the individuals whose idiographic risk assessment places them in the High-risk demographic identify as New Zealand Maori (Wilson *et al*, 2007) it was necessary for me to familiarise myself with the meaning of key Maori words, phrases and expressions, especially those which featured in the day-to-day vernacular of the participants and/or their environment. I achieved this by meeting with a cultural advisor.

Documenting the Evidence

Given the structural framework of my proposed interview format it was not unsurprising that a considerable amount of information was obtained. Whilst I undertook every effort to safeguard the naturalistic flow of information by minimising the use of artificial interpretation procedures it was necessary to introduce some structural analysis to the data obtained, in order for it to be made accessible to the research community. In accordance with the emergent nature of the design, the finite structure of this analysis remains open throughout the data collection phase and developed implicitly as the research evolved.

A system underpinned by data collection, coding and analysis was used to identify and extract those themes and patterns which I felt most accurately addressed the research objectives. Collating the data over a gradual process enabled its semantic

essence to be alternately expanded and compressed in a manner described by Frost (2004). As the data was accrued conceptual relationships between data sets were proposed (compression); the credibility of the relationships were then scrutinised by reflecting them back to the interviewees (offenders and staff) through the process of expansion. This procedure was repeated until no new categories were identifiable (Frost, *ibid*).

Ethical Considerations

This research was sanctioned by two independent research committees. The Human Research Ethics Committee at the University of Waikato and the Policy, Strategy and Research unit of the New Zealand Department of Corrections. In planning and carrying out this study, I had to consider several important ethical issues.

Minimisation of undue distress and the maintenance of confidentiality

The possibility of the participants experiencing psychological torment, emotional discomfort or any external prejudice, discrimination or victimisation as a result of their agreement to participate in this study was given careful consideration. The following safeguards were employed to guard against this:

- All of the processes and protocols were explained to potential participants in an *Information for Potential Participants* briefing sheet (Appendix One) which covered such matters as the intended outcomes and objectives of the research, the right to withdraw from participation at any stage, the use of audio recording equipment, and the use of pseudonyms and other measures to safeguard anonymity. Multiple meetings were undertaken with potential participants in order to ensure they understood the processes of data collection and the proposed outcomes for the data obtained. All potential participants were advised of their right to make a complaint to the University, should they so desire, and the details of the appropriate contact persons were laid out in the briefing sheet.

- Psychological staff from within the Karaka unit were actively involved from the outset of data collection in order that they could monitor the wellbeing of the participants.

- My former professional status (Probation Officer) was explained to the potential participants from the outset.

- Each participant was asked to select a pseudonym at the commencement of their initial interview and its use to disguise their identity was clarified.

- Each participant was advised that they would have the option to have contact established for them (by the Prison) with the principal researcher, should they wish to enter into follow-up discussions.

- All of the participants were advised of their right to decline participation at any stage of the preparatory process and to refuse to answer any questions.

- All of the participants were informed that they had the right to challenge the factual details of their transcription and that they would be given a summary of findings upon completion.

- The principal researcher did not make any disclosures to any of the participants of the names or identities of other participants.

- Access to the audio recordings and the transcripts was restricted to the principal researcher.

In summary, this chapter has examined a number of key points, most notably: the overall purpose of this research, the proposed data collections and the analytical strategies used to assess my data. A brief introduction to the participants was included in order to empower the reader with appropriate background knowledge of the circumstances which may have determined their worldview. The ethical considerations of this research were also explained in this chapter to demonstrate my commitment to ethically sound practice. The proceeding chapter will make use of partial interview transcripts from all six participants in order to illustrate the consistent themes and patterns identified by them. References to the wider international literature we will be provided in order to cross reference the findings of this research with those of related external sources.

Chapter Four – Findings

This chapter is chiefly concerned with the exploration and deconstruction of the experiences of the participant interviewees. By comparing and contrasting the opinions of the participant interviewees with one another the primary themes and patterns within their individual and collective experiences will be identified. A number of the views and beliefs of two programme facilitators and one member of the custodial staff team are also included. This is deemed appropriate as it enabled additional insights into the observations of the participant interviewees.

For ease of reading, this chapter is divided into a series of sections. These examine the relevance of a particular theme and highlight its importance to the participant interviewees through the direct quotation of interview transcripts. Each section will also contain references to relevant international literature as a means of juxtaposing the participants' opinions against external sources.

Theme One: Motivation

This section will consider the role of motivation and its influence upon the participants' reasons for agreeing to participate in the STU-RP. As discussed in Chapter Two, there is a debate in the literature about the relative benefits of external (extrinsic) factors such as coercion by an external source(e.g. family, friends or a government system), versus internal (intrinsic) factors such as a deeply felt, self-directed determination to effect a particular course of action It is widely held amongst experts in the field of motivation (Miller & Rollnick, 1991, 2002) that profound intrinsic motivation is the desired mindset for persons attempting any form of behavioural change as it serves as the connection between the individual and the task (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Therefore, it holds the key to the successful achievement of their intended outcome.

A clear distinction was observable between the pre-course motivational influences of the STU-RP participants interviewed in this piece of research. Both of the programme graduates, Jerry and Al, acknowledged that the initial trigger for them in attending the STU-RP was the influence of an external agent(s) - Sentence Planner and Case Officer (Jerry) and the Custodial Staff in general (Al)[2].

---

[2] Jerry stated that his Sentence Planner wrote STU-RP participation into his Sentence Plan without his knowledge, and Al insisted that the Custodial Staff in is former unit were instrumental in convincing him to attend the STU-RP.

Jerry and Al disclosed trepidation about the prospect of being transferred to the Waikeria Prison, stating that they were settled in their respective prisons and were concerned by the distance that would be created between themselves and their families if they agreed to undertake the STU-RP. Al stated that he had also heard negative reports of Waikeria Prison (in particular the dominant position of the Mongrel Mob) and that these had contributed to his hesitation in agreeing to participate:

> *I was sort of quite comfortable in the jail I was in, so I wasn't too keen on doing the course ...* (Jerry)

> *I guess a few of the guards down in where I was ... they had a lot to do with it as well, they sort of pushed me to sort of come up here ... I just wanted to stay close to home.* (Al)

> *I had heard lots of bad things about this Jail too ... like it was run by the Mongrel Mob and that there were lots of fights up here.* (Al)

Having reflected on the pros and cons of doing the programme Jerry recognised that participation would help at future Parole Board hearings. Al observed that whilst he wanted to make changes for his own personal wellbeing the influence of his family members (in particular his Mother) was also crucial in his decision making:

> *... if I did go to the Board* (Parole Board) *I wouldn't get it* (without completing the STU-RP)*, so I thought "oh yeah, I should do the course" ... I was trying to address all of the objectives on my Sentence Plan.* (Jerry)

> *Family, friends and wanting to find answers for myself. It was the support of my Mother; I think my Mother had a lot to do with it.* (Al)

Both Jerry and Al acknowledged that once they had overcome their ambivalence, made the decision to relocate to Waikeria and commence the STU-RP their motivation to see it through increased.

Jerry recounted how his motivation evolved from being purely extrinsic (undertaking the STU-RP for the benefits it would have to his Parole application), to become more intrinsic as he adjusted to the life in the Karaka Unit and began to recognise aspects of the programme that could be of use to him. When asked what he attributed this motivational shift to, Jerry replied:

> *Oh getting used to how the place was running and that; just feeling more confident in myself ... Um, oh, once I started to recognise the things that I could relate to um particularly with offending, being a high-risk offender*

and that um yeah na I felt that I was learning a lot from that and um yeah that I was sort of going towards genuine change and yeah. (Jerry)

Al insisted that his motivation to actively engage in the STU-RP had always been high; although he did notice that it increased over time:

… it (motivation) *has got a lot, probably got stronger, stronger over time, but not by much 'cause when I first um when I made the decision to actually come up here I thought "no you know I'm going to go for it" going in: might as well go hard. And that was me, I was as motivated as to do it and I got here and I haven't changed my mind since … (motivation) probably built over time, but keeps going up.* (Al)

It would appear that Al's motivation to engage with the STU-RP is getting consistently stronger. In addition Jerry's motivation seems to have evolved from being influenced purely by external factors – obtaining a positive Parole report, to more intrinsic ones – comfort with the environment, increased self esteem, a recognition of the applicability of the programme content and an awareness of 'genuine change.'

Given the empirically supported relationship between intrinsic motivation and sustained behavioural change (Miller & Rollnick, 1991, 2002) it is encouraging to note that both Jerry's and Al's motivation increased with their exposure to the programme. One may infer (from Miller and Rollnick's conclusion) that the nature of Jerry's and Al's motivation will serve as a protective factor against future engagement in criminal activity.

Jay explained, in detail, the rationale behind his motivation. His disclosures appeared to be intrinsic in nature. He reported being driven by a number of important factors: a desire to eradicate violence from his life and from the lives of his whanau, the need to atone for his offending in the eyes of all of those persons around him, especially his children; and, finally, to pay homage to his victim's memory.

… I wanna break this chain of um this chain of violence you know, thing um, bad habits, bad attitude, conduct and all those. I wanna um that was another decision na na you, to make your life better and not to to waste that fellas, that man's life that I took, to make you know, his life more meaningful, not to be forgotten. I gotta do I sort of pull all of the things together and and to guide me. Well, yeah, I owe it to my kids, owe it to everybody else but to mean it too and then it's just one big circle that will come back to me again … sometimes I can find myself wandering away and sometimes it's not about my kids and that's not enough to push me to then oh it's about him (victim)*; na na na, that's how I use motivation.* (Jay)

Jay explained how, from the time of his offending, he had experienced considerable dissonance between his overarching moral outlook (core beliefs) and his criminal behaviour. Jay described how the incongruity between his underlying belief system and the nature of his crime was the result of 'mental problems.' Jay maintained the view that participation on a criminogenic programme was essential for him as it would allow him to address his dysfunctional thoughts and behaviours:

> *I don't think um ah um taking somebody's life is normal. And I knew it wasn't, you know something, um, whether it was an instinct or conscious inside me, "no that's not right, that can't be right." Something just didn't sit well. That just doesn't sit well and I needed to find out how; why I did it? How did that behaviour come about? And more of that, that was the driving force for me to, to seek, to find myself ... I had mental problems, in my head ... from the day of my offending; the initial day that something was wrong I knew that something was wrong with my thinking patterns. I didn't actually know the terminology and um it was a desire of me to seek that kind of knowledge.* (Jay)

Jay's apparent commitment to pro-social lifestyle change can be evidenced in his explanation that he had originally attempted to enrol on a different violence prevention programme but was declined on the grounds that he did not meet the entry criteria. He persisted, asking the custodial staff to telephone the principal psychologist of the Karaka Special Treatment Unit so that he could speak with him in person and discuss the possibility of enrolling onto the STU-RP:

> *I talked to Sam* (Principal Psychologist) *over the phone and asked if I can attend it, why I wanted to attend it, 'cause I really wanted to know myself, find out how I functioned and why I had those distorted thoughts, problem thinking and all those core belief problems that um, that drove me to um offending and that was the whole thing really for me, I wanted to know myself.* (Jay)

Similarly to Jerry and Al, Jay found that as his exposure to the programme increased his motivation:

> *It's heightened, it's elevated to the stages where I am practicing survival strategies and problem thinking skills and questioning our ownselves and all that um um management emotion techniques, awareness and all that I thought I thought and um that as I get home I'll I'll sit back in my cell, I'll kick back and I'll reflect back and I'll put myself into a scenario, make myself angry; you know, make myself say make myself identify the body sensations, and the reward out of it is me knowing myself how to deal with it.* (Jay)

64

Although Jay expressed a profound degree of intrinsic motivation to attend the STU-RP, his status as a programme non-completer is interesting and should be carefully considered. On the one hand, it is possible that Jay's reflections upon intrinsic motivation were not as robust as he indicated. Conversely, if Jay's intrinsic motivation was as sincere as he described his expulsion from the programme may contradict the value of intrinsic motivation in pro-social lifestyle change. Whilst it would be inappropriate to suggest generalist conclusions from the limited scale of this one example, some doubt may be cast upon the importance of the role played by intrinsic motivation in this case.

At first glance the findings here may appear contrary to the views of Miller & Rollnick (1991, 2002), who insist that profound intrinsic motivation is crucial to success. That is, Al and Jerry who were more extrinsically motivated completed the programme, whereas, Jay, the self-proclaimed, highly internally motivated participant, was exited from the programme just days before he was due to graduate. We will discuss, in the Positive Experiences section, the impact of the programme upon Jay. In this section the argument will be presented that by applying the skills he learnt, Jay prevented himself from far more serious offending. Although Jay may not have graduated the course, he demonstrated, not merely through a contrived, rhetorical account, but through a real life demonstration, how the symbiosis of his experiences on the STU-RP, and his robust intrinsic motivation had a profound influence over his actions.

Jay's encouraging post-intervention actions are consistent with the findings of McMurran & McCulloch (2007). McMurran & McCulloch contend that most of the programme non-completers they encountered expressed a desire to undertake further interventions and considered themselves motivated to stop offending. It is, however, important to note that Jay's positive comments regarding the STU-RP are contrary to those of McMurran & McCulloch's non-completers who perceived a lesser degree of relevance in the programmes they had attended.

Whilst some variance is notable in the idiographic mindsets of the participants prior to commencing the STU-RP it became evident that they all approached the STU-RP with the expectation of successful graduation. Although some of the participants believed the programme would be challenging, they felt its contents would be of distinct benefit as it would enable them the opportunity to gain insights into their offence antecedents and meet the requirements of their sentence plan, thus demonstrating positive intentions to the Parole Board.

It is apparent that once they began treatment, any residual anxiety the participants may have been harbouring soon dissipated.

Jerry, as we have already discussed, had some reservations about commencing the STU-RP, explaining that he was settled in his previous prison and, having heard

reports from members of the custodial staff in that prison, was expecting the STU-RP to be "… pretty full on …" Despite this, Jerry's initial reaction to treatment was a positive one. Jerry recalled how one of his earliest memories of the STU-RP intervention was undertaking a series of psychometric tests; an experience which he appeared to enjoy:

> *Oh, just the way they, um, done all the tests and that, to see um IQ tests and that. Yeah, the way the thing was set up … oh it was quite interesting, yeah.* (Jerry)

Al also reported feelings of hesitation about commencing the STU-RP. Despite these he remained confident that he would graduate successfully. Al identified, at an early stage in the intervention that he was growing across both intra-psychic and inter-personal domains, as well as developing a focus on more long-term goals. Al recalled:

> *… eye opening, huge sense of growth in myself, self belief, confidence, um all the skills given me all the skills to um um communicate in a proactive way with other people, um set my um it's given me aspirations to work towards, um I got my goals back and that, and my morals. Identify, it's given me the chance to identify where I went off the rails, and ah, um with high-risk situations that that sort of led to that, yeah. Oh it also just open up to people, put it out there, make myself vulnerable and um it's alright; yeah, yeah, yeah, don't have to hide behind a façade.* (Al)

It would appear that Jay entered the STU-RP in the midst of profound psychological distress. This distress appears to correlate with the commission of his index offence for which he seemed to harbour considerable guilt:

> *… I just knew something was wrong taking, doing what I had done. No, I don't want to justify, I just knew something was wrong taking, doing what I had done to a man, an innocent man at that, um you know, couldn't justify that, there was no way I could justify that I can't make "oh no that's the reason why I done it" and try and live with it. I just knew, nah nah, you find yourself, that was my um goal, that was the goal, it became an incentive "come on Jay, you find out why, why?" And with assistance and perseverance as the days, years went past started finding out more … I believe if I knew all of these coping skills I have attained now I would have been able to see that more, I would have been able to call on support people, loved ones and ask them, even then you know, like um, I recognise now that pride, ego, self centeredness and selfishness, um played a major factor …* (Jay)

When considered in conjunction with his earlier statements regarding pre-course motivation, Jay's apparent insights would suggest he commenced the STU-RP

66

with the intention of satisfying his yearning for resolution. To fulfil his need to discover the root causes of his offending and help him develop an enlightened awareness of, and rationale for, the possible causes of his ego-dystonic, disordered mindset. In addition, Jay seemed keen to acquire strategies to identify and manage his thoughts, emotions and behaviours in a more adaptive manner.

Looking at this situation from a social constructionist perspective, Jay's positive comments and encouraging actions represent a clear indication of his intrinsic world view. Focusing upon the positive emphasis expressed by Jay may be criticised as a form of collusion by those who adopt a more detached, critical perspective. However, the subjective position adopted here is deemed necessary as it is an accurate reflection of the socially constructed emphasis of Jay's comments. Whilst the theoretical model used here may reflect a certain outcome, or emphasise a particular aspect of Jay's character, that does not mean it is essentially wrong.

