Social Intervention: Supporting Success, Guiding Desistance. An Introduction

The crisis of excess that has engulfed our penal system must be challenged with new ways of thinking that are fit for the 21st century.

Wilson, 2009: Foreword

Effecting Change

There is little doubt as to the importance of the numerous factors associated with offending behaviour, breaking the cycle of offending and in aiding successful rehabilitation (see for instance: TUC, 2001; Farrall, 2002; Savolainen, 2009; Ministry of Justice, 2010, 2013). The Social Exclusion Unit (2002) noted the importance of a stable job, good health and welfare, education, stable accommodation and family support, the lack of which is so often implicit in high rates of reoffending. The reality for many offenders however, is often something very different, in which they are faced with few opportunities, limited access and with unrealistic expectations of what is possible following conviction (Flynn, 2010).

Crucial to Maruna (2001: 12) are the questions of how rehabilitation works and why it works for some and not others, rather than the somewhat older and more sterile question of ‘what works’. Thus, although there is a recognition of ‘social needs’, its importance is often ignored until after the committal of the offence, in effect it is only tackled after the need has arisen, rather than in response to preventing it from happening in the first instance. If the situation is only addressed once the offence is committed, then the counter argument is one which offers advice and guidance. However, in order to aid the journey toward rehabilitation and a cessation from offending, the individual needs to be supported and empowered. This is an argument acknowledged by Chris Grayling in the Ministerial
Foreword to the government’s consultation document: *Transforming Rehabilitation* (MoJ, 2013), an argument which is returned to throughout this thesis.

**Desistance and Change**

‘Desistance’, says Maruna (2001: 17), ‘...is an unusual dependant variable for criminologists because it is not an event that happens, rather it is the sustained *absence* of a certain type of event (in this case, crime)’ (similarly supportive discussions can also be found in Crow, 2001; Farrall, 2002; Weaver and McNeill, 2010; Canton, 2011). To this Farrall and Maruna (2004) add that there exists a difference between what can be understood as primary and secondary desistance. Primary desistance can be seen as a lull in offending behaviour, where secondary desistance starts from the point in time when an individual decides to be a non-offender. This can be described in terms of the order to “cease and desist”, a request to stop what you are doing (cease) and refrain from doing it again (desist)’ (Maruna, 2001: 26).

McNeill and Weaver (2010: 9) however, point out that ‘...offenders are heterogeneous, their needs are complex and their pathways to desistance are individualised’. For some the situation arises from an aging out of crime (Glueck and Glueck, 1940) or moving away from a (deviant) peer group; for others it is the importance of social attachments, such as relationships, employment, and/or family, often referred to as social capital (Farrall, 2002; Savolainen, 2009). What seems clear however, is that for the most part it is a combination of circumstance and situation, which seek to encourage a development of the individual (for example as training or education), as much as to maintain – or improve – the individual’s personal circumstance (relationships and family). This supports Maruna’s further assertion
of a third theory – that of the narrative changes – changes to personal understanding of the self (Maruna, 2001). It would seem then that an inter-play between the three positions offers the greatest opportunity for successful change (Weaver and McNeill, 2010).

Offenders often come from poorer socio-economic backgrounds; more often than not they have low levels of education and little or no employment history (SEU, 2002), making it more difficult to place in appropriate settings (Creasey, 2005). Furthermore, the Prison Reform Trust (2012) note that they often require specific support, a great deal of time and resources, and they can present with chaotic lifestyles brought about through drug and alcohol misuse, which prove a challenge to those that work with them. They are often seen to be vulnerable, falling foul of the system and slipping through the social net and face social discrimination on the basis of past behaviour (Bain and Parkinson, 2010). Yet, a concentration upon desistance focussed working could result in a reduced number of victims, lower the cost to the criminal justice system and have the effect of enabling a concentration upon those individuals that are seen to be at risk of falling back into offending (MoJ, 2013).

The thesis presented here situates itself within a similar frame, arguing that offending behaviour can be seen in relation to events and circumstance which surround the offender: a lack of education; limited skill for, or barriers to employment; no employment history; and the need for supportive relationships – personal and professional – providing for the knowledge, understanding and guidance which offer the greatest opportunity for the individual to change and develop as a non-offender. These are important points to note,
and are present in the argument which unfolds in chapter 6, as the thesis discusses the findings from this research and implications for future practice.

If change is to take place and be effective, society must have a part to play in supporting that change. Here it is argued that there must be a consideration of the impact of the social, of learning and social learning, individual choice versus (societal) inclusion and exclusion, which may also be considered through a discussion of social bonds, attachments and inclusion. This is not to argue against the need to punish those that harm, or even the fact that there are those that will not conform to the rules of society; the so-called ‘dangerous’, ‘predatory’ or the ‘persistent’ offenders; rather to state that for punishment to be effective it must: (a) have purpose, and (b) provide for change. The contention here is that there exists a regulation of social life of which many offenders sit outside, in which individuals are controlled and indeed control their own behaviour lest they fall out of favour and suffer exclusion from the social group (Young, 1999), which more often requires intervention and (professional) guidance.

**Developing the role: Defining ETE**

Interventions such as Education, Training and Employment are not new in England and Wales; skills and hard work were seen as being conducive to an effective change in behaviour for young offenders throughout the Victorian period. Higgs (2007: 12) states that convict prisoners at HMP Pentonville that were ‘...young, fit and healthy and deemed suitable for reformation’, were taught a skill or trade which would equip them for employment.
Whitehead and Statham (2006) have similarly noted that the responsibility for providing guidance and support has been variously performed by the supervising probation officer, originating from the goals of the police court missionaries of the Temperance Society, before being offered by Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) – such as NACRO, providing guidance and support on a purely voluntary basis (positions discussed at length in chapter one). Latterly, staff were engaged directly by the local probation service areas and employed at the PSO (Probation Service Officer) grade (Dorset Probation Trust, 2012). This is reflected further in Farrall’s (2002) discussion of the introduction of employability officers, set up by local probation service areas to offer a more holistic and consistent service.

In a similar way the local probation service area examined in this study first provided for such a service in 1994 (Creasey, 2005), in the form of a community links team, given the role to provide for advice and guidance about benefits, debts, housing, education, grants and allowances for training and employment. These services were offered to offenders made subject to a supervision order or a period of licence following a custodial sentence, and although offenders could self-refer, their need was often identified by the supervising officer through the writing of a pre-sentence report.