There are consistencies between the disclosures of Jerry and Al and certain participants interviewed by Clarke *et al* (2004). Jerry and Al and a number of Clarke *et al*'s participants felt that participation in a rehabilitative intervention would be advantageous to their future Parole assessments. They were motivated, largely, by extrinsic factors.

Further parallels can be observed between the motivational characteristics of some of the participants encountered by Clarke *et al* (2004) and the participant interviewees from the STU-RP. For example, Clarke *et al* categorised as 'Sceptics' those participants who initially presented with an instrumental rationale for completing the programme (to achieve a favourable Parole report), but then developed their view, becoming more inclined towards self-development in accordance with exposure to the course content. Consistencies exist between this group and Jerry, whose, disclosures suggested that he was happy in his previous unit and that he only agreed to relocate to Waikeria after direct influence from his Sentence Planner and Case Officer, and deciding that completing the STU-RP would benefit his chances of early release. Despite his essentially extrinsic rationale for initial enlistment, Jerry described how his motivation began to evolve as he became more akin to the procedures and protocols of the unit and recognised that the course content held specific applicability to his offence-related cognition.

The basis for Al's intra-psychic motivation is consistent with Clarke *et al*'s (2004) 'self-developer' category. According to Clarke *et al,* the self-developer is highly motivated to change his behaviours prior to commencing an intervention. Although Al described some hesitation about the prospect of undertaking the STU-RP, it appears that he had thought carefully about addressing his criminogenic needs. Moreover, feelings of ambivalence or opposition to the

programme were largely born out of anxiety towards relocation, rather than an overall objection to the programme.

Jay's termination from the programme should not overshadow the fact that he began the STU-RP with what appeared to be a strong desire to address his offence-related cognition. He continued to do so when confronted with a high-risk situation (a point which will be discussed in greater detail under the positive experiences section). Accordingly, Jay, like Al, fits Clarke *et al*'s (2004) profile of a self-developer.

It would appear, particularly in the case of Jerry and, to some extent Al, that a combination of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation influenced their programme completion. Nevertheless, motivational consonance is one of many factors which play a crucial part in the overall formulation of human consciousness. We must acknowledge that criminological psychology has merely scratched the surface of this intra-psychic, interpersonal mystery; therefore, further investigation is not merely advisable, it is absolutely necessary.

Having carefully examined the impact of intrinsic motivation upon the participant interviewees we will now consider the role of extrinsic motivation. If we accept the definition of intrinsic motivation as "…the doing of an activity for its inherent satisfaction rather than for some separable outcome …" (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p.56) and acknowledge its empirically supported potency in determining treatment compliance we must, at the same time pay, due regard to extrinsic motivational factors, as well as exploring the possibility of a link between them.

Extrinsic motivation can be defined as the impact of one or many external variables acting upon an individual, or group of individuals, at any one time, which, according to Deci & Ryan (2000), can be paired with a separable outcome. Deci & Ryan cite deCharms (1968) to make the observation that, traditionally, extrinsic motivation was perceived to be a robust, but less prominent, aspect of motivation than its intrinsic counterpart. Deci & Ryan dispute this position from the perspective of Self-Determination Theory, presenting the argument that extrinsic motivation does not exist as one discreet phenomenon; rather, it embodies the form of "... active, agentic states" (Deci & Ryan, *ibid* p.55). Deci & Ryan suggest that individuals can undertake externally ordained tasks with umbrage and an air of antipathy, or, alternatively, with a degree of enthusiasm that indicates the intrinsic acceptance of the externally driven task at hand, acceptance which is endorsed by the recognition that the task holds specific personal value for them. The critical determinants underpinning this distinction are, according to Deci & Ryan, the instrumental value the individual perceives in the task, the personal endorsement they attribute to it and the degree of autonomy they feel they have over it. Deci & Ryan insist this process is mediated by internalisation and integration which they define accordingly,

> *Internalisation is the process of taking in a value or regulation, and integration is the process by which individuals fully transform the regulation into their own so that it will emanate from their sense of self* (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p.60).

For a detailed analysis of Deci & Ryan's (2000) taxonomy of human motivation the interested reader is directed towards the primary text; however, for purposes of this research the notion of integrated regulation (Deci & Ryan, *ibid* p.62) will be considered.

Credited as being the most autonomous form of extrinsic motivation, integrated regulation transpires when imposed regulations are incorporated entirely into one's self perspective (Deci & Ryan, 2000). According to Deci & Ryan, this is achieved through self-monitoring and the unification of external conditions with personal values. It follows, that the greater the degree of acceptance the individual attributes to the external conditions, and the further they assimilate them with their personal identity, the more the externally decreed conduct becomes self-affirming. Although integrated regulation may appear similar to intrinsic motivation, Deci & Ryan point out that behaviours attributable to integrated regulation are firmly in the extrinsic realm, as the individual actor is driven by a desire to acquire the instrumental value associated with a particular outcome which is distinct from the behaviour itself, despite the fact that the behaviour is vigorously endorsed by the self.

All of the participant interviewees observed how the rules of the Karaka Unit were stricter than they had experienced in any if their previous units. However, we see (in the disclosures of Jerry and Al) working examples of integrated regulation. In these cases it becomes apparent how prisoners may perceive custodial enforcement to represent a source of animosity – a tangible opponent they can vilify, against which they can vent their internal angst (for example an institutional directive which prohibits one inmate entering another inmates cell, or one which forbids the use of a piece of wire as a radio antenna). Nevertheless, Jerry and Al demonstrate how those prisoners with the foresight to recognise the opportunities available to them during their incarceration are able to make use of their situation to help them achieve their long-term objectives. Firstly, Jerry provides a clear example of this through his observation that the strict unit rules brought harmony to the wing, which, in turn, unified the participants by operating in conjunction with their internal cognitive processes (e.g. goal setting and the desire for early release), thus the possibility of accomplishing their long-term objective (early release) was increased markedly. Secondly, the personal autonomy and individual value inherent in Deci & Ryan's (2000) integrated regulation can be found in Jerry's observation that his motivation began to evolve from extrinsic to intrinsic as he became more comfortable in his environment and recognised the relevance of the programme content upon his personal situation 'as

a high-risk offender;' in his own words, this sequence of events led him to 'genuine change.'

The evidence presented would suggest that conditions which encourage self-monitoring and the adoption of unit regulations as explicit personal values are likely to enhance the probability of programme participants experiencing positive outcomes from their intervention.

The impact of the unit rules upon the participant interviewees will be explored in greater detail under a subsequent heading.

Theme Two: Group learning

This section will look at two distinctly different, but inter-related aspects of group learning: firstly, the role of intra-group dynamics, in particular the management of challenging behaviour by the facilitation staff and, secondly, the didactic delivery of the course content.

According to Prochaska & Norcross (2007), both Beck and Ellis consider cognitive therapy to be problem orientated, directive and psycho-educational. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that one of the most prominent features of the combined CBT-DBT STU-RP intervention is the delivery of skills-based, psycho-educational treatment. Therefore, it is necessary to consider both the didactic rationale of the STU-RP – as decreed by the facilitation manual; and the impact of the intra-group dynamic upon the facilitation of change.

The role of inter-personal dynamics in promoting change amongst the therapeutic group has received attention from within the rehabilitation programme evaluation literature. For example, the work of McMurran & McCulloch (2007), as discussed in Chapter Two, serves to illustrate the importance of cohesive inter-personal relations between group members as a key factor in fostering a positive treatment environment. True to the Social Constructionist rationale of this research, the symbiosis between the subtleties of inter-group dynamics and the predetermined content of the programme must be carefully considered.

Studies in the non-criminogenic field of psychotherapy have demonstrated that clients' faith in the ability of the services being provided to influence realistic change within them is a pivotal factor governing treatment outcome (Joyce, McCallum, Ogrodniczuk & Piper, 2003; Meyer, Pilkoonis, Krupnick, Egan, Simmens & Sotsky, 2002; Lambert 1992)

Jerry and Al appeared to believe strongly in the ability of the STU-RP to enable them to effect lifestyle changes; however, they expressed how the relationship they shared within their respective groups had the most critical influence over their learning:

... cause it was like set up in groups and we sort of learnt from each other as well – sharing experiences. Yeah. The teachers were just there facilitating – take us through our workbooks. Um, yeah, we sort of come up with our views and then yeah they sort of um yeah, just worked through the workbooks. (Jerry)

The books are there to give you names for things to refer to, but I've learnt a lot more through say, just coming to class and there's been a situation in the unit and we just bring it up and talk and talk about for hour. You learn more through that from real situations that happen to you or to others then um just being real; yeah, it's not sort of made up, it's a real thing it's affecting us currently yeah. You get a lot more learning out of it, talking between group members and ah instead of just writing on the board "this is what we are doing today" like I can't really make this personal for myself, yeah; some guy wrote a book and they took his page out of it, yeah, and here it is. (Al)

Al insisted that having a broad variety of participants in the therapeutic classroom provided an excellent learning opportunity. Al explained how he feels the combination of the depth of personal experiences and varied backgrounds of the participants is essential in fostering the most adaptive therapeutic environment as it enables each of the participants to learn from one another's stories:

I think you have got to have a range of people on the programme, don't have all people from the same gang, or the same ages, or the same offending, and a range of young people, um long laggers, short laggers, um different ah different sort of backgrounds and histories and that yeah ... 'cause they'll they'll have different different things to put into it; different instead of um several being similar, you don't have much to learn from each other right? Yeah, um lots of variety. (Al)

Without detracting from his affiliation with the group, Jay insisted that the vast majority of his learning in the STU came from the course content and the group management skills of the facilitators. When discussing the relative contributions of these factors, Jay demonstrated the type of dialogue he had witnessed in group; whereby the facilitators guide the participants' discussions to assist them in achieving the most appropriate outcome:

Um um, if I was to put it in percentage wise, yeah I think 60%, 70% from them um giving us the information: 30% from the group. Because sometimes there was like a gap thing, because with the group um thing they will always take the lowest form, standard, and they are "oh no what am I? You know "can you help me here" "oh, no no no, this is what you should be doing" they (the facilitators) will correct it. (Jay)

71

On occasions the groups would drift away from the intended area of discussion. This circumstance would, of course, require the facilitators to bring the discussion back on track. Al acknowledged that this was more of a problem when the group first began, as participants were less inclined to voice their own opinions, appearing happy to go along with the 'group think' or collective consciousness. Whilst Jay stated that he was happy to challenge the group from the outset, Al took a little while longer to adjust. Nevertheless, both Al and Jay were in agreement that their programme facilitators were extremely adroit at recognising and addressing these circumstances:

> *Oh they pull it up straight away. They'll pull it up, yeah on the day, they make you address it, make you talk about it; can't run away from it.* (Al)

> *Oh going off the topic. Oh, oh Marie* (facilitator) *is quite good at that yeah, and Linda* (facilitator) *is just as good; she'll bring us back and go "na na na come back to the topic" um quite assertive behaviour too* (Jay begins knocking on the table top) *"na na na" she'll be looking at the board and what were on about the topic and go "na na ok" ... "we are talking about this, stick to this please" 'cause I think she knew that it was avoidance, because people try to do that.* (Jay)

Jerry, on the other hand, recalled how, on occasions, he felt that certain group members managed to de-rail the group, altering the course of the discussion away from its intended direction:

> *... cause when we were in a group discussion and there were fellas that would um you know, go off the subject a bit and then um yeah, be some times like an hour or nearly the whole the whole class would be taking on a different subject and like it it's you know that's something that I wasn't participating in you know, 'cause it had nothing to do with me. Yeah, that was happening for, you know, nearly weeks on end. Yeah, start moaning about the staff and the way they act and, um, ah, yeah just things that um a lot of the inmates would think that they were not being entitled to and yeah. They would bring stuff into the class. Suppose it was good in some ways you know, just to sort it out, um, but there were times when particular fellas would do it all the time, yeah, so I just shut off and turned off and yeah.* (Jerry)

An additional aspect of these de-railing behaviours appears to have been the attempts by particular group members to dominate a facilitator. Jerry observed that one of the female facilitators appeared to struggle in her dealings with particular group members, making an explicit contrast between the male Principal Psychologist who:

"was able to like um turn it back quite easily, take it back on track and yea, he was pretty good at um yeah, sort of like sorting it out there and then.... (and a woman facilitator) *that um, um, um that some of the inmates could sort of you know, it was like a power struggle sort of thing at times.* (Jerry)

When asked to explain this further, Jerry contended that the inmates in question would:

Um, oh just, you know, getting aggressive and that, things like that, having tantrums and oh 'cause we had this thing called time out and they would just storm out and have a breather outside and yeah, come back to class once they've settled down, things like that ... Yeah, and after that the class would stop and we would just sit around and wait 'til they come back. They didn't want to progress without them. (Jerry)

Jerry insisted that the confrontational inmates would not directly threaten the personal safety of the facilitator; however, they would direct verbal insults towards her.

Given the explicit reference to the role of facilitation staff members I considered it prudent to discuss this issue directly with them. The comments of two members of the facilitation staff are included. The particular facilitators were deliberately chosen as they shared a close professional relationship with the participant interviewees. An interview was conducted with each facilitator. To safeguard the anonymity of the facilitators, and to assist the reader, these facilitators are referred to as Facilitator "A" and Facilitator "B."

Facilitators A and B acknowledged how, given the combination of the unpredictable, often impulsive, sometimes volatile nature of their client group, the challenging approach and often emotive content of the work being undertaken, it is to be expected that there will be occasions on which certain participants react with expressive, anxiety-filled outbursts.

Facilitator A explained how this reaction can be seen from a positive angle, as it suggests that the individual is experiencing anxiety, and as a consequence, uncovering a discrepancy between their values, beliefs and behaviours. They suggested that with anxiety comes the most prominent learning; Q E D: "anxiety is your friend." (Facilitator A)

Facilitator B explained how one of the members of a particular group would deliberately de-rail sessions by attempting to steer the discussions off course. This behaviour would often be quite subtle. Consequently, Facilitator B had to be careful not to be "sucked into that" insisting that as a facilitator it is imperative to keep the group focused and to explore and process (with the group) the reasons

why they are attempting to de-rail. The facilitator cited a specific example from a group session whereby the members established a 'group think' dynamic by purposefully refusing to provide feedback to their peers during the offence mapping sessions. Facilitator B explained that it took between three and four sessions to eventually 'get the group on board.' Facilitator B interpreted this as a challenge to the establishment of functional group dynamics. Facilitator B noted that the group in question contained a high proportion of dominant group members who would lead the provocation of resistance, with the other, less vocal, group members buying in to this behaviour. Facilitaotor B suggested that this circumstance enabled the group think to take hold.

Facilitator B recognised how it is likely that there will be occasions whereby individual participants will directly challenge the facilitation staff. Facilitator B stated that having spent a number of years facilitating groups 'I would find it strange if that didn't happen.' Facilitator B has come to accept this as part and parcel of group facilitation, acknowledging it as '…one of those difficult behaviours you have to work with'. Facilitator B made it clear; however, that the explicit recognition of the presence of challenging behaviours was in no way an attempt to normalise them.

Reflecting upon personal experience, Facilitator B observed that there have been occasions whereby individual participants have said things that have "pushed some of my buttons." Whilst reacting, internally, with thoughts in the manner of "how dare you say that sort of thing" Facilitator B neutralised these, responding instead by identifying and managing the emotional, instinctual sensitivities so as to present in a professional and respectful manner; in essence, modelling pro-social behaviour. Facilitator B recognised that intimidatory behaviour was not a widespread occurrence, and was restricted to one or two individual participants.

Here it should be noted that the inmates interviewed had had different facilitators. Presumably this helps explain the differing views on facilitation, although of course the composition of the group may also have been a factor.

Although some of the participants may, at times, have minimised the role of the facilitators in their overall learning, one could argue that this highlights the crucial role of the facilitator and exemplifies their skills – they empowered the group to engage in self-directed, hands-on, interactive learning, where the group members themselves take responsibility for and, therefore, ownership of their cognitive developments.

Whilst all three participants recognised intra-group dynamics as being instrumental to their learning, they appeared to acknowledge that the changes they were experiencing in their cognitive processes were, in fact, the result of a delicate interaction between the formal course content, the intra-group dynamics and the

nature of the relationship they each had with the facilitators. The participants noticed how this last factor was influenced by the degree of honesty they maintained with their facilitators.