However, the election of a populist New Labour government in 1997, budgetary concerns, rising custodial figures and little evidence of a reduction in crime figures, caused the probation service to move towards much tighter controls and defined roles. This culminated in the nationalisation of the local probation service areas, and a redefined role for community links officers as ETE (Education, Training and Employment) officers. The role of ETE was additionally, and in no small part also guided by the academic research and
policy reports identified earlier. This followed much of the policy rhetoric, which sought to be tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime (a discussion further developed in chapter two); yet as Creasey (2005) notes, still lacked national targets for the engagement of ETE services by the turn of the millennium.

In the move towards a service of Employment, Training and Education, criteria had been set for the advice and guidance provided to the offender. ETE concentrated exclusively on work and education in order to reduce rates of reoffending (Dorset Probation Trust, 2012), acting as a sign-posting service, directing offenders toward other professionally skilled persons who would look at a specific issue: debt, housing, benefits, leisure, etc., such as the Citizens Advice Bureau or Employment Services.

Such specification can begin to de-skill members of the team, especially where staff have built up large contact lists and information regarding the services available to offenders. Finn (2000) has also noted that repetition can lead to fragmentation of the work undertaken, as paperwork is transferred or cases re-referred based on immediate need. Furthermore, it can lead to uncertainties regarding the consistency and reliability of service, apparent in the referral which sees the individual move from one area to the next, each dealing with specific issues rather than holistically. This is important because a holistic service was something identified by Ward and Maruna (2007), Bain and Parkinson (2010), Weaver and McNeill (2010), yet Creasey (2005) has noted that no such strategic planning has taken place within the ETE services provided, leading to overlap and a lack of baseline definition.
The Thesis

This thesis considers the impact of an intervention in a community based team to guide and support a desistance from crime, more specifically, in looking at the role played by an intervention which supports the education and employability needs of offenders (Education, Training and Employment). This research was undertaken with a local supervision probation trust area, as part of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) in England and Wales. As highlighted at the beginning of this chapter, recent years have seen numerous reports, both academic (see for instance Bain and Parkinson, 2010; Rhodes, 2008; McNeill, 2004; Farrall, 2002) and policy documentation (Ministry of Justice, 2010; SEU, 2002) which have highlighted (amongst other needs) the importance of education and employment to a reduction in offending. Indeed, Savolainen (2009) has noted that – if nothing else – the argument can be made that steady, full-time, long-term employment, imposes obvious limits upon time and therefore the opportunity to offend (Savolainen, 2009).

Reflecting upon McNeill and Weaver’s (2010: 11) statement that more research is needed in order to better understand ‘...what sorts of practices and practitioners best support desistance’, this study places the importance upon the understanding of the individual, of hearing the offender’s voice. If crime is to be reduced, then surely success will come from a greater understanding of the individual, as much as an understanding of their crimes and the related punishments. To this end the research undertakes to examine the understanding, experience and outcome of the individual following a programme of community intervention, given the remit to advise, assist and support the individual in their education, training and employment needs. It will examine the ability of a local community team to positively support change within an offender’s life, perhaps not too far removed
from the probation services original auspice – to advise, assist and befriend (Whitehead and Statham, 2006), and therefore to ‘positively’ effect the risk of re-offending.

In this instance, a number of questions will be considered in the form of the research aims (as set out below) in order to address the central theme of the thesis; that of the ability of an intervention (of ETE) in a community setting to have a positive impact upon, and support desistance from crime.

**The Research Aims:**

The research seeks to

1. Explore the provision of Employment, Training and Education, and/or similar activities, in a social (and) historical context *(Chapters 1 & 2)*

2. Consider the role of interventions in supporting a reduction in offending behaviour to achieve periods of desistance in adult offenders *(Chapters 3, 5 & 6)*

3. Using appropriate methodological techniques, assess the impact of Employment, Training and Education (ETE) in a non-custodial setting, using individual expectation and recorded outcomes *(Chapters 4 & 5)*

4. Establish other definitions and measures of success – such as soft-outcomes (self-esteem, motivation, life-skills, preparedness), within a culture judged by the success of hard-outcomes (education, training, employment) to re-offending *(Chapter 5 & 6)*

The contribution to the wider research literature comes from the rich data, collected from the participants concerning their own personal knowledge and experience of the intervention of ETE as staff members or probationers.
The Structure of the Thesis

1: The Literature Review

Chapters one and two provide for a review of the literature concerning policy development, punishment and change in behaviour. In part this is set out as an historic discussion, which has at its heart the important role that education and employment has played — and continues to play — in desistance and the restoration (rehabilitation) of the offender. Chapter one is divided into three parts: the Victorian ideology of punishment as change, which emphasises the role of skill acquisition and hard-work for offenders as evidence of a change in character, during a period often seen as bloody, volatile and contradictory; second, the rise of the probation service, with a mandate to advise, assist and befriend, which was based within a Christian ethos and supported by a concern for idle hands and busy minds; finally, the chapter considers the failure of rehabilitation in the latter years of the 20th century, which brought with it increased punitiveness, a contradictory ethos, and left many staff confused and disillusioned.

Chapter two concludes the historic debate, considering the last decades of the 20th century, and the first decade of the 21st century. It is a period which has seen the important work of education and employment come to the fore, finding a place in academic and public research, and for the first time being provided some reference in legislation, regarded as a specific activity to help support rehabilitation (CJA, 2003, S. 177, see also Taylor, Wasik & Leng, 2004: 220). The chapter considers the important place that interventions have to play in the change of behaviour and in guiding a successful period of desistance. This provides
the important background to the use and development of interventions which unfolds in chapter 3 and is developed throughout the remaining chapters of the thesis.

Chapter three focuses its attention upon the use of intervention and considers the debate of the individual and the social. Where chapter one concludes with the discussion of the purpose of punishment, and chapter two has provided for a discussion of policy and punishment as the 21st century unfolds, chapter three begins by looking at the ways in which offenders and their behaviours are viewed. The debate centres upon the role interventions have in the reduction of criminal behaviour and, if through successful interventions the probation service can reduce recidivistic behaviour and provide for greater desistance.

The chapter provides a brief discussion of the four main types of intervention used in a community setting in England and Wales: (1) community payback (formally community service, and/or community punishment); (2) drug rehabilitation programmes; (3) cognitive behavioural programmes; and (4) education, training and employment programmes (NPS, 2008). It uses the backdrop of the role of psychology in understanding crime and the offender’s behaviour, whilst making use of varying social theories to explore the behaviour of the individual in a social setting. Thus, where for Cornish and Clarke (1986) criminal behaviour is an individual responsibility, a (rational) choice to be made, the chapter is also able to consider the argument of a number of political commentators and leading political figures, such as former Prime Minister Tony Blair (1993), and the then Home Secretary David Blunkett (2003), both of whom have noted that crime is something that people grow into. Criminality is not something that offenders are born to, and it is not inevitable,
concluding that it is made easier for an individual if they have a good and secure start in life, a stable home, a good education, full employment, and decent healthcare.