Reflecting on intra-group dynamics, Jerry noted:

Um, oh just hearing other people's um views and know their life experiences and that and um, oh just what we learnt off from the course, you know, new skills, um that's probably where most of the change came from for me. (Jerry)

Emphasising the role of the facilitator, in particular their rapport building skills, Al stated:

... the good thing that facilitators always try and do, always to try to get to um relate to us personally.' (Al)

Tying in the emphasis he placed upon self-determination and individual honesty, Al also recalled:

Oh it's for yourself you know, if you are not being honest you might as well not be here; you might as well go somewhere else. Class started with ten people and we are down to three now; so at least that's three we know are all honest, all here for the right reasons. (Al)

Jay too affirmed the importance of individual honesty:

It was part of my commitment: honesty; to find myself um um holding things back oh um it's like I'm hiding something. (Jay)

Um, I was quite open and honest about it, my offending and that, yeah. (Jerry)

Having considered the impact of intra-group dynamics upon learning it is appropriate at this point to examine the educational component of the STU-RP. None of the participants found the learning tasks of the STU-RP to be beyond their grasp. One of them, Al, noted that he found it particularly easy to handle as he had achieved a reasonable degree of formal educational prior to his incarceration. He stated that there were a number of occasions whereby he found himself finishing exercises ahead of the rest of the group and having to wait for them to catch up. To his credit, Al did not reflect negatively upon this: he simply observed that it allowed him the opportunity to practice his communication skills, stating that both the facilitators and his peer group were always on hand to assist him in dealing with any negative emotionality he may have felt during these occasions.

Jay appeared to have engaged very seriously with the course material. He explained, in detail, how he would go to great lengths to study and revise the concepts discussed during class. Jay vividly described the almost ritualistic nature of his practical revision; he explained how the lonely hours of solitude of his prison cell (to which he referred as 'home') were employed both as a time for sombre reflection and for the applied rehearsal of specific CBT/DBT protocols. As he lay alone in the darkness, Jay would invoke a state of marked emotional distress by deliberately focusing his thoughts upon scenarios that he knew would distress him. From his descriptions, it appears that by entering into a dark, complex intra-psychic dialogue Jay was able to reach the apex of this emotional climax. At this point Jay would apparently direct his thoughts, in a manner of self-interrogation, in order to identify the inconsistencies in them and experience the impact they had upon his bodily sensations. From this, it is likely that through an appreciation of the magnitude of the somatic effect, Jay began to engage his coping skills. With careful practice Jay was able to experience the emancipation of cathartic release and, in his own word "take it into another realm." This experience had an intense effect upon Jay, who described how, it essentially "Broke me down" to the point where he "didn't want to come back to class as my (his) eyes were still red in the morning".

Jay's prison cell essentially became his own private odium in which he could safely rehearse the behaviours that would represent his newfound insights. The magnitude of Jay's dialogue and engagement with the safety protocols is, in one respect, somewhat unsettling. At the same time, it is worthy of commendation as it is indicative of a powerful commitment to change. Jay attributed his comfort with the course content and willingness to engage to his devout intrinsic motivation:

> *Oh quite um quite yeah quite easy 'cause for me it was quite it was 'cause of my commitment to to changing it was quite easy for me to adopt it you know and to to to listen to listen and and and um to give specific feedback and give it all back in its purest form …* (Jay)

Jerry was somewhat reticent in his comments regarding his overall comprehension of the course content, stating simply that he did not find it overly challenging. Jerry did bring one of his workbooks to the interview and happily exhibited some of the exercises he had completed.

It is apparent, and not unsurprising, that the participants engaged with programme in varying ways. None of the participants indicated any difficulty in grasping the conceptual elements of the course, attributing their comfort with the subject matter to such variables as high levels of intrinsic motivation and a robust educational background. Nevertheless, an important criticism noted by Al was that whilst he recognised the need for formal instruction, he felt the sessions were

too heavily weighted towards group-discussion based delivery of generalist theoretical principles:

> *...perhaps ah more hands on stuff, not so much ah just sitting and talking in a circle. I'd like to see more role plays, more poster work, just things that are more hands on because a lot of the time you just sit there and it can get um quite repetitive and um boring at times. So there's a lot of guys in our situation they they not guys that can sit there and just take stuff on just by talking talking talking lot of the guys in Jails are hands on sort of people, they learn a lot more by doing than seeing so ah it* (the programme) *could be developed more, yeah. They* (other group members) *say it in here, they say it in the class yep, they say* "oh, na, we need to do something more funny, more engaging' yeah, let the tutors know "ok, we'll do this" *more role plays,* (keeping it real) *honest* (and applying it to real-life) *yeah.* (Al)

Al's comments are analogous with the findings of McMurran & McCulloch (2007), who stipulated that tutors (or facilitators) may require ongoing support in identifying and managing the cognitive needs of their participants.

Although some of the participants minimised the role of the facilitators in their overall learning, one could argue that this highlights the crucial role of the facilitator and exemplifies their skills – to empower the group to engage in self-directed, hands-on, interactive learning where the group members themselves take responsibility for their cognitive developments. To draw upon the insights of W.B. Yeats (n.d.) "Education is not filling a bucket, but lighting a fire".

Theme Three: Environment - Rapport and Relationships

This section will consider the integration of the various contextual factors underlying the delivery of treatment within the prison setting. It will examine the prospect of a connection between the wider prison environment, the nature of the relationships established between prison staff and inmates and the development of therapeutic rapport.

Ross *et al* (2008) make the observation that a variety of contextual factors exist within the overall matrix of a prison, each of which has an influence on the successful delivery of treatment. Ross *et al* suggest that these factors can be sub-divided into two distinct domains: correctional system factors and factors in the immediate environment in which therapy is undertaken. Correctional system factors are largely beyond the control of the programme staff and include such policy-orientated matters as decisions concerning programme eligibility. Factors in the immediate environment are more susceptible to the influence of those tasked with treatment provision.

As discussed in Chapter Two, the Karaka Unit advocates a multi-disciplinary approach to the delivery of treatment, an approach which accords with the philosophies of the therapeutic communities (Clark, 1999). In accordance with this paradigm staff are advised to take every opportunity to preserve the participants' individuality, assume the participants are trustworthy, encourage good behaviour, ensure the participants' retain the capacity for responsibility and initiative, and make certain that all participants are provided with opportunities for regular activities (Clark). Clark maintains that if these principles are actively pursued by the staff team the opportunities for a resolute therapeutic bond to develop between staff and participants are markedly increased.

3.1 Therapeutic Relationship (Offenders and Therapists)

In the opinion of Saunders (1999) the quality of the bond (known as the reciprocal intimacy) established between the therapist, or facilitator, support staff and client holds considerable influence over the integrity of the therapeutic process. It can be contended that the nature of the relationships established between all parties connected with the STU-RP is of marked consequence to the outcome. Without exception, the participants interviewed reflected positively on the quality of the relationships that were established and maintained between themselves and the programme facilitators and psychologists. In describing his relationship with the facilitation staff Jerry observed "Um, yeah, I think it was quite positive. Yeah, catered well and yeah."

Jerry recalled, furthermore, that the facilitation staff always spoke to him in a polite respectful manner, listening to his concerns and consistently offering him positive feedback.

Jay's opinions concurred with Jerry's; however, he offered a more detailed insight:

> *Oh, with Marie* (Facilitator) *and Linda* (Facilitator)*, oh in any relationship you have your ups and downs you know, and that's what strengthens it 'cause um they are there in the good times but ah they are more um more visual and more um verbal and when the bad times are there ... quite supportive in both times you know, and they don't let you get into difficulty; sometimes they will focus more and come in and help you.'* (Jay)

Al's views about the positive rapport he shared with the facilitation staff appeared unequivocal. Al described his relationship with the facilitation staff as "Awesome," explaining how they were always on hand to offer support and tend to his psychological wellbeing:

> *The relationship with the facilitators has been awesome, like they are always there for you, there for you to confide in, they don't they don't go*

78

off they won't go tell the guards unless it's something to do with um securities or assaults on others, but um apart from that you can go and tell them anything, they'll ah they'll just keep it confidential; it's a good thing. Yeah trust. (Al)

Al's remarks indicate the degree of value the participants place on the feelings of mutual trust established between themselves and the facilitation staff.

With all of the participant interviewees having reported a number of positive remarks in respect of the inter-personal styles of the facilitation staff, it is abundantly clear that productive inter-personal conditions, consistent with the notion of circular causality (as described in Chapter Two), were present throughout the delivery of treatment in the STU-RP. The only notable exception to the overall positive rapport between facilitation staff and participants appears to have been the occasional loss of focus in particular sessions which emanated from the alleged intimidation of a certain facilitator by members of the treatment group.

It is possible to surmise that through a combination of their will to learn, their engagement with the programme and the optimistic, constructive approach of the facilitation staff, the participants discovered the type of support necessary to fulfil their thirsts for personal insight. This can be taken as evidence to suggest that the inter-play theorised in Chapter Two between the Edifice Complex and circular causality had a direct impact upon the psychological positions of the participant interviewees.

As discussed in Chapter Two, the atmosphere encompassing the delivery of treatment plays a crucial part in its delivery. One of the key objectives of the Karaka Unit is to develop a therapeutic environment modelled upon the TC approach; thereby, creating a community of change within the confines of the unit. The fundamental aspects of the TC, as described by Clark (1999), are the sense of trust, the preservation of a participant's individuality, and the ownership of responsibility and initiative imparted onto the participants from those in either a predominantly therapeutic or supervisory role.

One of the approaches utilised by the Karaka STU in engendering the spirit of the community of change is the weekly community of change meeting (please refer to Chapter Two). As a communal forum in which to discuss the events of the week, inmates are encouraged to use this time as an opportunity to reflect upon their insights and achievements, to discuss any difficulties they may have been experiencing and to ask for assistance from their peers in overcoming particular concerns or issues. The community of change meeting is a place where disclosures can be made and concerns discussed in an open, non-punitive, edificatory manner.

Facilitator A considers the meetings to be a crucial part of the overall community of change paradigm. It was stated that these meetings are especially helpful for the participants as they give inmates an opportunity to maintain individual accountability for any behavioural misdemeanours whilst simultaneously seeking assistance from their peers to prevent them from encountering further high-risk situations. The facilitator described these meetings as "… an opportunity for the participants to speak freely about the difficulties they have."

Having attended two community meetings during the data collection phase of this research it was clear to me that the manner in which they are arranged afforded the participants a first-hand opportunity to address those circumstances which have a direct influence over their wellbeing. All of the participants who chose to speak were received with positive regard from all persons in attendance. They were encouraged to resolve doubt and alleviate scepticism in a safe, ordered manner – self-empowerment through collective acceptance.

There is support for the view that open communication and supportive relations are required to empower the participants in a manner consistent with the recommendations of the TC (Clark, 1999). It is possible to conclude from the spirit engendered by the regular community of change meetings and the comments made by Jerry, Al and Jay, that the facilitation staff are actively concerned with meeting this expectation. Regrettably, the same cannot be said for the approach adopted by certain members of the Custodial Staff team.

3.2 Interpersonal Relationships (Offenders and Custodial Officers)

One of the strongest, most consistent patterns to emerge from the STU-RP interviews concerned the disparity individual participants experienced in the manner in which they were treated by the facilitation staff versus the unit's custodial personnel. All of the participants were in agreement that this requires immediate attention as they all spoke unfavourably of the treatment they had received at the hands of particular Custodial Officers. This dynamic may prove to be problematic for the Karaka Unit as it could hamper its development as a TC. Haigh (2002) draws upon the work of one of the earliest proponents of the TC approach (Jones, 1968), to explain the notion of the living-learning experience, a principle which is expressly applied to interactions in outside of the primary therapeutic setting (in this research the Karaka unit itself). Haigh identifies how everything that occurs within the broader community "… from the washing up, to the board games, to the requests for leave can be used for therapeutic effect" (Haigh, 2002, p.252). It is apparent from the disclosures of the participant interviewees that they are not currently experiencing the full potential of this aspect of therapy within the Karaka Unit.

Jerry interpreted the actions of individual Custodial Officers as rude and condescending, and as a consequence, described how they essentially modelled anti-social conduct:

> *... oh, just some of the staff can um sort of be real condescending. Um at first I I I was sort of um responding in the way that I was being spoken to, so that got me into a bit of trouble ... yeah but um yeah after a while I stared getting along with them and um, yeah just trying to accept the things I can't change ... I can't change their attitude towards me.* (Jerry)

In comparison, Jerry described the rapport he experienced with the facilitators as "supportive and positive."

In contrast to the tenets of the TC approach, all of the participants perceiving the Custodial Officers role as essentially one of safety, and security monitoring. Jerry identified how the only member of the Custodial Staff who discussed treatment with him was his Case Officer. Jerry appeared resigned to this circumstance and had accepted it as a *fait accomplis*:

> *Yeah, oh I don't mind that too much, you know that's their job pretty much, just to do, just to look after us and yeah muster checks and yeah.* (Jerry)

Al identified a marked discrepancy between the overall 'kawa' (philosophical guidelines) of the programme and the manner in which he encountered particular Custodial Officers:

> *I don't see the ah guards in the same line as the programme. They are not they are not, ah the way you treat the way they treat you in the yard um to me doesn't go along with the ah Kawa or the expectations of the programme; there is still a "them and us" scenario, yeah.* (Al)

In conjunction with the modelling of anti-social behaviour earlier identified by Jerry Al found it very difficult to respond positively to those Custodial Officers who consistently disrespect him:

> *Um just find that they don't respect you very much. Yeah, and we're expected to um respect them, but it's quite hard to give respect when you don't get respect back. Two-way you know, got to meet them half-way yeah.* (Al)

When asked to describe some of the behaviours to which he was referring, Al explained:

> *Um, oh it's just when you talking to them they sort of slam the door in your face; might be something important, to do with your family and you*

really need a phone call home and they'll go "Na!" won't have any, won't even talk to you about it. You can't um, they'll just send you away and won't won't want to hear a bar of it. Yeah yeah yeah yeah whereas um I like to think that um you be able to go to the guards and actually say "look, this is my problem, um it's really hurting me in this way and I'd like it if I could talk to someone about it, or the Unit Manager, or um get a phone call to such and such" and quite often they are just "Na, I don't want to hear it!" (Al)

Al's view of the Custodial Staff members' role was similar with Jerry's in that *"Oh, just run, keeping the unit safe, running the unit, yeah yeah, keeping us all inside."*

Jay instigated a lengthy dialogue around the role of the Custodial Staff, including: his initial expectations of them, the lack of consistency between their overall approach and that of the facilitation staff and the differences he noticed between the demeanours of Custodial staff in the Karaka Unit, compared with that of his previous (Maori Focus) unit:

> *Um yeah, they weren't um it there wasn't the normal the normal um um staff that I was used to 'cause I was where I came from Maori Focus Unit they were quite ah um they they were there, you know, if you had an issue, you had a problem they were there they they they will attend to you they were quite very therapeutic. They were there.* (Jay)

Jay compared this to the more formal approach of the Custodial staff in the Karaka Unit:

> *Um with regard to if you want to put a letter they will get back to you in three-days, not very one-to-one, there's no um open-door policies. They* (custodial staff in his previous Maori Focus Unit) *didn't have a lock on the door, I could walk into the Unit Manager regardless and goes "can I see you?" And he goes "I'll see you in a minute." Um, the relationship there was quite open.* (Jay)

Both Facilitator A and B appeared to have an awareness of the alleged disparity between the interpersonal styles of the Psychological Services staff and the custodial officers. Facilitator A drew upon the discrepancy between the manner in which inmates are required to address facilitation and custodial staff members, and the variance in the phrasing of the response they will receive:

> *...I think one difference is we* (facilitation staff) *ah call the guys by first name and they* (participants) *call us by first name uh custody officers will only use their* (offender's) *surname and they* (offenders) *call them* (custodial staff) *Miss or Mr. So um you know in terms of um in a way*

depersonalising when you relate to them in such a way so that's certainly a difference ... (Facilitator A)

Further to this remark, Facilitator B reported having witnessed inappropriate behaviour on the part of certain members of the custodial team:

... certainly from my observations, I have seen some very inappropriate behaviour from certain officers in terms of swearing, um calling prisoners names ... (Facilitator B)

Facilitator B stated that certain custodial staff members have behaved in a manner that was corrosive to the overall objectives of the STU-RP. Furthermore these behaviours were believed to be detrimental to the motivational consonance of the particular participant to which they were addressed:

... comments from officers like "Oh no, you're not back here are you? Oh you are gunna fail." You know, almost as soon as they (offenders) *are stepping into the compound they* (certain custodial staff) *are being disempowering, you know. Um they* (offenders) *are already struggling with motivation and to hear those kinds of comments can be very damaging, which actually goes against what we are trying to do here* (STU) *which is build motivation to change and to support them through that process of change.* (Facilitator B)

Facilitator B highlighted what they felt to be a general lack of cohesion between the facilitation and custodial staff:

... I've certainly observed myself maybe different approaches and sometimes there's conflict and the clash, it's still quite ah, it's still quite segregated in terms of it's 'them and us' - custodial and treatment staff; I think there's a long way to go, but I think we have made significant progress ... (Facilitator B)

Both Facilitators A and B remarked how these are early days for the unit in terms of the implementation of the therapeutic communities approach:

...we are only at the beginning stages ... I mean we are not there yet you know you've read about um supportive communities and what that is all about but it takes years of work to get everyone on the same page, training all sorts ... (Facilitator A)

Facilitator B's understanding of the implementation of therapeutic community paradigms within custodial settings has led to the conclusion that a period of adjustment is always required before both the custodial and facilitation staff teams are able to successfully amalgamate their differing outlooks and achieve a more functional homeostasis or equilibrium. Making an anecdotal reference to reports

encountered from an established, highly functional prison-based therapeutic community, facilitator B observed:

> *... it took them years to actually get to a stage where custodial staff and therapeutic staff had the same agenda on the same level singing from the same hymn sheet, if you like, and they were working together. I think here, I have had to kind of check in with myself and be more flexible and to remind myself that this is still quite a very new unit ... we've come a long way in getting more custodial staff on board ...* (Facilitator B)

Facilitators A & B recognised the possibility that custodial staff may require additional training to bring them up to speed with the philosophical rationale underpinning a therapeutic community approach, and; as a consequence, the particular inter-personal style they are expected to model:

> *... I don't know that all custodial staff have had training in what that means and ah what is expected of them ...* (Facilitator A)

> *... there's plans to do some staff training with custody to hopefully to get to get them more on board with the idea of the TC and why we are doing that here in the Community of Change ...* (Facilitator B)

The facilitation staff interviewed confirmed that a gulf exists between the approaches and inter-personal styles of their team members and of those of the custodial team. However, they made it clear that this circumstance is steadily improving, and that they are confident it will improve even further with the advent of the pending custodial staff training.