2: Research & Evaluation

The research consists of a further three chapters, which identify the Methodology, the Findings, and the Discussion, Conclusions and Implications for Future Practice. Chapter 4 presents the methodology of the study, presented as a case study of an intervention of ETE in a community setting, and was undertaken through a triangulation of methods, making use of both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. In doing so the research, and has made use of an assisted questionnaire (see Holt and Pamment, 2010), semi-structured interviews and a follow up outcomes analysis (which considers offending related outcomes based upon data collected from the probation services electronic recording system – CRAMS), each of which brings bearing to the former and the latter.

Chapter 5 provides for a discussion of the findings of the study. As noted above, the first stage of the research made use of an assisted questionnaire (AQ) with individual offenders drawn from the active cases of a local ETE team. Case files provided for demographic data (age, gender, health and disabilities) and information regarding the offence, sentence, period of supervision, educational attainment, employment status. The assisted questionnaire was chosen as it enabled the opportunity to discuss motivations and individual expectations of completing the period of guidance and supervision with the ETE officer and any work undertaken with partnership agencies.
At the second stage of the research, individual offenders and the interventions team (staff and management) were provided the opportunity to feed-back their understanding of the success (or otherwise) of the ETE provision, via a short semi-structured interview. The interview provided the opportunity for both staff and offenders to express their feeling for and concerns about the service provided (Bannister, Burman, Parker, Taylor and Tindall, 1994). The interview process discussed the purpose of intervention, and its ability to achieve the desired outcome, for both the offender and society (on the basis of a reduction in offending behaviour).

Stage three provided the opportunity to go back to the case file and examine any ‘current’ criminal activity of the individual and/or their desistance from offending. It examined those that continued a professional relationship with the ETE officer and those that chose to end the relationship, and as a third part to the investigation, it also considered offending versus desistance rates for those given ETE as a requirement of the courts, in comparison to those that were not.

The final chapter, 6: Discussion, conclusions and implications for future practice provides for a discussion of the findings in the context of the wider literature on from the subject area. The discourse will develop the debate of rehabilitation, recidivism, restitution and desistance, whilst considering the importance of the self, professional relationships and social identity. In doing so there will be discussion and reference to the arguments of: Crow (2001), Farrall (2002), Goffman (1968, 1963), Robinson and Crow (2009), Canton (2011), and Maruna (2012, 2011, 2004), amongst others. These important works will help to build a picture of the social world and debates which currently concern the criminal justice system,
the victim and the offender, once the community order (and/or licence period) has been completed.

With this in mind, the narrative has supported a debate which questions the position of social interventions, and the evidence for greater social support (as raised by the SEU Annual Report, 2002; Centre for Crime & Justice Studies, 2007; and others) and the lack of new, supportive, evidence for custody as an effective means of long term crime reduction policy. It has considered the popular nature of punitive policies that remain to the detriment of other methods of crime reduction strategy, which have perhaps had little (or less) political, social, popular support. In this way, punishment is seen as a positive experience – not only for the community (as, for instance, payment in public service) but an experience which provides for an environment conducive to learning, one which supports growth and development of the individual and which produces a form of social capital and self-worth; thus, supporting desistance and providing a pathway to rehabilitation in the long-term. In doing so there is a sense that the service of ETE can become a future-focused, supporting change and desistance from offending behaviour.
Chapter 1: Crime, Punishment and Rehabilitation

Although recognised as a period of pain and suffering, the late 18\textsuperscript{th} and throughout the 19\textsuperscript{th} centuries saw the rise of punishments which sought to support and change the offender, such was the belief in the rehabilitative ideal (Foucault, 1977). This is a position perhaps best embodied in two statements made a century apart. In the first John Howard (1777) suggested the use of ‘an orderly institutional regime designed to bring about the ‘moral correction’ of prisoners’ (Raynor and Robinson, 2005: 34). In the second Lord Gladstone (1895) suggested that punishment was to be seen to be of benefit to the offender; enabling them to return to society as a fuller, more rounded member of the community from whence they came.

Thus, chapter one develops a discussion which considers rehabilitation and the terms by which it was (and is) understood, painting a picture of the essential role that the rehabilitative ideal has held in the punishment of offenders in the last 200 years. Chapter one is presented through the discussion of a number of inter-related topics: (1) Crime, punishment and desistance; (2) 100 years and more; (3) The end of a rehabilitative ideal; and (4) Individual management and a change in ethos, each of which are woven together to form the body of discourse. This enables the chapter to consider the importance of rehabilitative processes in punishment for Victorian Britain and the philanthropic notions which provided the basic tenets for the probation service throughout much of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century. This will provide the opportunity to consider the important period at the end of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century which saw first a loss of faith with the rehabilitative ideal before a move to question what works(?) and finally, as this chapter does, an academic discourse which suggest that some
things do work, more often reflected in the discussions of (accredited) cognitive behavioural programmes. Presented in this way, chapter one addresses the first of the four aims, considering the provision of ETE, or similar activities, in a social and historical context. This will set the scene for chapter two, presenting an argument of two sides: the popular punitivism of the end of the century and the growing understanding of the effects of the social upon the individual, highlighted in the academic and policy discussions of the new millennium. Furthermore, it will provide a solid basis of evidence from which to consider the growing concerns for the role of interventions in the 21st century, an area for discussion in chapter three.

Crime, Punishment and Desistance

Although a relatively young concept desistance has had a place in the work undertaken with offenders throughout the ‘modern’ history of criminological investigation and intervention, although perhaps well hidden within the wider discussions concerned with the crime, criminal behaviour and the purpose of punishment. For example, in contrast to many academics at the time, Glueck and Glueck (1940) were particularly interested to identify and describe periods of offending and non-offending, the influences upon delinquent behaviour and highlighting the inevitability of ‘aging’ out of crime as a primary reason for why the offender had in fact ceased to commit crime. However, Maruna (2001) reminds the reader that other explanations are just as convincing, a good and satisfying job and a stable marriage, being numbered among them. Desistance then, as described in the introductory chapter, can be seen as a process of maturation, a combination of social and personal circumstance which supports a prolonged change – or rehabilitation.
Others have discussed the often paradoxical nature of (crime and) punishment. O’Malley (1999), for example, is quick to note the often volatile and contradictory nature of punishment. A point further reflected in Higgs (2007) account of the differing experiences of inmates at the convict and local prisons around England and Wales during the 19th century. Indeed, she notes that offenders would often encounter different regimes depending upon what the local county justice believed to be the purpose of prisons. ‘If they saw it as a deterrent, treatment was necessarily harsh. If it was seen as an attempt to reform prisoners, more emphasis might be placed on religion and education’ (Higgs, 2007: 7). This was also reflected in the work conducted with individual offenders toward the end of the 19th century and the intervention of police court missionaries. Bain (2004, 2005) notes that although there were many initiatives set up throughout the 18th and 19th centuries, it was often left to an individual magistrate or justice or the argument of the missionary, to steer the offender from the harsh realities of punishment. If considered in this often contradictory manner, as O’Malley (1999) does, it is easy to see that desistance (and/or rehabilitation) was well hidden within the wider discussions concerned with the justification of punishment.