The distinction between the attitudes of the Custodial staff in the Karaka Unit and those in the Maori Focus Unit appeared to be an important theme for Jay, as he returned to it at a latter part of the interview stating:

> *... with regards to the outcome from the* (previous unit) *which it was a special unit, they were more open and understanding, therapeutic yeah. Quite um sort of supportive the old unit, you never felt lonely, you could you could rely on them ...* (Jay)

It became apparent that Jay has given some lengthy consideration to the relationship created by the custodial staff. Jay described how he feels the uniformity of their regimental approach is so pervasive that it must have been indoctrinated during their time in training school. Therefore, the means for addressing it lies at a broader, institutional level:

> *"Lock you up, lock you up, lock you up!" Because that's their way, um they've been told that from training school, "na, you just do it like this and you keep it" and guards will going to be questioned on it, so I think it's*

84

got to come from another um from their superiors. They just do their job and their job is safety: their safety, our safety, community safety and that's can't get anymore regimental than that you know, and and that's that's quite basic rules for them to live by and easy to work with you know. (Jay)

In accordance with his remarks concerning their lack of professionalism, Jay recalled how he has frequently witnessed Custodial Officers making disparaging comments to inmates (particularly the younger ones), speaking to them in a manner that he felt was deliberately designed to be patronise and antagonise them. Jay emphasised the need for improvements in the communication styles of certain Custodial Officers, suggesting that it would be more beneficial for the inmates if they were credited with the opportunity to make decisions and take responsibility for their own actions; for example:

"If you are going to do that, that's ok, you are going to force my hand and I'm going to have to either put it in the book or charge you" so it gives them, ah the youth, the the option now to take the right path or the wrong path. (Jay)

Jay expressed a desire for the custodial staff to treat the inmates with a greater deal of respect, to be more engaging and behave in a manner that would allow the inmates to feel that they had not been pre-judged and were, in fact, trusted.

Similarly to Jerry and Al, Jay reported a marked discrepancy between the approaches of the Facilitation and Custodial staff:

... with regards to the facilitators; they quite um caring: with regards to um the Custodial they only here to um meet their responsibilities and to do what they just asked for and no more. That's their role and they will do what they got to do you know, that's their lifestyle. (Jay)

Jay's reference to 'their lifestyle' when describing the detached, indifferent attitudes that he experienced from members of the custodial staff team is of interest, as it suggests a degree of frequency. It follows, that this oppositional approach from particular custodial officers cannot be attributed to a one-off, stress-induced, momentary lapse of concentration. Rather, it has become a consistent mode of interaction.

Focusing on the positive aspects of his difficult encounters with certain Custodial Officers Al explained how their confrontational stance served as an opportunity for him to rehearse a number of the skills he had acquired from the STU-RP, in particular, those related to anger management and distress tolerance:

Oh yeah yeah, but it's also um those situations always where you use your coping strategies and that, take a time out, use your breathing, all these different things we've been given. It's just like walk away that's just how

it is we have to accept it, yeah, so it's good practice in some ways for those other skills, but um, I'd like to see more opportunities to practice the communication skills with the guards. (Al)

Whilst it may be observed that participants learning to adapt in a disciplined, self-controlled manner to the unfavourable actions of those around them is evidence of strong pro-social, inter-personal development, certain Custodial Officers hold a negative attitude towards them is not akin to the TC spirit.

In discussions around the overall atmosphere of the unit, Jay considers that the participants approach the STU-RP with a constructive outlook and that having earned the right to be in attendance they have made a positive demonstration of their commitment to long-term lifestyle changes; moreover, that the facilitation staff and psychologists are consistent in their constructive approach and compassionate, therapeutic outlook. Nevertheless, Jay did not extend this view to the Custodial Staff, suggesting that their collective approach has restricted the sense of belonging he experiences in the unit. Jay insisted that a crucial aspect of rehabilitation is feeling happy within the broader confines of the unit; as, if participants are happy, they are more inclined to learn:

> *... I think part of being rehabilitated is as a person to be um, happy, so that you can attain this course to not committing anymore victims to express* (trust) *so that they can build and that's what it's about ...* (Jay)

Maintaining that it is relatively easy to identify those participants in the Karaka Unit who are seriously committed to making significant changes, Jay described the nature of the two-way therapeutic relationship between the staff and offenders that he feels would be optimal in the Karaka Unit:

> *...'cause it's easy to see someone who wants to change and somebody that doesn't want to change, you can pick it up from a mile just by their conduct, their actions, their words ... be more helpful, more accommodating for a Mother-Father* (unit staff) *role: the client the child ...* (Jay)

Nevertheless, Jay made the important observation that not all of the Custodial Officers conducted themselves in this manner:

> *you known you've got your good ones and you've got your bad ones ... the ones I like are consistent, consistent always know "yes" is "yes," that keeps me safe 'cause I know where they are, I'm not gunna um um yeah yeah consistency. To be to be yeah to to stand their ground you know. When they go over-professional in the way they ah abuse their power, I see it from afar ...* (Jay)

It appeared that Jay, Al and Jerry were expressing a desire for consistency, and for clearly defined boundaries supported by a mutually-dependent model of treatment between Psychological Services and Custodial Staff.

Dolan (2003), citing Rapoport (1960) emphasises the role of the broader institutional context in determining treatment outcomes in TCs, insisting that the "… community itself … forms a cornerstone of therapy – embodied in the concept of the "community as doctor"" (Dolan, 2003, p.410). Dolan suggests; furthermore, that we consider the point made by Main (1946) that it is not merely "the structure but the culture which is decisive for the human relations on offer" (Main, 1946, as cited in Dolan, 2003, p.410).

By comparing the comments made by the participants to the observations of Dolan (2003) it would seem that a degree of inconsistency exists between the conduct of a proportion of the Custodial Staff and the intended TC approach of the unit.

The opinions of a Senior Corrections Officer (with over fourteen-years of professional experience in Waikeria Prison) were obtained in order to provide a direct insight from a custodial perspective and bring a sense of equipoise to the data collection process. The officer's opinions are deemed especially relevant given the particular essence of the comments received thus far concerning the alleged incongruity between the approaches of custodial and facilitation staff.

During a discussion of the participants' perceptions of the role of custodial staff, the officer maintained that security, control and the safe, humane containment of prisoners are the chief concerns for custodial personnel. He stated "… *that's number one for a corrections officer, or should be …*" At the same time, the officer recognised that correctional staff do have an important role to play in the modelling of appropriate behaviour; moreover, that this is especially important for the Karaka Unit as the custodial officers have the opportunity to actively promote the behaviours illustrated throughout the STU-RP:

> *They* (facilitators) *may be um touching on a topic of say, respect of property and people, and; therefore, I guess want the corrections officers to be showing that same sort of respect for people and property.* (Custodial Officer)

Given the extensive emphasis placed upon the TC approach by the Karaka Unit I considered it appropriate to question the officer on his perception of its implementation. The officer suggested that the newer staff respond better to it than the more experienced staff. He explained how "the system" has changed significantly in the last five-years to become "a lot more PC (politically correct)". He observed that there are now a lot more opportunities for those prisoners who believe they have been disrespected to make a formal complaint, giving as an

example the establishment of an ombudsman system to whom the prisoners can now take their grievance. The officer cited this as the trigger for a more open, informed style of prisoner management:

> *... that wasn't really a problem initially, in the earlier days, it was like "Do as I say and I'm not telling you the reason why, you just do it" basically. Now it's more like explaining, as in "No, because, and you have go to understand that's the reason for no"* (Custodial Officer)

When asked to comment on the TC approach, the officer identified how it represents the unit (facilitators, custodial staff and prisoners) working as one to achieve a desired outcome:

> *The safe humane containment of the prisoners and that everyone's, you know, as happy as they can be in an environment they don't want to be in really ... everyone's here together to try and make a change for themselves, to better their lives when they are released back into society.* (Custodial Officer).

As a consequence of the TC emphasis the custodial officer considered his role in the Karaka Unit to be markedly different from the manner in which it is defined in other units. He maintained that the unification of prisoners, facilitation and custodial staff through a shared objective – the development of personal growth in persons preparing to re-join society has enabled those individuals who are *genuinely* concerned with making a sustained change, to do so without fear of losing face *mana* in front of their peers or other gang related influences.

With a striking similarity to the comments of the offender interviewees, the custodial officer identified how the prisoners are likely to experience therapeutic benefits from listening to the experiences and reflections of their peers and as a result, communicate with greater transparency and more honesty.

Whilst the views, opinions and insights of this particular officer are notably positive and would suggest that he has a thorough understanding of the principles of the TC this officer's reflections are inconsistent with a number of the views of the participant interviewees. A particular point of concern can be evidenced in the officer's observation that the more experienced staff experience difficulties in adapting to the protocols of the 'PC' approach of the TC, and, consequently, struggle to model the types of behaviours required of it. This may prove particularly problematic as the newer staff members are likely to look to their more experienced colleagues as role models, and to approach them for advice and suggestions as to optimal working practices.

The environment created in the Karaka STU is the product of a number of discreet variables at both a micro and macro level. Examples of micro level factors

observed during visits to the unit include: the positive, affirming attitudes of the psychological staff (and in my experience many custodial officers), the manner in which the psychological staff consistently address the participants (by first names and with a respectful validating emphasis in the tone and content of their speech) and their unrelenting beliefs in the ability of their participants to effect lasting change in their lives; on a macro level - the community of change meeting; as described earlier.

The position adopted by those members of the custodial staff less-willing to adhere to the principles and procedures of the TC is problematic, as it serves to dilute the overall impact of the TC effect. As a consequence, the Karaka Unit appears more closely aligned with the hierarchical, TC approach (please refer to Chapter Two) and, as such, is prevented from achieving its full potential and attaining its envisaged position as a TC proper.

3.3   Unit Safety

This section considers the inmates perceptions of personal safety in the Karaka Unit. I will discuss the importance of unit regulations and the various interpersonal factors which the participants considered to be relevant to this matter.

Research (Ireland, 2000; and Allison & Ireland, 2010) has explored occurrences of bullying and intimidation between prisoners. Whilst acknowledging that the literature in this area is still developing, Allison and Ireland propose that a number of factors enable intimidatory behaviours in custodial environments. Most directly relevant to this section of the research is the proposition that hierarchical, authoritarian prison environments can lead to a greater prevalence of prisoner aggression. Allison & Ireland cite Shepard and Lavendar's (1999) position that factors such as staff/inmate conflict and the denial of privileges are may lead to aggression between inmates. Allison and Ireland incorporate Berkowitz's (1993) frustration-aggression hypothesis to account for this. Accordingly, inmates direct the frustration they feel for the system onto one another (Berkowitz, 1999, as cited in Allison & Ireland, *ibid*, p.50).

Allison and Ireland (2010) offer further insight into the relationship between strict prison rules and incidences of inmate aggression through the works of Gilbert (1994). In accordance with the views of Gilbert, Allison and Ireland propose that bio-psychosocial theories of aggression may account for the correlation between authoritarian prison administration and aggressive behaviours. Gilbert's theory maintains that authoritarian leadership influence the surrounding culture, facilitating punitive, aggressive conduct between prisoners. Moreover, the use of hierarchical 'shame based' containment may result in prisoners experiencing feelings of rage (Gilbert, as cited in Allison & Ireland, *ibid*, p.50).

Ireland (2002, as cited in Allison & Ireland, 2010, p.50) affirms that a penal culture deemed to be dependent upon security; rules and regulations can influence the prisoners' subculture, making the prisoners more likely to react aggressively against it.

In addition to the difficulties the offenders cited in their dealings with certain custodial staff members, they described how the day-to-day regulations of the Karaka Unit were of a more stringent degree than they had previously experienced in other units. The ramifications of this appeared to be both positive and negative.

When discussing his thoughts regarding the unit regulations Jerry reported:

> *Oh, nah like at first I thought it was quite stupid, like the little rules they have around here ... just abide by the rules I guess, Yeah, 'cause it a lot different to other jails, yeah other jails are probably more relaxed ... yeah, just the little things ... um, having a piece of wire. I got charged for having a piece of wire for an aerial for my um, radio. And for putting my foot on um a doorstep. Yeah* (Jerry)

Relating these circumstances to his previous unit, Jerry stated:

> *Oh, they don't have a rule that you are not allowed in anyone's cell ... You know, I didn't get any misconducts or anything, and I come here and I'm getting done for the little things like that; yeah, so I thought it was stupid* (Jerry)

Jerry observed that as a result of his indiscretions he received a misconduct report and lost certain privileges. He was locked up an hour earlier for approximately ten-days and had his television removed from his cell.

Having apparently taken the time to reflect, Jerry appeared philosophical, acknowledging that the strict unit rules, whilst containing his freedoms, are actually a positive aspect of the Karaka STU. Jerry identified how they have helped him learn to respect authority, and that he believes these lessons will serve him well post-release. Compared with Jerry's adjustment difficulties and formal charges, Al seemed to have made a relatively smooth adjustment into the Karaka Unit. Having initially received a number of reprimands for a failure to comply with the daily shaving requirement, and, at the time, having projected some resentment towards the unit at this, Al appears to have re-considered his earlier opinion. Making no attempt to justify his misconduct, Al openly acknowledged his anger was misplaced and that he had a responsibility to live in accordance with the unit regulations. It became apparent that Al had invested some time processing this, as he described that by failing to comply with unit regulations he was "*... giving them* (custodial staff) *the opportunity to do it to me ...*"

Consequently, Al made the conscious decision to abide by the daily shaving regulation "

> *... so I've just sort of um step up, shave everyday; don't give them the chance to do that to me, yeah.*" (Al)

Jay felt that the rules of the Karaka Unit were stricter than those of his previous units. He explained how he was able to adjust through his internal dialogue:

> *... I had to adjust to their way of running, their way of living, their way of organising from my benefit with regards to rehabilitation so I I I made instant, it wasn't quite instant but I still had my niggles "Oh this not thing" but I took step back and "hang on, not here because you are only getting one blanket, not here because you haven't got a T-shirt, here because this." Then I will use I will compare compare to ah knowing my kids are at home might not even have a blanket so I start comparing and then I usually back out of that scenario and just be happy to do what you got to do thinking about the bigger picture, my goals, the goals.* (Jay)

It is interesting to note that all of the offender interviewees reported feeling safe in the Karaka Unit. Whilst this dynamic is likely to be attributable to a number of interpersonal, environmental factors the inconsistencies in the interpersonal styles of the Psychological Services and custodial staff do not appear to have impacted significantly upon safety issues in the Karaka Unit.

Despite the stringent regulations of the Karaka Unit, allegations of the combative attitudes of certain custodial officers and the correlation observed between these factors and inmate aggression in the wider literature (Allison & Ireland, 2010), the offender interviewees commented positively on safety in the Karaka Unit.

Jerry explained how physical altercations were commonplace in his previous unit and drugs were a lot more freely available than they are in the Karaka STU. Furthermore, Jerry noted that whilst some of the Karaka inmates had discussed gang membership in his presence he had not been directly coerced into joining. Jerry attributes the calm, largely peaceable atmosphere in the Karaka STU to the fact that the majority of the inmates consider themselves privileged to be attending the STU-RP and keep fresh in their minds the point that they are completing it for a greater purpose (increasing the possibility of early release). Jerry maintained that his peers are all aware how a charge for serious misconduct would result in exclusion from the programme:

> *Um, yeah, pretty much, um in other units you can have a fight but you won't get kicked out. Whereas you know here, people are thinking that um they are here to do the course and maybe you know that's their ticket out*

of here sort of thing. So if they mess that up you know they are likely to do most of the um sentence. (Jerry)

In accordance with Jerry's views, Al reported that he had never experienced serious conflict in the Karaka STU, had never been the victim of intimidatory actions, nor felt in any way pressured to join a gang of any description. For Al, the atmosphere in the unit was far from bellicose, being, instead, underscored by a fervent sense of group camaraderie. He recalled how, on the rare occasions an argument may have begun to develop, the respective classmates of the conflicting parties would defuse the tension with a supportive word or prompt:

> *Oh yeah I've felt real safe real safe yeah ... I haven't seen any of that* (intimidation or stand-over tactics) *in here well respected by everyone. I think a lot of the guys look out for each other too they see if they see someone in classmate having an argument with someone they go "Bro, come on Bro let's go let's go over here we'll go we'll go away from this situation. Don't worry about him, over here for yourself man." So, um a lot of that is to do with the camaraderie.* (Al)

Al corroborated Jerry's earlier observations concerning the privileged, status of the STU-RP participants and the higher purpose of their shared goals:

> *... also everyone's here for the same reason, all here to do the course. We're not here to fight, to do drugs all those sorts of things you know, yeah.* (Al)

Al noted that, on the occasion where a new participant entered the Karaka Unit with a combative attitude they discover, very quickly, their dysfunctional thinking or disruptive behaviours serve to marginalise them from the rest of the group; as a corollary, they address them swiftly. Al explained how his pre-course concerns regarding the presence of a highly militant chapter of the Mongrel Mob operating in Waikeria Prison did not apply to the Karaka STU, even if they did hold true for other units.

Jay's comments regarding safety concurred with both Jerry's and Al's: however, he adopted a more individualistic view point to account for them. Jay explained how it is not uncommon for him to be 'pre-judged' by other offenders who, after learning about the nature of his index offending (Murder), are generally uncomfortable in his presence. Whilst he contends that he does not deliberately present in an intimidatory manner, nor revel in the adverse undertones which are often associated with a crime of the nature he committed, it is not until an independent third party acts as a go-between and introduces him to other inmates that they begin to accept him:

I think, because of my crime, a lot of people stand away from me. It's not, I don't project that it's just that people um judge me with regards to my crime and that's totally the opposite and it's not until they really get to know me then they come up and goes "Oh we thought you" which is quite normal now, I'm getting quite used to it after all these years now. Oh you know and then then ah um then they go away, and then they come back and the other fellas come up and you know they like you know "Na, Jay's cool" ... (Jay)

In my view a clearly defined code of conduct within the unit is critical to the effectiveness of treatment programmes. It not only ensures the safe, secure running of the Unit but also the cohesiveness of the treatment group. Moreover, it ensures that high standards are maintained by the inmates, an important part of their rehabilitation and their preparation for re-adjustment into the community. The pro-active, zealous enforcement of unit regulations appears to have been highly successful in achieving these objectives. Nevertheless, the divergent approaches of the facilitation staff and Custodial Officers in the Karaka Unit appear to have created a feeling of confusion on the part of the participants. These dynamics are evident in those comments made by the participants who described the warmth and positive regard they consistently experienced in the company of the facilitators. These can be juxtaposed against the austere attitudes of certain custodial officers who appear to have demonstrated restricted inter-personal dexterity and limited empathy towards the participants and their peers: a company of prisoners detained within a unit designed to be overtly therapeutic in its approach.

Theme Four: Applying the Learning – Life after the STU-RP

As we have already discussed, one of the most prominent findings of this research has been the strength of the relationship established between the facilitation staff and the individual participants. Nevertheless, in order to attain a more devout appreciation of the STU-RP it is necessary to explore the offenders' comments regarding the real-world validity of its structural content. This will be approached by examining the offenders' opinions of its applicability to *in vivo* situations.

Jerry described, in detail, how he found the principles and skills taught on the STU-RP to be of particular relevance. He believed that the course had empowered him with insight into the relationship between the nature of his thoughts and his corresponding behaviours and how the combination had led him to offend "*Um, oh just like knowing my old ways and that and um knowing how to challenge it* (thinking and behaviour) *now.*"

Jerry expressed an awareness of his offence triggers and offered further detail into the symbiotic relationship between his thoughts and behaviours, explaining how:

Um pretty much the thought (serves as the initial offence trigger) *'cause a lot of my crimes was to do with um dishonesty and ah, the Poker machines and that. Um, yeah, I reckon I was a lot of it was the entitlement, yeah, you know, I felt that I was entitled to 'cause, I'd been um um a Gambler and um I'd lost so much money to the machines; thought I was entitled to the money back and um' yeah.* (Jerry)

After taking a few moments, Jerry explained that as a result of his participation in the STU-RP he is now able to ... *challenge those thoughts*:

Um, just tell um myself that I'm better off without gambling. Um, just be happy with the money that I've got. Um, yeah, just thinking of, you know when things do happen um um; when I'm around um like even in the streets and that seeing the flashing lights and you know, that's like a trigger for me. Yeah. Just, um telling myself "Nah, I've been down that, I've been down that road before." (Jerry)

Jerry acknowledged that it was necessary for him to find alternative ways to amuse himself, without succumbing to the thrill of gambling:

Yeah, other ways to entertain myself and that, to fill that rush that I was chasing ... Oh, just tell myself "Nah, there's other ways of being happy;" yeah, just being with my family and walking down the beach and going to the gym or something – to get that same adrenalin rush. (Jerry)

The cognitive-behavioural modifications to which Jerry is referring here are consistent with the D and E components (or latter stages) of Ellis' (1991) ABCDE model of cognitive therapy. Accordingly, Jerry has *D*isputed what he has identified to be an irrational belief system (the justification to rob Poker machines, which stemmed from a more intrinsic sense of entitlement through financial loss); and has constructed an *E*ffective new philosophical approach - an adaptive, pro-social coping strategy for achieving a sense of personal gratification (taking his family to the beach or going to the gym).

Al maintained that it would be relatively easy to apply the knowledge he has acquired on the STU-RP. He emphasised the importance of the identification of problematic thinking patterns and harmful core beliefs, and insisted that the amount of time which is devoted to the rehearsal of communication skills (role plays and group discussions) in therapy sessions serves to reinforce the learning and solidify it in his mind. According to Al:

...um we practice it here so much I think I think it will come naturally and um myself I'm gunna try to avoid those situations in the first place. Yeah, over time it has sort of become part of my thinking, my my my thinking patterns pretty much, yeah, core beliefs, yeah core beliefs, and just the

> *way the way I process things is a lot more um, I put all the models into them ah all the models we've learnt. If there's a problem I'll go right, that model, we'll use that model and sort of run through it in my head, yeah.* (Al)

This use of group work to practice new skills is analogous with the recommendations of Ellis (1992). However, Ellis suggests that group-based cognitive-behavioural activities are only to be commenced once the participants have a thorough awareness of the basic principles (A – *A*ctivating event, B – *B*elief system and C – *C*onsequences of what has occurred - Ellis, 1991) of cognitive interventions. According to Prochaska & Norcross (2007) group-based therapy is a useful component of the overall cognitive-behavioural intervention as it affords the clients the opportunity to rehearse and refine the rational insights they are learning to apply. Moreover, the group environment itself serves as a scaled-down representation of the types of atmospheres (challenging, persuasive, rewarding etc) that the participants are likely to encounter in real-life circumstances.

Al provided a very thoughtful insight into the basic tenets of sustained abstinence from criminal behaviour, or, as it has been described by Serin & Lloyd (2009), the transition into an offence-free lifestyle. He expressed a carefully considered, pragmatic view of the potential pitfalls that await the desisting offender. Observing that an offence-free lifestyle cannot be sustained without contemplating a variety of challenging contextual variables, Al described how his future lifestyle will be governed by the fluctuations in his state of mind, which are, in turn, manipulated by numerous external influences.

> *Um, difficult at times: easy at times. Contextual, yeah contextual, depends on the situation, um depends on my frame of mind at the time, you know, depends on the influences around me at the time…* (Al)

Recognising the uncertainty inherent in real-world exposure and the potentially caustic nature of certain external influences, Al noted that the facilitators are good at "*keeping it real.*" By this he meant taking theoretical knowledge and presenting it in a manner that is easily applicable to real-life situations. Al feels so well-versed in his relapse prevention skills that they have become second-nature:

> *… it becomes natural; a instinct to use to use it. It just happens, yeah … That's the thing, you got to make it behaviour within yourself; you got to make it part of you. Whereas, if you just um um not making it a habit for yourself you are going to lose it in time.* (Al)

Al insisted that he has secured this attitudinal change, stating

Oh yeah, yeah. I do think the whole thinking's changed, yeah

In what may seem like a paradox, Jay, the programme participant exited from the STU-RP, described in considerable detail the faith he held in his ability to apply the skills he had acquired.

Jay portrayed himself as a man who was facing considerable emotional conflict when first arrived at the Karaka Unit. That is, tormented by feelings of guilt, Jay coped partly by adopting a tough guy persona:

> *I went back in myself that's when I went in for safety reasons and um emotional reasons; I went to my cell you know. I would walk around during the day out on the wing like you have to put up a bit of a ah mask, with the other serious offenders living in the same environment, for survival, survival you know you have to walk around, but when you go back in your cell, that's another world – you're isolated. You can have your own thinking, you know, and with that it sort of took me closer to my spiritual side, because even from, then onwards "I know this can't be right."* (Jay)

Having become more familiar with the *status quo* of the unit it seems that Jay began to settle in and experience the therapeutic effects of the STU-RP teachings:

> *I feel more um inclined now to to to lend an ear, to listen with regards to directions and taking instructions and where I was quite um, quite selfish as before and pride "Yeah, nah, I'm the man, I don't need your fellas help" now I'm more open minded to help and directions and instructions, um being um more mindful now being more mindful I have had to find myself, to be mindful of myself with regards to feelings, my emotions, my talking how how they lead to aggressive behaviours and all that; my problem thinking and distorted thoughts, I am aware of those as well. I am aware of my SIDs* (Seemingly Innocent Decisions) *because I have had a problem with pride and egotistic and self-centredness and that. My problem thinking was expectations of others and of myself that wasn't, wasn't me it came "I am law, I'm entitled to" you know all um made it what it was. I realised that consumption of alcohol and other stimulants really distorted my um thought patterns which really enhanced my problem thinking, which went into SIDs and that catastrophising, then the paranoia was all in amongst it, which led me to um "I am law, beat or be beaten and I have the right" – righteous anger ... I find it quite disgusting, sickening and how pathetic and weak I really was, you know, from finding myself and looking back ...* (Jay)

Jay went on to describe how, in the seclusion of his cell, he would reflect upon the days events and review the learning activities by reading through his work books

and applying the knowledge to historical life events in order to analyse, question and then re-configure the logic he applied in those given situations. Jay reported a sense of fulfilment having completed those exercises which allowed him to re-visit his previous, impulsive, angry, criminally-orientated mindset. He explained that having completed these exercises he is better able to recognise the bodily sensations, thoughts and feelings that accompanied this harmful mindset and experience the *rewards* associated with managing it in a more effective manner.

Shortly after our initial interview, Jay was charged with having a cellular telephone in his possession. He was immediately removed from the STU-RP and from the Karaka Unit to a unit with a higher-security rating. In a second interview, he described his reaction:

> *… I could see myself, you know, coming out of my body and not going back and and um it was quite hard, it was quite hard it was quite hard 'cause I was only twelve-days from graduation which was quite you know that's really what made me angry then um visions of Marie* (Facilitator) *coming in um my kids and thing and that's when it elevated itself, elevated my temperature, started getting thing and um started getting quite um thing with myself, um angry at myself …* (Jay)

Jay told me how he would have reacted to this situation before being on the STU-RP:

> *I would have taken them in the old times. I would a done a lot a damage to the cell … I would most probably have smashed my TV through the window, smashed the radio, um I would have got into a situation where I would cover myself in um um something slippery, like butter, and wait for the CNR* (restraint procedures) *I would have waited for and I would have taken my aggression out that way; then gone to the pound* (solitary confinement) *and donged my head on the ground again gone "Ah that didn't work."* (Jay)

Instead, he appeared to have demonstrated a notable degree of personal insight by adopting more positive coping strategies:

> *… breathing techniques came in, the breathing, the um feelings, I identified them. I saw my emotions going up and down in waves, I saw tunnel vision and I saw that tunnel vision, ah that the old sweaty palms, the just clenching fists and all that um … what the school said I've attained and has given me has actually helped me … breathing, counting to ten "Oh na, they work!" … I could see that you know, I could see that "Oh, hang, hang on, hang on, start breathing, counting to ten relax" um um like um there's these the um my curtain was open so I used the vision technique; ah look at something, focus on it, then try to hear it and listen*

97

to turn everything off and listen to the birds. I had a tennis ball, tennis ball (simulated squeezing the tennis ball) *and that um and um I had a pack of lollies, a pack of lollies in there so started eating a lolly slowly, tasting it, that's when I realised "yeah, oh na, hang on you can't, you can't go back there Jay, what's the point of? You know yourself now Jay, you will make it even worse" … if I hadn't attained those skills or didn't have knowledge of any other techniques to deal with it it would have been totally different.* (Jay)

With the benefit of his 'mindful' insights, Jay reflected on the possible psychological cues that essentially gave him permission to violate the Prison's Code of Conduct and procure a cell phone. At the start of the day in question Jay reported receiving positive news from his psychologist in relation to his pending Parole Report. Experiencing a pronounced sense of elation Jay recalled being overcome by feelings of excitement which led him to a desire to contact his partner and children and share his good news.

Jay readily acknowledged that his inability to manage correctly feelings of elation led him to violate the Prison regulations. Jay recalled how, during treatment, his group spent considerable time discussing various emotional states (sadness, vulnerability, anger, fear and happiness) and how each can influence the likelihood of an offence-related relapse. Jay described how he would relate the group discussions and theoretical knowledge to his own personal experiences and historical life events. Having paired his past offences with thoughts of anger, and linked these angry thoughts to negative emotional states (sadness, vulnerability, anger and fear), Jay deliberately elected to overlook the possible link between positive emotions (e.g. happiness, excitement and elation) and offending, choosing instead to focus upon those of a more negative persuasion:

… happy, and all these other words that related towards being happy; well, I sort of looked at: I didn't think happy could ever get you into Jail, make you reoffend again. So I said "Oh well, lets work on these, feeling sad 'cause I know that feeling sad will get me angry, I know being scared get me angry – I didn't realise scared cause I go oh I never get scared, I never get scared …" I thought happy; na, if I'm happy: I'm always happy. I'm not going to get in trouble being happy, so I turned a blind eye on it and concentrated on these other ones – look what happened. It goes "Hey, look. You forgot me, kicked me in the arse." (Jay)

Despite his expulsion from the STU-RP, Jay appeared adamant that he is firmly committed to establishing an offence-free lifestyle. Jay insisted that in addition to the cognitive-behavioural, mindful insights gleaned from the STU-RP his age is also playing a part. Now approaching 40, Jay acknowledged having a variety of responsibilities and commitments, in particular the welfare of his children. He

98

told me that once he is released from prison he intends to return home and impart his new-found knowledge upon his children, and, in time, his grandchildren. Jay described how his responsibilities to his children serve as a strong motivational factor for him. Making use of highly emotive visual imagery to convey his point, Jay portrayed an image of himself standing at his Grandfather's grave, flanked by his children, gazing out to sea. He explained that this image is ingrained in his mind and serves as a potent reminder of the need to comply with his sentence and return to his family with the benefit of broadened insights in order to 'break the chain of violence, bad attitudes, bad habits and bad conduct' that have marred their wellbeing

Jay's comments are consistent with the findings of Sampson & Laub (2003) who conducted an extensive longitudinal analysis of the offending patterns of 500 individuals from the age of 7 up to 70 (taking into consideration individual mortality variables). Sampson & Laub concluded that all offences declined by middle age for all groups of offenders, even when factors such as death and incarceration are accounted for. Moreover, parallels can also be between Jay's comments regarding intra-familial discord and the findings of numerous criminological studies into familial criminality and general discord including the Cambridge Study (Farrington, Lambert & West, 1998) and the work of Palmer & Hollin (2000). The authors concluded that a complex relationship exists between environmental factors and socio-cognitive processes, both of which play an important part in the evolution of delinquency and hostility.