Punishment then may be justified depending upon the situation, the definition, or circumstance of the individual (or group), as victim, perpetrator, commentator or justice. Durkheim (1983: 59) states that ‘... punishment constitutes an emotional reaction’. In this way, it is a reflection of society’s feelings of disapproval for the action or behaviour taken. Schwartz (1978: 656) suggests that in punishing the individual there is the natural ‘impulse to do harm to those who have wronged us’ (Retribution). Historically, this can perhaps best be exemplified in the use of branding or flogging of a thief. Yet, Schwartz (1978) also states
that the punishment should only ever be equal to the crime committed, and nothing more. Thus, punishment should support a change in behaviour without the need to inflict physical harm. Today, examples can be found in punishments which seek to restrict freedom (tag), or make use of physical labour (community service).

Conversely, discussions of deterrence leave unanswered questions of who is to be deterred. For example, if the purpose of punishment is to deter the offender, then it is to take action in preparation for offences which may never occur. If punishment is to deter those that have not committed a crime, then punishment is offered for something that they would not do in the first place. Stella (2001) concurs, stating that through the observation of punishment, a secondary form of deterrence is provided, as the offender must be punished in order to be deterred in the future. Yet, a general deterrent effect is only a consequence of the punishment and therefore should not be seen as an aim. Deterrence then is only effective if the punishment is too great for the individual to bear (i.e. past experience produces a desire for avoidance), or if the loss associated with the punishment exceeds the gain.

In this way it can be suggested that a further purpose of punishment is to prevent such action from re-occurring; to stop or incapacitate the offender in some manner, often seen in the form of a custodial sentence. A custodial sentence should inform the offender of the harm they have done and in the removal of liberty, offer the opportunity to make amends for the behaviour which offended. Consequentially, punishment can provide for some form of redress for a wrong done. The victim can be paid recompense, or compensated in some way, thus the victim is restored to their former position (as would certainly seem the case in
more restorative punishments). However, in seeking restitution for the victim, there is also an expectation that the offender will be restored to their proper place within the *social* (see for instance, Maruna, 2012; Bain and Parkinson, 2010); that is after all the definition of not only restoration, but also rehabilitation. In this sense there is an expectation that through a purposeful punishment behaviour will be changed and thus result in a period of desistance culminating in the renewed inclusion of the offender following their successful rehabilitation. That is to say, desistance has always had a place, if there is an expectation of change. Thus if rehabilitation is the goal then there is a path to follow and a journey to be understood. This journey, says Canton (2011) was a test of character, an indicator that change had taken place. Desistance, Maruna (2012) suggests, is the path that is followed on the journey to a successful rehabilitation. When understood in these terms it is perhaps far easier to situate notions of desistance within a discourse of (rehabilitation) crime and punishment.

Yet, whatever purpose punishment has, Lord Phillips has stated that ‘Punishment can be termed the treatment of those condemned of criminal conduct’ (2006: 1). It is a sanction set against an individual who has knowingly broken the law. Sanctions may take many differing forms, including those which seek to restore or even re-integrate the offender, notions born of the Victorian era, and the ideal that through hard work and exercise the character could be moulded anew. Indeed, Goodman (2012: 15) has noted that ‘Punishment was used to give prostitutes and vagrants the experience of using their labour in the wider world so they were not a burden on the state’. Thus, in a return to the point which started this discussion, Goodman demonstrates that although recognised as a cruel
and violent place, it is a view which often obscures the philanthropic endeavours of the period.

**A Place in History**

This philanthropic nature is further addressed in Briggs, Harrison, McInnes and Vincent’s (1996) discussion of the use of punishment during the same period (of 18th and 19th century England). In it they state that even throughout the most notorious period of punishment, colloquially termed *the bloody code*, a local justice, judge, or jury were more likely to use a combination of punishments rather than make use of the death sentence when some 220 offences could receive such a sentence. In no small part much of the changes that came about was a reflection of the work being undertaken by notable reformers such as Jeremy Bentham, John Howard, Elizabeth Fry and others, and suggest that popularity for the death penalty waned as legislation increased in an effort to control, change and deter further offending behaviour, rather than punish (brutally). This says Goodman (2012), is the point at which the use of imprisonment was favoured as a form of punishment, providing for an opportunity to change whilst serving (more generally) as a deterrent to would be criminals.

Importantly, the role of the prison in England and Wales, prior to what Foucault (1977) refers to as ‘the great confinement’, was not necessarily to act as punishment, but more often than not remained the holding centre for sentences and punishments much worse. Custody was however, just one of a range of sentences used in preference to the death penalty throughout the period of the late 18th and 19th centuries, preference given instead to terms of servitude or transportation. Goodman (2012) states that transportation had two distinct advantages over the death penalty; first, it offered the opportunity to show
mercy to an offender; and second, it provided a much needed work force for the continued development and prosperity of the colonies. It was only the end of transportation (1867) that an alternative form of punishment, providing for the same hard work and strict controls, which made the prison an attractive – if somewhat controversial – alternative. Almost a century before John Howard (1777) had noted that if prisons were to be used as a humane form of punishment then there was a need for change, suggesting that prisons were in fact ‘filthy, corrupt-ridden and unhealthy’, and not a decent place to keep a human being (Raynor and Robinson, 2005).

Foucault (1977) maintains that this whole period of history was a period in which there had been a move away from the punishment of the body to one that held mystique and secrecy, producing the greatest optimism, and propelling the prison to the forefront of punishment. Where once punishment had been a public spectacle observed by all, the prison, provided for a punishment hidden behind high walls in silence, away from the outside world, but in easy sight of all those around it. It was this hiding of the punishment, by the mid-point of the 19th century, which according to Foucault, produced an aura of fear. In itself this acted as a deterrence, and thus produced a change in behaviour related to the fear of observation, the public (as well as the offender) regulating their own behaviour.