Jay observed that in addition to his desire to address his offence-related cognition for the sake of his family, he experiences a profound sense of guilt for his actions towards his victim. Jay stated that he owes a debt of responsibility for the life that he has taken. Jay reported that by learning about his mindset and by working to address his dysfunctional behaviour he is ensuring his victim is not forgotten and that his life was not wasted. Jay confirmed that whenever he finds his mind wandering off task he thinks about either his victim or his family and regains his focus.

Jay's expressions of personal guilt about his family were echoed in comments made by Al. Al explained how facing up to the honesties inherent in mindful contemplation invoked feelings of selfishness and guilt for the impact of his actions upon his family. Al described, at length, the negative effects of his offending, explaining how it impacted upon his siblings as they have been forced to miss out on contact with him. Al explained that he believes this has been especially difficult for his Brother, who "... *has started to go off the rails 'cause he doesn't have much guidance ..*". Al confirmed that whilst he acknowledges that he is powerless to change his past conduct he will learn from it in order to "... *stop it from happening again ...*"

Theme Five: The Importance of Bi-cultural Therapy

As discussed in Chapter Two the STU-RP employs a multi-dimensional model in the implementation of treatment. The underlying principles are essentially western: the RNR Model (Andrews & Bonta, 2006), CBT (Beck, 1967 and Ellis, 1973), DBT (Linehan, 1991) and the Therapeutic Communities paradigm (Clark, 1999). However, the STU-RP also draws on Maori models of wellbeing, in particular, the Te Whare Tapa Wha model (Durie, 1994). Whilst a pronounced Maori influence underpins the milieu of the Karaka Unit the participants are offered the opportunity to engage in a therapeutic intervention deliberately designed to explore those areas of their cultural identity which may impact upon their ability to further their desistance from crime and may not be directly addressed through western approaches. This aspect of treatment is referred to as the BTM (please refer to Chapter Two). All of the participant interviewees engaged (at varying degrees) with the BTM and offered exceptionally positive feedback on their experiences.

Both Jerry and Jay transferred to the Karaka Unit from specialist Maori Focus Units and; therefore, brought with them a considerable wealth of knowledge and experience of Maori principles and protocols. Nevertheless, both men acknowledged how the BTM represented an opportunity for them to consolidate their current knowledge and broaden their insights, particularly in relation to those practices exclusive to the people of Tai Nui lineage.

Jerry observed:

> *I thought it* (BTM) *was quite good … yep, um oh 'cause it's I come from a Maori Focus Unit before I come to this unit. So it just sort of enhanced what I already knew. You know, it extended my vocabulary and in the Maori language and yeah, yeah, I learn more about the area that I am in. Yeah* (Jerry)

Whilst echoing these sentiments, Jay also emphasised the therapeutic catharsis he experienced through his rapport with the facilitator:

> *… it* (BTM) *brought back memories … whereas, I was down Taranaki they had Taranaki protocols; here they are Tai Nui protocols, different, yeah lot different so it was "Oh yeah, choice" you know, some more um um skills and knowledge … It was good to ah um, with Matua, it was quite, it was quite, I enjoyed his company, and he enjoyed my company. It was um um 'cause I love my language you know and there's nobody else I can talk to it in there … I could come in and it would sort of take me back into that therapeutic surroundings again, and then I'll forget I'm actually incarcerated sometimes, until I walk along by the gate "Oh hey" 'til I see the green uniforms and it reminds me …* (Jay)

Jerry's comments would suggest that, the BTM enabled him to integrate his knowledge of Maori culture with a reduction in his likelihood of reoffending by creating an awareness of the symbiotic relationship between respecting oneself and developing respect for others. Interestingly, Jerry extended this logic to incorporate both potential victims and co-offenders:

> *Um, it sort of give me a sense of um, um, you know respect for myself and um, yeah just try and respect others. If you respect yourself you tend to respect others as well. When it comes to, just yeah, um you know if I am going to offend with someone I not really respecting them other people and that.* (Jerry)

In conjunction with the importance of self-respect, Jerry emphasised the need to remain acutely aware of self-monitoring. This formulated one of the most prominent learning opportunities for Jerry who observed that self-monitoring can be applied on a number of levels and affects all areas of his existence:

> *...there was Te Taha Hinengaro - just looking at the way we think and that ... on the first module we had um, they introduced Te Whare Tapa Wha, that was like our um oh, four cornerstones. Yeah, it's like our um our thoughts, our spiritual wellbeing, our physical, respecting our physical self and um and just keeping them all in balance, 'cause you know when sort of um yeah one's out of balance it sort of affects the person, yeah.* (Jerry)

Jerry stated that he relates his thoughts, feelings and actions the Te Whare Tapa Wha model on a consistent basis and that he intends to do so upon release. Jerry described how feeling a discrepancy in one aspect of life (e.g. the spiritual) will impact upon other aspects (e.g. the physical or psychological). Accordingly, Te Whare Tapa Wha formulates a fundamental part of Jerry's long-term relapse prevention, self-monitoring strategy. Jerry suggested that if any aspects of his life are inconsistent with this model *...I'll know something's not right, yeah, yeah.*

Similarities can be observed in the participants' experiences of the BTM and the treatment sessions which employed more mainstream approaches. Whilst both men appeared to enjoy the BTM they emphasised the relative value of different aspects of treatment. As we have discussed, Jerry favoured the importance of the structural content, whereas, Jay chose to accentuate the strength of the relationship he built with the facilitator and the support and pro-social modelling this offered him.

When discussing his relationship with the BTM facilitator, Jay explained:

> *I found him um quite available person ... I enjoyed his company, enjoyed his his character, good character and the thing about that I liked about*

him, he was kind. You know, it's like I don't know what I don't know, what makes me attracted to that kind of thing but he was "Don't do that ok, you just make sure you're strong" … it makes me want to learn, yeah yeah, almost like (a Fatherly role) *yeah, whereas the custodial wing, custodials were all and that was it – laws. Come across as quite passionate, quite passionate with the Fatherly role, the Matua role. He was quite um; I loved him, loved him.* (Jay)

In comparison to those of Jerry and Jay, Al's engagement with the BTM was notably short-lived. Al explained how the scheduling of the BTM intervention clashed with his recreation time and that he chose to go to the gym rather than attend the BTM sessions:

I um started it (BTM) *at the beginning when I first got here, but I stopped about six-weeks into it … the afternoon's sort of the only time you can get to go to the gym. So um I just used that the same time as the BTM and I'd just rather rather keep fit; thing of priorities, some people prefer to learn Tikanga Maori, but um it's a personal thing.* (Al)

To the external eye it seems unfortunate that Al found himself in a position whereby he felt he must choose between physical fitness and the psycho-physiological wellbeing that others discovered in the BTM - something which for them formulated a crucial part of their overall therapeutic experience.

Theme Six: Stigmatisation

The final theme to be discussed is that of stigmatisation. The particular focus of this theme concerns the degree to which the participant interviewees considered the label 'high-risk offender' to have stigmatised them.

As discussed in Chapter Three, Tannenbaum's (1938) sociological writings on the role of the consensus view in determining societal estrangement, and Lemert's (1972) Secondary Deviance may account for some of the possible sociological features underlying criminality. Nevertheless, this approach has been largely discounted in recent years with many criminological theorists identifying the need for greater exploration of more situational elements (Wellsford, 1975) and the diversity and complexities of human interaction (Andrews & Bonta, 1998).

In accordance with the suggestions of Wellsford (1975) and Andrews & Bonta (1998) both situational elements and the complexities of human interaction will be considered in the respect of the Karaka Unit's participant interviewees. Consistent with the views of Tannenbaum (1938) and Lemert (1972), these variables will be examined relative to the notion of deviance promoted through the socially-determined context in which they were contrived. In addition to its value in promoting the social constructionist emphasis of this research, this

approach is considered necessary for two distinct reasons. Firstly, one of the key themes to arise from this study concerns the disparity between the institutionally-ordained 'High-risk Offender' labels attached to the participants (accompanied by the implication of deviance this promotes) and the way they view themselves. Secondly, a thorough understanding of the impact of socially-determined labels upon the individual (in particular the individual who is subject to governmentally-decreed, publically-endorsed confinement) cannot be reached simply by conducting analysis *reductio ad personam* (Lemert, 1972). According to Lemert, the constricted aspect of such an approach is flawed at the most fundamental levels as it fails to consider the relevance of '…macrocosmic, organisational forces of social control through which public and private agencies actively define and classify people, impose punishments, restrict or open access to rewards and satisfactions, set limits to social interaction, and induct deviants into special segregated environments' (Lemert, 1972, p.64). Therefore, the influence of the institutional setting upon the individuals is deemed to be of note.

Two of the three participant interviewees (Al and Jay) described, in detail, their views of the high-risk offender label.

Al observed how being referred to by the Department of Corrections staff as a high-risk offender has been disheartening. For him, the high-risk label appears to reflect a lack of trust on the part of the staff and lacks insight into the progress he is making:

> *Feels, um not trusted, disheartening. They* (Department of Corrections' staff) *don't know me, you know, I'm not like that anymore. It's like, if they knew what was going on inside my head I wouldn't I wouldn't be on the list. Yeah, it's like ah like I know myself, I don't see myself ever offending again, like um that's how strong a resolve I've got within me. Yeah, yeah, yeah it's like um if I get to say when I get out I've got a 83% chance of reoffending "Na na na; where did you get that from?' That that was my past years, I'm here I've changed. So where do I get recognition for that?* (Al)

Al maintained that the interaction between his aggregated risk rating and perceived lack of tangible recognition for his accomplishments is a very complex one, and can only be understood on a macro level:

> *Ah the system, the system, you know, we get a certificate but that's it, my my my um chance of reoffending isn't going to change, it won't go down.* (Al)

In accordance with his cynical view of the Departmental risk assessment tool, Al indicated that he does not give a great deal of credence to his finite risk rating or the potential for ideological stigmatisation which accompanies it:

> *Yeah, 'cause I've got the chance to get out there and go "I'm not coming back, I'll not see you again. (Al)*

For Al, it is his intra-psychic position, not the external Departmental labels or ratings, which hold the most significant value and are likely to determine his future:

> *... I know it's* (idiographic risk rating) *part of the system. I know it's not the truth: I know the truth ...* (Al)

Jay's view of institutional stigmatisation appears harmonious with Al's. Jay made it very clear that his internal, self-directed opinions are of greater consequence to him than the high-risk label attached to him by external sources:

> *I don't really take heed of their* (Department of Corrections') *view. I know what I've achieved you know, I I I know that the difference from what I used to be where I am now, and that's what I look at ... It's about you, whether you are a high-risk situation or not; it's how do you feel, and I feel that I know more about myself now ... if somebody else comes along and says those sort of says those question "Oh, you're still a high-risk situation' and well, yeah, you know, and I'm not going to deny that um I for my crime course I will be; for the rest of my life I'm a high-risk situation, but I've got coping skills ...* (Jay)

From this statement, one may conclude that Jay values the content of his own mind over the labels attached from the outside in determining his lifestyle choices.

The disclosures made by Jay and Al provide evidence to suggest the impact of social labels are consistent with Tannenbaum's (1938) and Lemert's (1972) caveat around ideological allusions to personal deviance. However, these findings are inconsistent with Lemert's notion of secondary deviance. Rather than giving credence to their high-risk offender label and seeking out means to validate and affirm it, the participants perceive it as a conjectural millstone, an historic artefact and a symbolic reminder of the pre-intervention persona they used to represent.

It would appear that insights (from the intervention) lead the participants to make intra-psychic, inter-personal discoveries, re-assess their self-perspective and move beyond negative self-ideation associated with secondary deviance to formulate a more adaptive, informed self-evaluation. The patterns which have emerged from the comments made by the participant interviewees would suggest that they see themselves as rehabilitated men: men whose histories may be scarred by chaos and turbulence, but whose futures, as yet, un-written will be determined by the consistency of their actions, and the integrity of their self-reflections (factors not markedly dissimilar to that of any *other*, mainstream individual). What seems to set these men apart from the mainstream, however, is the degree of disorientation

and anguish in their pasts, the crimes that they have committed, the nature of their collective therapeutic experiences, and their abiding faith in their abilities to make good on their intentions of returning to society as enlightened, rehabilitated men intent on sustaining an offence-free future. Consequently, one is left in an ideological quandary between the need to manage issues of logistical organisation and the potentially disempowering messages inherent in the term 'High-risk Offenders' for those persons approaching the successful completion of the STU-RP.

Chapter Five - Conclusion

The primary objective of this research was to identify themes and patterns in the experiences of male offenders (assessed as high-risk by the Department of Corrections risk assessment measure, the RoC*RoI) who were either completing, or had completed an intensive residential rehabilitative treatment programme in the Karaka Unit, Waikeria Prison. This objective has been accomplished with a number of relevant themes having been identified. A total of three offender interviewees were recruited. In addition, the views of three members of staff (two Programme Facilitators and one Senior Corrections Officer) were also included.

A qualitative research methodology incorporating the contextually-dependent focus of Postmodernism and the subjective relativism of Social Constructionism was chosen. This approach was deemed to be appropriate for a study of this nature as it allowed information to be obtained in a manner that values the subjective experiences of the individual participants above all other considerations. Moreover, it enabled the key points which arose during the data collection to be presented as a series of coherent themes. It is apparent that the themes identified by the offender interviewees are consistent with those discussed in the wider literature.

A review of the literature highlights an evolution in theories of offender management. It is apparent that more traditional, containment focused, punitive strategies are being replaced with a more progressive outlook, one that emphasises idiographic risk assessment and deliberately targeted interventions as part of a comprehensive rehabilitation package. An understanding of the numerous interpersonal factors which influence the likelihood of a person's rehabilitation is useful if we are to realise the potential of this constructive philosophy.

Central to an individual's rehabilitation is their pre-treatment motivation. The findings of this study highlight the complexities inherent in attempting to appreciate the motivation of high-risk offenders. It is apparent that factors which can be defined as intrinsic played a crucial part in determining treatment compliance for the STU-RP participants. Nevertheless, these factors did not operate in isolation and are affected by external motivational determinants, including the influence of third parties (custodial staff and family members) and pending Parole Board reports. Although the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is not always a clear one, it is evident that intrinsic acceptance of the principles of treatment, and recognition of their inherent benefits, are advantageous to the long-term maintenance of the intended behavioural change.

Having acknowledged that intervention programmes do not operate in isolation, this research also highlights the importance of establishing a positive working alliance between all persons associated with the therapeutic experience (offender participants, facilitation staff and custodial personnel). Variance in the interactions between these three parties was observed throughout this research. Whilst it was apparent that the facilitation staff and Psychologists regularly engaged with the programme participants in a constructive manner, this pattern was not consistent for all of the custodial personnel. These communicative discrepancies have the capacity to influence the treatment integrity of the unit by impacting upon the Edifice Complex (Torrey, 1972) and notions of the Circular Causality (Galvin & Brommel, 1996). The authoritarian attitudes of certain custodial personnel are likely to engender feelings of alienation in the individual participant. They may result in mutually disrespectful encounters between staff and offenders and as a consequence hamper the offender's faith in the programme to effect change in them.

When considered as a discreet phenomenon, it is interesting to note that certain authors (Ireland, 2000; and Allison & Ireland, 2010) suggests unit safety is impaired by authoritarian attitudes of correctional staff. This does not appear to apply in this research. All of the offender interviewees reported feeling safe throughout their time in the Karaka Unit, describing the Unit as generally peaceable. They do, however, largely attribute the cohesive atmosphere to the fact that entry into the Karaka Unit is a privilege, noting how their peers see acceptance into a rehabilitative intervention as a stepping stone to early release. In this circumstance unit safety appears more proximally related to the mindset of the individual participant than the influence of custodial personnel.

The Karaka Unit is actively seeking to establish a therapeutic environment by operating in accordance with the TC paradigm. It is apparent that when treatment is established in therapeutic conditions akin to the TC (Clark, 1999), the therapeutic engagement between staff and participants is developed markedly. In addition to its role in enhancing rapport building processes, the TC also served as a channel for participant empowerment. The TC approach to treatment was manifest in the interpersonal styles of the facilitation staff, Psychologists and certain custodial officers in the Karaka Unit: it was also evident in the Community of Change meetings. Conversely, those custodial officers who adopted an authoritarian demeanour triggered negative emotionality, disempowerment and a defensive demeanour in the participants. This negative ideation was further entrenched by the use of the term 'High-risk Offender.' Evidence from this study supports the view that a categorical definition of this nature and the antagonistic attitudes of certain unit staff impair the efficacy of the TC approach. They reinforce societal stigmatisation and serve to further estrange a group of individuals already marginalised from the general population.

Facilitation and custodial staff clearly hold positions of authority, yet the facilitators' demeanours did not detract from the TC emphasis of the unit. In contrast, the offenders interviewed perceive the custodial officers as embodying an overtly authoritarian role. It would be foolish and somewhat short-sighted to overlook the possibility of prisoners having an inherently negative, combative view of uniformed authority figures, and that this may have contributed to their polarised opinions of facilitation and custodial staff. However, the consistency and depth of the evidence that certain custodial personnel are acting out of sync with the TC approach cannot be overlooked. Moreover, true to the postmodern, social constructionist paradigms underpinning this thesis, the participants' reflections constitute the *truth* of their socially constructed, contextually determined reality and, as such, deserve to be acknowledged with the appropriate credence.

As the custodial staff play a prominent role in contributing to, or detracting from, the general rehabilitative atmosphere the disparity between the participant interviewee's perceptions of the custodial staff and the comments of the custodial staff member interviewee are of interest. Having shed some light upon what could represent a crucial aspect of treatment delivery; this study has invited the possibility of further research being conducted into the inter-personal discursive relations between offenders, custodial personnel and treatment staff.

The relevance of inter-group dynamics has received attention from the academic community (McMurran & McCulloch, 2007). Identification with a group of persons sharing a collective worldview was of importance to the offender interviewees in this study. It is noted that much of the learning that occurred in the treatment groups can be attributed to the interactions participants experienced with one another. From the evidence presented in this study it is clear that the group learning enabled the individual participants to identify the shortcomings in their individual processing. It would appear that the opportunity to learn from the stories and reflections of a likeminded peer group is of value to persons attempting prominent lifestyle changes.

The delivery of treatment in a manner that is sensitive to the needs of the individual is of paramount importance and has been discussed in the broader literature (Clarke *et al*, 2004; Department of Corrections, 2008 and McMurran & McCulloch, 2007). This study has shed further light on this area by highlighting the value of the BTM. All of the offender participants had engaged with it to varying degrees and all reported positively on their experiences. The consistently positive nature of the feedback for the BTM would suggest that it holds enormous value for the STU-RP participants. That being the case, it is unfortunate that alternative timetabling arrangements could not have been made to enable Al to experience the benefits of completing the BTM in addition to those associated with physical fitness. It is somewhat disconcerting to observe how a

rehabilitation programme participant found himself in a position where he had to sacrifice the holistic benefits of physical, spiritual, psychological and familial wellbeing (Durie, 1994) associated with the BTM, for the opportunity to engage in physical recreation. Future criminogenic interventions may wish to consider the timetabling of their activities so that their participants may engage in the full remit of activities and interventions.

The findings discussed thus far represent a number of implications for the running of residential prison-based intervention programmes. It is apparent that ongoing research into the treatment motivation of offenders is needed if we are to assist residential prison-based programme participants in developing the most adaptive motivational position. If we are to support participants in cultivating treatment motivation and developing pro-social life skills it is advisable for treatment to be delivered with a high degree of integrity and in a manner consistent with the TC paradigm. Further to this point, and in conjunction with the observations made regarding the Edifice Complex and Circular Causality, all persons connected with residential treatment delivery have a responsibility to conduct him or herself in a manner which reflects the values and credibility of the programme. A crucial factor in this process is the overall interpersonal style adopted by the unit staff. Both facilitation and custodial staff need to be mindful of the therapeutic context which oversees not only treatment, but also the day-to-day interactions which transpire in the wider Unit. Staff must be proactive in self-monitoring and in identifying deviance from the intended means of interaction in their own practice and in that of those around them.

Unit safety is a significant matter for any person connected with prison-based rehabilitative interventions. The observation that selective recruitment to the Karaka Unit formulated a means of social control amongst the offenders is of consequence to the wider literature regarding prison-based rehabilitative interventions. Not only does selective recruitment into rehabilitation programmes accord with Andrews and Bonta's (2006) RNR model, but it unites with a strict code of conduct to constitute a means of internal regulation. It represents a clear indication to participants that their place on a programme is subject to their conformity to unit regulations.

It may seem that advocating selective recruitment and stringent rules is incongruent with the egalitarian principles of the TC. Accordingly, those persons overseeing the TC approach must ensure that participants benefit from a blend of autonomy and dependence (Ware *et* al, 2009). Participants must experience those therapeutic conditions which encourage them to take responsibility for their own conduct and support one another on their individual journeys of self discovery. Nevertheless, this needs to be managed with the assistance of clearly delineated parameters.

Limitations

An obvious limitation of this research concerns the size of the sample. The limited number of participant interviewees means that it would be unwise to attribute these findings to broader groups or collectives. The findings are offered as tentative explanations: they require further research in order to be appropriately validated.

In addition to the small number, it is apparent that all of the participants were of New Zealand Maori lineage. This was not unexpected given the disproportionate number of high-risk offenders in the New Zealand penal system who identify as New Zealand Maori (Wilson *et al,* 2007). It is hoped that this research contributes to the overall wellbeing of Maori persons as it has not only provided a group of Maori offenders (who may have otherwise been overlooked by the academic community) with a conduit through which to express themselves in an unencumbered manner, but it has also raised awareness of some of the issues affecting incarcerated Maori.

As an immigrant with limited insight into Maori world views, I have valued the bi-cultural relationships established in this research. Nevertheless, the opinions of persons of other ethnic backgrounds would have been welcomed, as it is conceivable that the evidence of such persons may have given a more complete view of treatment in the STU by reflecting, more accurately, the overall population of the Karaka Unit *per se*. Moreover, it may have afforded the reader a glimpse into the experiences of those persons of non-Maori lineage undergoing treatment in an environment strongly influenced by Maori culture.

The richness of the overall data could have been enhanced by the inclusion of naturalistic observations as these would have enabled me to witness some of the events described by the participants and facilitators. Furthermore, the participants were not overly keen to embrace the discourse analysis aspect of this research, appearing reluctant to share their written materials. Although a great deal of data was obtained solely through 1:1 interviews the collection of these additional data would have enabled more effective triangulation of the information acquired. Therefore, their inclusion in future projects of this nature is heartily suggested.

In conclusion, the rehabilitation of offenders is a fascinating, complex area of academic enquiry which is continually evolving to reflect the equally dynamic, broader cultural *zeitgeist* which encompasses it. It is hoped that this piece of research will offer interested parties an insight into some of the challenges facing those individuals who are attempting to construct the genesis, or in other cases reclaim the essence, of an offence-free lifestyle.

References

Allison, M.D., and Ireland, J.L. (2010). Staff and prisoner perceptions of physical and social environmental factors thought to be supportive of bullying: The role of bullying and the fear of bullying. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry,3*, 43-51.

Andrews, D.A. (1995). The psychology of criminal conduct and effective treatment. In J. McGuire (Ed.), *What works: Reducing re-offending: Guidelines from research and practice* (pp. 35-62). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (1998). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (2nd ed.) Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (2003). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (3rd ed.) Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Andrews, D.A., & Bonta, J. (2006). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* (4th ed.) Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Andrews, D.A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R.D., Bonta. J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F.T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology. 28,* 369-404.

Anstiss, B. (2003). Just How Effective is Correctional Treatment at Reducing Re-Offending? *New Zealand Journal of Psychology, (32)*2, 84-91.

Bakker, L., Riley, D., & O'Malley, J. (1999). *RoC Risk of Reconviction: Statistical models predicting four types of re-offending.* Christchurch, New Zealand: Psychological Service, Department of Corrections.

Beck, A.T. (1967). *Depression: Clinical, experimental and theoretical aspects.* New York, NY: Harper Row.

Bordin, E.S. (1979). The generalizability of the psychoanalytic concept of the working alliance. *Psychotherapy: Theory. Research and Practice, 16.* 252-260.

Breakwell, G.M. (2006). Using Self-recording: Diary and Narrative Methods. In G.M. Breakwell, S. Hammond, C. Fife-Schaw, & J.A. Smith (Eds.), *Research Methods in Psychology* (3rd Ed) (pp. 254-272). London: Sage.

Cann, J., Falshaw, L., Nugent, F., & Friendship, C. (2003). *Understanding what works: Accredited cognitive skills programmes for adult men and young offenders.* Home Office Research Findings No. 226. London: Home Office.

Chia, R. (1995). From Modern to Postmodern Organisational Analysis. *Organisational Studies(16)*4, 579-604.

Chwalisz, K., S. R. Shah, & Hand, K.M. (2008). Facilitating Rigorous Qualitative Research in Rehabilitation Psychology. *Rehabilitation Psychology 53*(3): pp.387-399.

Clark, D. (1999). Social Psychiatry: The Therapeutic Community Approach. In P. Campling& R. Haigh (Eds.), *Therapeutic Communities Past, Present and Future.* (pp. 32-38). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Clarke, A., Simmonds, R., & Wydall, S. (2004). *Delivering cognitive skills programmes in prison: a qualitative study.* Home Office Online Report 27/04. London: Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.

Creswell, J.W. (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design Choosing Among Five Approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cullen, E. (1993). The Grendon reconviction study, Part1. *Prison Service Journal, 90,* 33-57.

Cullen, E. (1994). Grendon: The therapeutic prison that works. *Therapeutic Communities, 4*(4), 249-261.

Dallos, R. (2006). Observational Methods. In G.M. Breakwell, S. Hammond, C. Fife-Schaw, & J.A. Smith (Eds.), *Research Methods in Psychology* (3rd Ed) (pp. 124-145). London: Sage.

Davidson, C., & Tolich, M. (1999). *Social Science Research in New Zealand: Many Paths to Understanding.* Auckland, New Zealand: Pearson Education New Zealand.

Day, A., Howells, K., Casey, S., Ward, T., Chambers, J.C., & Birgden, A. (2009). Assessing treatment readiness in violent offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence 24*(4), 618-635.

Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The 'what' and the 'why' of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behaviour. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*, 227-268.

Department of Corrections. (2006). *Criminogenic Programmes' Facilitation Manual.* Wellington: Department of Corrections.

Department of Corrections. (2008). *Findings from the evaluation of community Tikanga Maori programmes.* Wellington: Department of Corrections.

Department of Corrections. (2010). *Programmes for Offenders* Retrieved January, 20, 2010 from http://www.corrections.govt.nz/about-us/fact-sheets/managing-offenders/programmes-for-offenders.html

DiClemente, C.C., & Prochaska, J.O. (1985). Processes and stages of change: Coping and competence in smoking behaviour change. In S.Shiffman & T.A. Wills (Eds.), *Coping and substance abuse* (pp.319-342). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Dolan, B. (2003). Therapeutic Community Treatment for Severe Personality Disorders. In T. Millon, E. Simonsen, M. Birket-Smith & R.D. Davis (Eds.), *Psychopathy: Antisocial, Criminal, and Violent Behaviour* (pp.393-430). London: The Guildford Press.

Dowden, C., Andrews, D.A. (1999). What Works for Female Offenders: A Meta-analytic Review. *Crime & Delinquency, 45*(4*)* 438-452.

Durie, M. (1994). *Whaiora: Māori Health Development*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, A. (1973). *Humanistic psychotherapy: The rational-emotive approach.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Ellis, A. (1991). Rational-emotive treatment of simple phobias. *Psychotherapy, 28,* 452-456.

Ellis, A. (1992). Group rational-emotive and cognitive-behavioural therapy. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 42,* 63-80.

Falshaw, L., Friendship, C., Travers, L., & Nugent, F. (2003). *Searching for what works: An evaluation of cognitive skills programmes.* Home Office Research Findings No. 206. London: Home Office.

Farrington, D.P., Lambert, S., & West, D.J. (1998). Criminal Careers of Two Generations of Family Members in the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development *Studies on Crime and Crime Prevention 7(*1) 85-106

Friedman, H. (2008). Humanistic and Positive Psychology: The Methodological and Epistemological Divide. *The Humanistic Psychologist, 36,* 113-126.

Friendship, C., Blud, L., Erikson, M., & Travers, L. (2002). An evaluation of cognitive behavioural treatment for prisoners. Home Office Research Findings No. 161. London: Home Office.

Friendship, C., Blud, L., Erikson, M., & Travers, L., & Thornton, D. (2003). Cognitive-behavioural treatment for prisoners. *Home Office Research Findings,* No.161. London: Home Office.

Frost, A. (2004). Therapeutic Engagement Styles of Child Sexual Offenders in a Group Treatment Program: A Grounded Theory Study. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment(16)* 3 pp191-208.

Galvin, K.M., & Brommel, B.J. (1996). *Family communication: Cohesion and change.* New York, NY: Harper Collins.

Garrett, C.G. (1985). Effects of residential treatment on adjudicated delinquents: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 22,* 287-308.

Greenson, R.R. (1965). The working alliance and the transference neurosis. *Psychoanalysis Quarterly, 34,* 151-181.

Guba, E.G. (1990). The alternative paradigm dialogue. In E.G. Guba (Ed.), *The paradigm dialogue* (pp. 17-27). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Haigh, R. (2002). The Quintessence of a Therapeutic Environment: Five Universal Qualities. In P. Campling & R. Haigh (Eds.), *Therapeutic Communities: Past Present and Future* (2nd Ed) (pp. 246-257). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Hanson, R.K., & Harris, A.J.R. (2000). Dynamic predictors of sexual recidivism based on comparing 208 recidivists and 201 non-recidivists on community supervision. Unpublished raw data.

Hare, R.D. (2003). *Hare PCL-R Technical Manual* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Multi-Health Systems Inc.

Hollin, C.R. & Palmer, E.J. (2009). Cognitive skills programmes for offenders. *Psychology Crime & Law V.15*(2&3), pp.147-164.

Horvarth, A.O., & Bedi, R.P. (2002). The Alliance. In J.C. Norcross (Ed.), *Psychotherapy relationships that work.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ireland, J.L. (2000). "Bullying" among prisoners: A review of research. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour,5*(2), 201-215.

Izzo, R.L., & Ross, R.R. (1990). Meta-analysis of rehabilitation programmes for juvenile delinquents. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour. 17*, 134-142.

Joe, G.W., Simpson, D.D., & Broome, K.M. (1998). Effects of readiness for drug abuse treatment on client retention and assessment of process. *Addiction, 93*(8) 1177-1190.

Joyce, A.S., McCallum, M., Ogrodniczuk, J.S., & Piper, W.E. (2003). The alliance as mediator of expectancy effects in short-term individual therapy. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 71,* 672-679.

Kemshall, H., & Canton, R. (2002). *The effective management of programme attrition.* Unpublished Report, Community and Criminal Justice Unit, De Monfort University, Leicester, UK.

Kukla, A. (2000). Social constructivism and the philosophy of science. London: Routledge.

Lambert, M.J. (1992). Implications of outcome research for psychotherapy integration. In J.C. Norcross, & M.R. Goldstein (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapy integration* (pp. 94-129). New York, NY: Basic Books.

Lammers, M. (2009). *Lecture: Violence in New Zealand Psych 516/09B* [Powerpoint slides]. Hamilton, New Zealand: University of Waikato.

Laudan, L. (1996). *Beyond positivism and relativism: Theory, method and evidence.* Boulder, CO: Westview.

Leech, B.L. (2002). Asking Questions: Techniques for Semistructured Interviews. *PS: Political Science and Politics 35*(4), 665-668.

Lemert, E.M. (1951). *Social pathology: Systematic approaches to the study of sociopathic behaviour.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Lemert, E.M. (1972). *Human Deviance, Social Problems and Social Control.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Linehan, M.M., Armstrong, H.E., Suarez, A., Allmon, D. & Heard, H.L. (1991). Cognitive-Behavioural Treatment of Chronically Parasuicidal Borderline Patients. *Achieves of General Psychiatry. 48* pp.1060-1064.

Lipsey, M.W. (1992). Juvenile delinquency treatment: A meta-analytic inquiry into the variability of effects: In T.Cook, H. Corday, H. Hartman, L. Hedges, R. Light, T. Louis, &F. Mosteller (Eds.), *Meta-analysis for explanation: A casebook* (pp. 83-127). New York, NY: Russell Sage.

Lipsey, M.W., Chapman, G.L., & Landenberger, N.A. (2001). Cognitive behavioural programmes for offenders. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *578*, 144-157.

Lipton, D.S., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). *The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies.* New York, NY: Praegar.

Lowenkamp, C.T., Latessa, E.J., & Holsinger, A.M. (2006). The Risk Principle in Action: What Have We Learned from 13,676 Offenders and 97 Correctional Programmes? *Crime & Delinquency 52*, 77-93.

Mallon, R. (2008). Naturalistic Approaches to Social Construction. *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy.* Retrieved August 22nd, 2009 from http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/social-construction-naturalistic/

Mandela, N. (1994). *Long walk to Freedom: The Autobiography of Nelson Mandela.* London: Little, Brown and Company.

Maslow, A. (1962). *Towards a psychology of being.* Princetown, NJ Van Nostrand.