Yet this notion of private isolation to be feared seems a somewhat narrow observation. As noted previously, punishment was – for Victorians – an opportunity to change and in isolation and servitude the offender could learn anew. This Christian ideal is exemplified in the Quakers notion of a penitentiary, a place where the individual could pay penance before God, and thus prove (his) reform of character and return to society as a better person. This
is not an isolated idea, and is exemplified in two examples. Firstly, Raynor and Robinson (2005: 50) note that supportive evidence can be found for the importance given to rehabilitation stating that by the turn of the 19th century young offenders were being placed into a strict regime of ‘discipline, education, training, exercise and constant activity’, which – through good progress – could lead to an early release. In a second example provided by the same authors, the evidence is no less supportive, although almost 100 years later. Raynor and Robinson (2005: 46) note, change/rehabilitation was a foundation of the Gladstone Committees report in 1895 (para. 25)

> Prison discipline should be more effectually designed to maintain, stimulate or awake the higher susceptibilities of prisoners, to develop their moral instincts, to train them in orderly and industrial habits, and whenever possible to turn them out of prison better men and women, both physically and morally, than when they came in

These two statements provide clear and supportive evidence for the importance placed upon (skill) training and employment throughout the Victorian period.

Garland (1983) has similarly stated that there was some form of support or guidance offered to the first time offenders throughout the period of custodial sentences, and was certainly noticeable by the end of the 19th century, yet it is only in this past century that such a sentence has been given a more formalised setting. It is the conviction in science and rationality, on the one hand, and the belief that the individual could be saved, changed and even transformed, on the other, which really draws attention to the deterrent and rehabilitative ideal of punishment.
The driving force of change, exemplifying the rehabilitative ideal, is possibly rooted in the early work of the predecessors of the probation service and can be considered throughout its history. Whitfield (2001), for example, has suggested that much of the Victorian positivity was exemplified in the work undertaken by the police court missionaries in the late 19th century. To which Canton (2011: 5) has added that this practice of supervision began as an informal and local practice that sought to guide and test those that had been placed ‘on probation: instead of being punished, and on their undertaking of good behaviour, they would be put to the test and given the opportunity to show they could lead good and useful lives’ (emphasis in the original).

For the most part, the prisons, the missionaries and latterly the probation officers, were charged with providing offenders with moral and religious guidance which would move them away from a life of offending, and towards a new life as decent and proper members of society. The prison sought to improve the position of the individual, to enable them to return to the outside community as a more rounded and industrious individual capable of making a fresh start and able to leave the past behind them. This was a way of removing those individuals that posed the greatest risk, to restrict their liberty (for the purpose of protecting others from their behaviour), whilst supporting the offender’s growth, development and rehabilitation (each points which bears remarkable similarities to the current state of affairs through the National Offender Management Service, or NOMS considered in chapter two). Conversely, the missionary’s ideal was based upon the notion that through the establishment of full-time and fixed employment, decent accommodation and health-care, the individual could be provided a fresh start. Then, as today,
rehabilitation (or change in character) was seen as being a key component of a successful punishment; the probation service being asked to view their work through a slightly different lens than the harsh realities of retributive punishment.

With the exception of sound-bite policy, such as the recently stated *Rehabilitation Revolution* (MoJ, 2010), there seems little acknowledgement today of the probation service’s original aims and ethos; for whilst the recent governments of Blair, Brown, and more recently the coalition of the Conservative and Liberal parties (under the leadership of David Cameron and Nick Clegg) have acknowledged the importance of addressing education, health and welfare, the individual is far removed from the debate, governmental priority centred upon protecting the public, and making ‘reassuring noises concerning public safety’ (Nash, 2010: 60). Indeed Nash (2005: 17) has previously stated that ‘…just as governments have to respond to global risks, even though they are often powerless to do anything, so must criminal justice agencies respond to crime concerns’, concerns which in recent years have centred upon risk of harm, public protection and persistent offenders.

**The Middle Years of Probation Practice**

The rehabilitative ideal remained strong throughout the middle years of the 20th century not only because of the endeavour of individuals, but also because of the changing nature of society and the growth and belief in scientific processes as opposed to a faith led belief system. Crime, punishment and (to an extent) the prevailing political understanding of the late 18th and 19th centuries, were based upon notions of free-will, individuality and the political notion of Laissez-faire governance (Whitehead and Statham, 2006). Crime was an act or action that the individual had chosen to undertake and therefore the punishment
received was the responsibility of the offender themselves. Yet, at the end of the 19th century knowledge and understanding grew of the realities of poverty and deprivation, and was further fuelled by a growing development of a scientific basis of knowledge. Thus, discussions of crime (and deviance) slowly turned to notions of behaviour determined in social circumstance.

One such development came from Freud’s lectures on Psycho-analysis (1962/1991), in which he had suggested that all humans had innate urges and drives which needed to be fulfilled (to some extent) and controlled (to another). The urges were the wants and needs every person has and experience in everyday life: food, clothing, shelter, friendships, sexual gratification, understanding, status, wealth, etc. These, he suggested, were controlled by the innate drives, or moral compass: Id, Ego, and Super-Ego. The Id is child-like; it wants and bears no reflection upon the consequence of action. The Super-Ego conversely, is over cautious and protective, considering only the consequence of the act, to the detriment of action. The Ego provides the balance, weighing up both action and consequence to provide for an acceptable outcome. An imbalance would naturally lead to an arrested development. Behaviour and personality were, in part, seen to be an expression of experience. Thus, it was the process of socialisation, through childhood experience and an engagement with family and peers, which informed behaviour. Consequently Freud’s, suggestion of an improperly socialised child developing a disruptive personality may also offer some insight into the development of policies which gave rise to the ASBO and the parenting order as part of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998. For Harrower (1998) and Palmer (2003), the arrested development may also cause him or her to act/react in anti-social, often criminal ways.
As scientific investigation developed, diagnosis, assessment and treatment of behaviour provided for the greatest opportunity of successfully changing the behaviour of the individual. This can be seen in many of the studies undertaken by the social researchers of the 1920s, 1930s, and the 1940s but is perhaps best exemplified in the work conducted concerned with social disorganisation apparent in areas of greatest change and transition (Hester and Eglin, 1992). This was further supported by Sutherland’s discussion of the importance of association and social learning, and relating it to places of social organisation and disorganisation as indicators of criminal involvement (Sutherland, 1939).