Maslow, A. (1970). *Motivation and personality* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

McFarlane-Nathan, G. (1999). *FReMO: Framework for Reducing Maori Offending.* Wellington: Psychological Services, Department of Corrections.

McGuire, J. (2002). Integrating Findings From Research Reviews. In J. MaCguire (Ed.), *Offender Rehabilitation and Treatment: Effective Programmes and Policies to Reduce Re-offending.* Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

McGuire, J., & Priestley, P. (1995) Reviewing 'What Works': Past, Present and Future In J. McGuire (Ed.), *What Works: Reducing Reoffending.* Chichester, UK: John Wiley.

McKendy, J.P. (2006). I'm very careful about that: narrative and agency of men in prison. *Discourse and Society 17*(4) 473-502.

McMurran, M., & McCulloch, A. (2007). Why don't offenders complete treatment? Prisoners' reasons for non-completion of a cognitive skills programme. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 13*(4), 345-354.

McMurran, M., & Theodosi, E. (2007). Is treatment non-completion associated with increased reconviction over no treatment? *Psychology, Crime & Law, 13*(4), 333-343.

Meyer, B., Pilkonis, P.A., Krupnick, J.L., Egan, M.K., Simmens, S.J., & Sotsky, S.M. (2002). Treatment expectancies, patient alliance and outcome: Further analysesfrom the national institute of mental health treatment of depression collaborative research program. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology. 70,* 1051-1055.

Miller, W.R., & Rollnick, S. (1991). *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing people to change addictive behaviours .* New York, NY: Guildford Press.

Miller, W.R., & Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing People for Change* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Guildford Press.

Millward, L. (2006). *Focus Groups.* In G.M. Breakwell, S. Hammond, C. Fife-Schaw, & J.A. Smith (Eds.), *Research Methods in Psychology* (3rd Ed) (pp. 274-300). London: Sage.

National Party. (2008). *Action Plan for Violent Crime.* Retrieved 23 January, 2009, from http://national.org.nz/Article.aspx?ArticleId=28857.

New Zealand Police. (2009). *Crime Statistics.* Retrieved January 12th, 2009 from http://www.police.govt.nz/service/statistics/2008/fiscal/index.html.

Newton, M. (1997). *Changes in the test scores during treatment at Grendon* Unpublished research paper. Research and Development Unit Report, HM Prison Grendon Underwood, Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire.

Palmer, E.J. & Hollin C.R. (2000). The interrelations of socio-moral reasoning, perceptions of own parenting and attributions of intent with self-reported delinquency. *Legal & Criminological Psychology 5*(2) 201-218.

Patenaude, A.L. (2004). No Promises, But I'm Willing to Listen and tell What I hear: Conducting Qualitative Research among Prison Inmates and Staff. *The Prison (84),* 4 Suppl, 69s-91s.

Polaschek, D.L., Wilson, N.J., and Townsend, M.R. (2005). Cognitive behavioural rehabilitation for high-risk violent offenders. An outcome evaluation of the Violence Prevention Unit. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,20*, 1611-1627.

Prochaska, J.O., & DiClemente, C.C. (1983). Stages and processes of self-change of smoking: Towards an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 51*, 390-395.

Prochaska, J. O., & Norcross, J.C. (2007). *Systems of Psychotherapy: A Transtheoritical Analysis* (6th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks/Cole.

Proctor, R.W. & Capaldi, E.J. (2006). *Why Science Matters: Understanding the Methods of Psychological Research.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Rawlings, B. (1998). *Research on Therapeutic Communities in Prisons. A Review of the Literature.* Department of Sociology, University of Manchester.

Reber, A.S., & Reber, E. (2001). *The Penguin Dictionary of Psychology* (3rd Ed.). Penguin: London.

Ross, R. R., Fabiano, E. A. and Ewles, C. D. (1988) Reasoning and rehabilitation, *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology 32*, 29-35.

Ross, E., Polaschek, D.L.L, & Ward, T. (2008). The therapeutic alliance: A theoretical revision for offender rehabilitation. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour 13,* 462-480.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25*(1) 54-67.

Sabatier, P. A. (1993). Policy change over a decade or more. In P. A. Sabatier & H. C. Jenkins-Smith (Eds.), *Policy change and learning: An advocacy coalition approach* (pp. 13-39). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Sampson, R.J. & Laub, J.H. (2003). Life Course Trajectories of Crime amongst Delinquent Boys followed to age 70. *Criminology 41,* pp.555-592.

Serin, R.C. & Lloyd, C.D. (2009). Examining the process of offender change: The transition to crime desistance. *Psychology Crime & Law, 15*(4), 347-364.

Smith, P., Goggin, C., & Gendreau, P. (2002). The effects of prison sentences and intermediate sanctions on recidivism: General effects and individual differences. (User Report 2002-01). Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.

Statistics New Zealand. (2008). "Recorded Crime Statistics 1998-2007". Retrieved January, 12th. 2008, from http://wdmzpub01.stats.govt.nz/wds/TableViewer/tableView.aspx?Report Name=Crime/Calendar/National/National%20Annual%20Recorded%20O ffences%20for%20the%20Latest%2010%20Calendar%20Years.

Tannenbaum, F. (1938). *Crime and the Community.* New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Tong, L.S. Joy & Farrington, D.P. (2006). Effectiveness of Reasoning & Rehabilitation In Reducing Offending. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 12*(1), 3-24.

Torrey, E.F. (1972). *The Mind Game: Witchdoctors and Psychiatrists.* New York, NY: Emerson Hall.

Ware, J., Frost, A., & Hoy, A. (2009). A review of the use of therapeutic communities with sexual offenders. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology,* vol. 0: pp. 0306624X09343169v1.

Wellsford, C. (1975). Labelling theory and criminology: An assessment. *Social Problems, 22,* 332-345.

Wexler, H.K., Falkin, G.P., & Lipton, D.S. (1990). Outcome evaluation of a prison therapeutic community for substance abuse treatment. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour. 17,* 71-92.

Whitehead, J.T., & Lab, S.P. (1989). A meta-analysis of juvenile correctional treatment . *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency. 26,* 276-295.

Whitehead, P.R., Ward, T., & Collie, R.M. (2007). Time for a Change: Applying the Good Lives Model of Rehabilitation to a High-Risk Violent Offender. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 51*(5), 578-598.

Wilson, N.J., Tamatea, A., & Riley, D. (2007). Psychology in A Criminal Justice Context: Principles And Interventions. In I Evans, J.Rucklidge, & M.

O'Driscoll (Eds.), *Professional Practice of Psychology in Aotearoa New Zealand (2007)* (pp. 429-445). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Psychological Society.

Woodward, R. (1999) The Prison Communities: Therapy within a Custodial Setting. In P. Campling& R. Haigh (Eds.), *Therapeutic Communities Past, Present and Future.* (pp. 162-173). London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Yeats, W.B. (n.d.). *Thinkexist.com.* Retrieved May 9, 2020, from http://thinkexist.com/quotation/education_is_not_filling_a_bucket-but_lighting_a/15313.html

Appendix One - Information for Potential Participants

Kia ora ......

I would like to interview you about your experiences on the Intensive Rehabilitation Programme which you are currently completing at Waikeria Prison.

I am a former Probation Officer and now a post-graduate student of Waikato University. I will be conducting this research for a Masters Degree in Social Sciences.

The project has the following aims:

1) To help the New Zealand Department of Corrections in identifying the strengths and possible areas for improvement in their high-risk offender treatment programme by offering detailed information of the participants' first-hand experiences.

2) To examine the experiences of high-risk offenders at varying stages of an intensive rehabilitation programme.

3) Describe the experiences of an intensive rehabilitation programme from the perspective of its participants.

4) To understand how an intensive rehabilitation programme affects its participants

I am especially interested in your personal thoughts, feelings and opinions of the Intensive Rehabilitation Programme; in particular: what you found interesting, which aspects you feel worked well, what you liked and; of course, anything that you found challenging, maybe did not enjoy as much, or you feel could be

improved. Most importantly, I am keen to hear about the reasons why you chose to attend the programme, why you kept going with it and how you think it will affect the rest of your life.

The interviews will take place between September and November, 2009. I am planning to keep the interviews fairly short (1-1.5 hours) and run them in a relaxed, informal manner once or twice per-week. I would not expect you to take part in anymore than two interviews (unless you specifically requested to do so). I would like to record our discussions, using audio equipment, as this will help me to write them up by making sure that I understand and record your opinions accurately. In support of the interviews, I would like to discuss with you some of the writings (course notes you might have made, recordings of your thoughts and feelings [e.g. Diary entries] or possibly, copies of letters to or from whanau or friends) about (your experiences on) the programme that you feel happy to share with me. Whilst I would encourage you to be as honest and open as possible you have full control over what written information we discuss; consequently, **you are in no way required to show me everything you have written.**

I will ensure that you cannot be identified by name in any part of this research. When I refer to you it will be by mutually agreed pseudonym (e.g. *Tom*). This would also apply to any other person/persons you might mention during our discussions. If necessary, names of places and times would also be disguised should the context in which we discuss them offer any possibility of you being identified.

My intention is to get as wide a range of participants as possible (varying ages, ethnicities and offending histories); therefore, I actively encourage you to apply. However, if a large number of people (15 +) express their interest in participating it may not be possible for me to include everyone. I wish to make it absolutely clear that any decision not to include a potential participant would be made on practical grounds and should not be taken as a personal criticism or insult. In the event that you are not included in the final study I would happily meet with you in person to discuss my decision in detail.

Limits of Confidentiality

I must advise you that, in the event you disclose to me any serious offending for which you have not been charged, (or that another unconnected person is currently charged with); I would be required to report it to the appropriate authorities; at the first stage this would include my academic supervisors, but may also include the prison management and Police. Furthermore, if you disclose any information that I deem to represent a serious imminent risk to yourself, prison staff or *any* other person(s) I would be required to report that also.

In order help me gain an understanding of you and your current situation it will be necessary for me to review your prison file; this would include: Previous Convictions List, Police Summaries of Facts, Pre-sentence Reports, Treatment Reports, Psychological (and possibly Psychiatric) Reports and any Incident Reports which may be on file.

Any interview notes/recordings would be stored securely at the University of Waikato for three years; after which time they will be destroyed in a way that will safeguard your identity.

The results of this research may be discussed at academic conferences and could be published in an academic journal.

If you agree to take part you have the following rights:

a) To refuse to answer any particular question, and to terminate the interview at any time.

b) To read any information concerning you that I have gathered as part of this research, at any time until the completion of data analysis on approximately the 30th day of September, 2009.

c) To ask any further questions about the interview or research project that occurs to you, either during the interview or at any other time.

d) To remain anonymous. Anything that might identify you will not be included in conference papers, academic articles or any other report about the findings of the research.

e) To withdraw your consent at any time up until three-weeks after my interview; without fear or concern of negative consequences in respect of your sentence. If you chose to withdraw, all data from you will be destroyed immediately.

f) To take any complaints you have about the interview or research project to the Research Ethics Committee of the Psychology Department, University of Waikato, Psychology Department, Private Bag 3105, Hamilton 3240). Correspondence of this nature should be addressed to either Dr. Neville ROBERTSON, or Dr. Jo THAKKER (Academic Supervisors) or Dr. Robert ISLER (Chair of the Ethics Review Board).

Please note: This project has been given approval by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Psychology Department (University of Waikato) and the Department of Corrections.

If you would like to participate in this research I would need you to sign a Consent Form. This form is confirmation that you understand fully what would be required of you, and that you are happy to participate.

Should you wish to contact me directly, please speak with the programme facilitation staff who will make the necessary arrangements.

Thank you for expressing an interest in participating in this research project.

My kindest regards,

Naku noa, na.

Damian Terrill

Appendix Two – Consent Form

"A Journey beyond the Bars: Participants' Experiences of Psychological Treatment in a Prison Setting"

Damian Terrill

CONSENT FORM

I …………………………………………………………………… have read / have had read to me (delete as necessary) the contents of the *Information for Potential Participant* sheets and have been given the opportunity to speak with the Unit Staff and Principal Researcher regarding the nature and purposes of this research. As a consequence, I fully understand what would be required from me as a participant and hereby give my free and informed consent to participate in the research.

"I would like to receive a summary of the research findings."   (circle)
Yes / No

"I consent to be interviewed for the research in accordance with the conditions laid out in the *Information for Potential Participant* sheets."

Signed:*Interviewee*_____Date:_____

"I agree to abide by the above conditions."

Signed:*Interviewer* _____Date: _____

Appendix Three –Interview Schedule

The purpose of the interview is to obtain a detailed understanding of the participants' experiences of the Intensive Rehabilitation Programme delivered through the Karaka Unit, Waikeria Prison. Although I am proposing to collate and analyse the data via a two-tiered approach, the 1:1 interview(s) is critical to the overall outcome as it serves as the primary means of directly eliciting information from the participants. In accordance with the overall qualitative paradigm employed throughout this research, accurate, authentic representations of the unique experiences of the participants are considered crucial to ensuring the credibility and trustworthiness of this research; therefore, the interview process has been deliberately designed to ensure the views and opinions of the participants are gathered in a manner that will safeguard their subjective essence.

The interview guide has been devised in accordance with the principles of an illustrative, semi-structured format in order to allow the participant the necessary flexibility to provide answers in as much or as little detail as they choose. In order to facilitate smooth, lucid interactions between the interviewer and interviewee the interview schedule has been divided into a series of chronologically orientated sections. Moreover, possible prompts have been included to support the participant in developing the narrative flow of their responses; prompts would be introduced on a discretionary basis as the interview develops.

Introduction

- Opportunity for the participant to initiate karakia.

Prior to commencing the data acquisition the participants would be offered an introduction to the research project. The introduction would address the following points:

- The general structure and key aspects of the interview.

- The purposes for conducting the research – to gain an understanding of persons undergoing an intensive rehabilitation programme.

- Possible outcomes of the research – presentation at relevant seminars and discussion groups and/or publication in an associated periodical.

- Privacy and confidentially issues – use of pseudonyms and storage of data.

- The negligible possibility of the participant being identified through the research.

- Ensuring the participant understands they will be given the opportunity to review the research prior to it being finalised.

- The right to refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from elements of the research with which the participant may perceive discomfort.

- Verify consent to use audio recording equipment.

- Confirm all file information is correct.

- Establish participant's status within their whanau – father, son, uncle, etc and the perceived strength of these ties. This aspect is essential to the proposed discourse analysis segment of the research.

Section 1: Beginning the Programme

The purpose of section one is to explore the particular circumstances affecting the participant prior to them making a decision to undertake the intensive rehabilitation programme. I will introduce this aspect with the following statement:

'To start with, I'd really like to know how it was you got to be on the programme.'

Possible prompts:

- *Pre-existing/preceding views/opinions of the programme.*

- *Deciding to do it.*

- *Motivational factors (intrinsic/extrinsic) to do the programme.*

- *Expectations of the programme.*

Section 2: Engagement with the Programme

Section two is designed to enable me to better understanding the nature of the participant's engagement with the programme content. This section would be introduced with the following question:

'So, how have you found the programme so far?'

Possible prompts:

- *Understand/difficulty of the course material.*

- *Too easy, too hard or just right?*

- *Most and least enjoyable/relevant aspects of the programme*

- *Rapport with the facilitators.*

- *Degree of openness and honesty with facilitators and custodial staff – explore any difference/variation which may be expressed. Did you hold back on occasions? If so – What aspects did you hold back on; why?*

- *Motivational fluctuations during the course – possible triggers/cues.*

- *Advice to other prisoners considering undertaking the programme.*

- *Applying the knowledge/skills to life outside of prison.*

- *Any major take-home messages or insights.*

Section 3: General Experiences of the Programme/Unit

The purpose of this final section is two-fold, firstly to examine the participant's thoughts and feelings in regard to their day-to-day experiences of both the programme and the Karaka Unit *per se*; secondly, to bring the interview to an appropriate close by allowing time for de-briefing, final clarification of the objectives of the research, an opportunity for me to answer any specific questions the participant may have and lastly, to canvass the participant's willingness to engage in a follow-up interview (as necessary). This section would be introduced with the following question:

'I understand the Karaka Unit has a strict code of conduct. How is life in the Karaka Unit different from the other units/wings you have been on?'

Possible prompts:

- *Adjustment into the unit.*

- *Rapport with other prisoners and staff.*

- *General conduct in the programme and in the unit.*

- *Safety in group and in unit.*

- *Gang affiliations/pressure.*

- *De-brief/review of interview.*

- *Any questions?*

- *Follow-up interview (as necessary).*

Before concluding the interview I would advise the interviewee that I am happy to make myself available for discussion of any issues or concerns they may have regarding the interview, up to the date at which I would be leaving the unit. I would make it clear that any requests to meet with me would need to be sanctioned by an appropriate staff member.

- Opportunity for the participant to initiate karakia.