Through a clinical dissection of behaviour, crime was seen as the (quantifiable) illness; the diagnosis taken from an examination of the structured social experience; rehabilitation was the expected outcome (prognosis), in which supervision could be seen to support a positive change. It was a rationale which only furthered the position of an individual engaged for the sole purpose of advising, assisting and guiding an offender – the probation officer. Nash (2004: 235) contends that in this positive environment, ‘…with the right guidance and role models alongside work opportunities… they [offenders] could be redeemed’, in custody and the community. Release without any support or guidance had been neither favoured nor successful, and offered the probation service the opportunity to provide aftercare and resettlement which also offered the first rationale for enforcement and desistance. Officers in this way were required to observe, record and report behaviour which could lead to the early termination of the requirement/licence, or conversely – where behaviour was not acceptable – it could also see the offender returned to custody following a breach, or failure, in the requirements.
Senior (2008: 288) has similarly noted that responsibility for ‘after-care’ (resettlement) had been transferred from voluntary and faith-based organisations to the probation service by 1962, providing for a more professionally driven approach ‘...focusing help on the immediate resettlement problems – accommodation, education and training, employment, health and benefits advice, etc.’ and seems the first tangible acknowledgement of the key role played by education, training and employment for the modern probation service. The addition of aftercare would seem to be a natural extension of the remit provided by the probation service under the 1907 Act. Goodman (2008: 43) states that the Home Office paper, *The Adult Offender* (1965) started with a quotation from Sir Alexander Paterson, that ‘You cannot train men for freedom in conditions of captivity,’ and continued by stating that although it may act as a deterrent from future (criminal) behaviour, it would not prepare them for re-entry to the community, and a law-abiding life.

Yet the emphasis on tolerance and understanding as guiding principles ended with the pessimistic discord of the 1970s. As debate turned to arguments that nothing worked in the rehabilitative ideals, so the position of the probation service was moved more to that of community punishment than supporting change through guidance and rehabilitation. Wasik (2008) states that (in terms of sentencing and punishment) following the 1907 Act the next major change for the probation service was the Community Service Order (1972). Whitehead and Statham (2006) argue that this change in direction (although not great) would not have been possible had it not been for a recognition of the role of the probation service throughout the middle period of the 20th century in observing and recording attendance, engagement and change; and secondly, for the greater introduction and use of
non-custodial sentences, during the 1960s. In an effort to combat the rise in custodial sentences and growing recidivism rates, the 1967 Criminal Justice Act focussed on non-custodial punishments, parole and the use of suspended sentences.

The End of a Rehabilitative Ideal

The continued poor success in rehabilitative approaches undertaken left many to question the work being conducted throughout the period of the 1960s and 1970s. There remained no clear evidence of how constructive ‘intervention work’ had been, or indeed, if that work would lead to the offender abstaining from criminal behaviour and led to greater questions of the rehabilitative ideal in general. McGuire goes as far as to say that ‘...the 1970s saw a failure of interventions to impact upon criminal recidivism and coupled with the expanding prison population went some way to explaining the more punitive stance’, which continued throughout the 1980s and 1990s (McGuire, 2002: 6). To this Crow (2001) adds that throughout the period there was a distinctive shift even in the language used to discuss the interventions undertaken with offenders. It moved from treatment and support, to the more punitive description which Mair and Canton (2007) point out had been reflected some years earlier in the title of the white paper The War against Crime in England and Wales 1959-1964. This suggested a penalty, punishment, or just deserts aimed at shifting the responsibility for offending back onto the individual. In a similar way, the preferred academic discussion turned from that of rehabilitation to desistance, being to stop and abstain from the same or similar behaviour in the future, an ideal highlighted in the definitions provided by Farrall (2002), Maruna (2001; 2012) and McNeill and Weaver (2010), discussed earlier in this and the introductory chapter.
The Community Service Order offered a viable alternative to short-term prison sentences and as such provided a punitive element to non-custodial sentences sought by many in political circles. Indeed, each of the additions to the work of the probation service, up to that point, had been seen as an extension of the rehabilitative ideal, set out in its purpose to ‘advise, assist, and befriend’. Parole, says Senior (2008), was introduced through the probation service in recognition of the difficulties inherent in the resettlement process following a lengthy custodial sentence. Similarly, the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act (1974) was an attempt to provide guidance and advice to offenders, supervising officers, the courts, and even employers about the offender and the offence committed and any restrictions that may arise in their employment (see the NACRO Quick Guide to the ROA (1974), Appendix: 1). This provided a set period of time in which the offender was required, by law, to provide information about their offending history to employers, training providers, education establishments, etc. Whitfield (2001) notes that prior to the introduction of the 1974 Act guidance was ad hoc, or disjointed, at best. The Act being the first comprehensive document to direct individuals to their roles and responsibilities and afforded them a point in time when they no longer needed to redress past misdemeanours.

Each also provides for an element of control in the individual's behaviour, and the development of such policies gives weight to Hill’s argument of theories of power and control (2009), evident in the change of language and the decline of a rehabilitative ideal. Thus, parole would be granted if it was felt that the offender had achieved a significant change in behaviour, posing less of a risk of re-offending in the future. Young (1999) states that changes in language also come with the additional baggage of labelling. By setting the requirements to inform or prove a change in behaviour, offenders are continually reminded
of their offending behaviour, which they are trying to leave behind. Subsequently, Young concludes that in applying the label, there is the maintenance of control and thus a position of power over the individual. It is a position that is clearly represented in the use of the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act providing further checks and controls, requiring the offender to provide proof of a change in behaviour through a prolonged period of desistance and thus maintaining the label (far beyond the sentence period), power relations and social order in the community, through the threat of further periods of incarceration.

Indeed, a system of tougher controls within the community also provides for further economic benefits to the system. This can be evidenced through the introduction of Community Service (noted earlier), a punishment which provides for free-labour on the basis of offending the community, yet provides little opportunity for reform to take place if the tasks are menial and petty, requiring little or no skill, knowledge or training. Whether the parole system was set up to provide for such controls in behaviour, or to provide economic savings is beyond the remit of this chapter, but they are undoubtedly positive outcomes for the government departments involved. The reduction in the prison population provided by these two measures (parole and community service) also provides for a reduction in the associated costs of housing, security, health care, staffing, etc., which Dunbar and Langdon (1998) have suggested can also be seen as producing a safety valve for the custodial estate.

There is little doubt that this was a period of massive change and development not only for the probation service, but in wider society as well, and can be supported in a number of ways (Savage and Robins, 1990). In the first place, in 1942, Sir William Beveridge had
identified the need for what popularly became known as the welfare state to counter-act the cycle of deprivation which had been witnessed during the 1920s and the great depression of the early 1930s. Beveridge’s plan was to provide for a system of social support which included social security and a national health service, paid for (in part) by contributions drawn directly from the wages earned; free secondary education, which was to supplement primary education; social housing – run and maintained by local authorities; and a system of full employment. Second, disposable income had led to a rise in consumerism, in part evidenced by changes taking place in the youth culture. Cohen (1985) notes the concern with delinquency, and in particular the perceived delinquency of youth culture and crime, not least evident in the drug culture of the late 1960s. Thirdly, this whole period bears a striking resemblance to the preceding century, following periods of economic boom and bust. Indeed, Britain had once again witnessed an economic boom (following the end of the Second World War and) throughout the 1950s, but by the start of the 1970s Britain was experiencing massive economic decline, perpetuated by the oil crisis and stock-market collapse (1973-1974). In the 1950s the average unemployment rate was around 3%, in 1970 unemployment was recorded at 640,000 people (around 6%) and by 1979 it was more than double that, with a national figure of some 1.3 million people (12.5%) unemployed (Whitehead and Statham, 2006).

This had further implications for those with criminal convictions. As more people became unemployed, employers recognised that they now had the opportunity to select from a wider base than had existed during the so-called ‘Golden Age’ of the 1950s. High unemployment has the effect of causing a rise in applications and as such employers are similarly able to inflate the requirements of applicants, whilst maintaining the conditions of
employment. Cohen (1985: 44) goes on to note the increased discontent in the ability of the system to reduce crime, stating that community control ‘...supplemented rather than replaced traditional methods’. He has concluded that if the custodial system has remained constant and community control has increased, then the (whole of the corrections) system must be getting larger.

Finally, this would also have produced growing animosity toward the rehabilitative ideal. Offenders securing education and employment opportunities based upon the notion of past, poor socialisation would only have fuelled greater criticism. This followed the use of non-custodial penalties throughout successive decades, and which can be witnessed in the debates held in the House of Lords (Hansard, HL, 1993), and stories in the media of young offenders being sent for holidays abroad (BBC, 1998).

**Steps towards Management**

An ever increasing prison population (and with it a massive rise in cost), the need for a more professional service to provide for the supervision, care, control and punishment of offenders, and a loss of faith in the rehabilitative ideology of the post war years, seems to have added pressure to move the probation service towards a more punitive stance within the criminal justice system. Whitehead and Statham note that as the numbers of offenders rose, so too did the need for a managerially guided service, bringing it ‘...into much closer cooperation with the [wider] penal system’ (2006: 51), resulting in a greater need for bureaucracy and accountability.
By the end of the 1970s a new political ideology had taken hold in England, which Oldfield (2002) has suggested is a neo-liberal, as opposed to the welfare model which had existed from the end of the 19th through to the latter part of the 20th century. It was a form of governance which sought to restore the individual and withdraw the social (central) controls which had been in place since the end of the 1940s. The social, political and criminal justice landscape then, was in some turmoil. Unemployment, as previously noted, was continuing to rise, reaching a high of a little over 3 million people in January 1982, a figure not recorded since the depression of the 1930s. Riots took place in many of the major cities around England, in part caused by feelings of social deprivation, but to which Lord Scarman added noticeable racial tensions experienced within British society, stopping short of suggesting that these racial tensions existed on an institutional level. Finally, strong policing tactics experienced in the Miner’s Strikes of 1982, only added to the loss of faith that the criminal justice system was already experiencing.

For the probation service, the 1980s were confusing as the emphasis continued to move away from the social ethos of the service but provided a great opportunity to shine, which more than once saw the Home Office refer to community orders as being the alternative to custody. This says Mair (2004), placed the probation service centre stage in the criminal justice system. In fact, by the end of the 1980s the Home Office was praising the work of the probation service, suggesting that in terms of non-custodial punishment, no other service was better placed to supervise offenders in the community (HO, 1988a). In contrast, Rumgay (1989) questions whether this enthusiasm for the service as a provider of punishment, was actually the view of the service or its staff at all. To Rumgay (1989) the probation service was quiet and unassuming, ‘thrust into the limelight... for alternatives to
custody’, which was caused – at least to some degree – by the criticisms of the nothing works debate and in recognition of the limited capacity in the custodial estate, which could only be countered by the development of non-custodial sentences that had some positive effect upon the reoffending rates.

The contradictions felt, effectively asked the probation service to look at its self more critically (Rumgay, 1989). The role of the probation service to enact change through a process of advising and assisting the offender had sat well with the ideology of the 19th and early-20th century, emphasising the social position of the individual and led by an emphasis upon a change through education, welfare and employment. Yet, this did not fit with the manifesto of the Conservative government throughout the 1980s and well into the 1990s, which took a much harder line on the issues of law and order. Critically, as noted earlier in the chapter, the move toward a more bureaucratic, managerial model placed a greater emphasis upon the role of the probation service as an agency of criminal justice and not one of social work (Goodman, 2012). For this there were NGOs (non-governmental organisations) such as NACRO whom had set up their first workshop to help the offender find suitable training and employment in Manchester in 1973 (NACRO, 2006).

This was important for two reasons. Firstly, as the probation service was being told that it needed to get tougher, the Conservative government were also looking for effective means of reducing costs in the public sector. Between 1983 and 1987 they began the selling off of a number of public assets, including British Telecom, British Gas and British Airways, which produced the net result of reducing public expenditure, but also provided for welcome tax cuts (Elliott and Treanor, 2000). Secondly, the use of NGOs provided an opportunity to
streamline services and concentrate efforts on issues of repeat offenders, dangerousness and the escalating youth offending. Whitehead and Statham (2006) state that the green paper entitled *Supervision and Punishment in the Community: A Framework for Action* (HO, 1990), placed greater emphasis upon the probation service to provide discipline and control, protection for the public, challenge offending behaviour and its effects upon the victim, a role which has continued to guide the probation service well into the 21st century. Tougher punishments called for stricter personnel and the probation service was highlighted as potential employment for personnel leaving the armed-forces, another area which was to see large numbers of redundancy during the 1980s and 1990s (Annison, 2013). Armed service personnel had the discipline and work ethic which could be put to great effect in the management of offenders, and would remove the popular image of ‘left-wing... politically correct’, soft on crime’ liberal social workers (Raynor and Vanstone, 2007: 68). Nash (2001: 66) notes an air of vulnerability about the service’s core tasks being pushed out to the private and voluntary sector.

This was an interesting turn of events, and one which is central to the debate which unfolds in the discussion of criminal justice policy presented in the following chapter however, it is also important to state here that this move toward punishment was highlighted in the political statements well before the changes came to bear on the service. ‘Many in the Probation Service saw the election of Margaret Thatcher... as an immediate threat to its future’, says Nash (2004: 237) and concludes that in a return to classical philosophies, ‘...Government declared that people chose to offend and were not driven to it’ (ibid).
By the end of the 1980s the concern over potentially dangerous or persistent offenders had gained momentum (Kemshall, 2002). By 1988 the Home Office was instructing local probation services to keep registers of all offenders considered to be a ‘risk’ of offending and released two papers, the first *Punishment, Custody and the Community* (1988a) and the second (delivered as Part b) entitled: *Tackling Offending: An Action Plan* (1988b). The first (White Paper) was concerned with the rising numbers of offenders given custodial sentences, believing that whilst for many this was the most effective punishment, for a growing number of offenders, this was not appropriate. In striking contrast to much of the pessimistic discourse of the period, was added the suggestion that ‘If they can develop the skills necessary for life and work, this should encourage greater self-reliance and respect for others; there should be less incentive to offend again’ (HO, 1988a: 1).

As a consequence, the second paper (more commonly referred to as the peppermint paper) required all local probation services in England and Wales to construct an action plan made up of more demanding community disposals to deal with offenders that were considered at risk of custody (HO, 1988b). In the opening paragraphs, it is noted that there was hope that policies could be developed that harnessed ‘the resources of the community and the various criminal justice services more effectively...’ in dealing with offending (HO, 1988b: 1). Furthermore, it was suggested that offenders should be ‘...brought to recognise obligations to society, family and friends, and to develop self-respect and respect for others’ and concluded that the consequence of even a short custodial sentence was ‘...likely to confirm them as criminals.’ (HO, 1988b: 2).
Individual Management and a Changing Ethos

On the back of this, the 1990s appeared to provide for greater optimism. As was previously noted, McGuire (2002) has stated that the period of the 1970s to the end of the 1980s was seen as a failure of the rehabilitative ideal, yet Smith (2004) has suggested that the 1990s saw a growth and development of the rehabilitative ideal fashioned in the restoration of psychology and its ability to support change through programmes of intervention (a discussion returned to in the following chapters). Similar evidence can be found in the work of North (1994), noting that the government white paper Crime, Justice and Protecting the Public (HO, 1990), had stated that prison was ineffective, only succeeding in making bad people worse. What was required was something which helped to support a change in behaviour and a move away from offending behaviour. Cavadino and Dignan (2007: 7) suggest that in response to this the Criminal Justice Act 1991 was seen to be the most ‘...radical legislative reform to the penal system since the Second World War’, which sought to reduce the custodial population by expanding further upon the use of punishment in the community. Ashworth (2010) adds that the aim of the 1991 Act was to provide for a twin-tracking of sentencing policy. Importantly, this would see only those deemed to be a danger, or convicted of the most serious of offences, such as sexual, violent, or the most persistent offenders, sentenced to custody; and with all other offenders receiving some form of community sentence: Discharge, Fine, Curfew, Community Service, Supervision or Combination Order.

In essence, the Act sought to recognise that prison was not always an effective means of punishment. The very nature of a punitive system, which placed greater emphasis upon the use of custody, would only succeed in exposing minor offenders to those with longer,
perhaps more serious, criminal careers (Gendreau, Goggin and Cullen, 1999). In a continuance of their policy formation of the 1980s, North (1994) states that the Act relied heavily upon the notion of ‘just deserts’; as the offender was seen as a responsible individual having made the choice to offend, they had the right to a sentence, and to be punished, in a way that was proportionate to the crime, but no more. The 1991 Act reinforced the principle of ‘proportionality’, rather than an increasing use of imprisonment, offenders considered to be low-medium risk of (re)offending could expect to serve punishment in the community. The premise of proportionality is nothing new however, closely reflecting the ideals of the Classical school of criminology which had prevailed throughout the much more rehabilitative notions of the Victorian period (discussed at the start of this chapter), and the words of Beccaria, over two hundred years previous:

\[
\text{Punishments should be proportionate to one another; they should also be proportionate to the crime, not just in their severity, but in the manner in which they are carried out}
\]

\[\text{Beccaria, 1764: 55}\]

Critically however, the 1991 Act provided for the supervision order as a sentence in its own right (Mair and Canton, 2007). A court could now order their supervision in the community and a failure to comply (or to breach the order) was seen to be an offence in its own right (this position was further clarified in the Crime Sentences Act 1997 S.38, which Canton (2011: 59) states removed the need for the consent of the offender to most community orders). Community Sentences had become more punitive, reflected in the statement of Bottoms (1977), concerning the need for the separation of dangerous, persistent offenders from the more mundane (less serious) offenders, resulting in a system of punitive bifurcation, or twin-tracking. It offered an opportunity to retain the position of custody for
the most serious or persistent offenders, and was based on the notion of risk rather than offence, on the grounds of public protection (Dunbar and Langdon, 1998). However, it also enabled the government the additional opportunity to increase the punitive nature of the probation service, and other community sentences (Mair and Canton, 2007).

This was supported through the introduction of the first set of National Standards for the probation service and for the supervision of offenders in the community (Allen, 1992). The probation service had undergone some restructuring and change following the Statement of National Objectives and Priorities (1984), which offered the probation service a move away from focussing on ‘…minor delinquents in need of social work intervention towards working with categories of offenders considered to be a risk to society’ (Sparrow, Brooks and Webb, 2002: 33). Nash (2001: 56-57) draws similar conclusions, suggesting that the introduction of national standards resulted in a ‘…reduction in professional autonomy and increase in central direction’. This, he says, supported a range of ‘management initiatives’, which shifted the balance, between the Home Office and what had been relatively independent local services. This was further added to by the document produced by the Association of Chief Officers of Probation entitled More Demanding than Prison (ACOP, 1988) as they sought to prove that the probation service could be just as tough (if not more so) than a short-term prison sentence. With its role more clearly aligned with the other agencies of the criminal justice system, the probation service moved significantly away from its founding ethos, which offered guidance and advice, and more towards a service of punishment and control which only compounded the constant state of anxiety about its future (Mair, 2004).
National standards had provided community service with a clear understanding of what was expected in service provision and provided for greater consistency in practice. Therefore, it would seem only natural to develop similar principles for the whole of the probation service. Indeed, Allen (1992: 5) concludes that national standards built upon good practice and provided a common framework of expectation, concluding that ‘While the standards encourage the use of professional skills, judgement and initiative, …they also offer a common basis for demonstrating accountability and achievement; and for maintaining and increasing the confidence of the courts and the public in community based work’. However, this seems less than accurate. Whilst it is true that the probation service found itself with common goals, objectives, and targets, it also provided for a tick-box mentality which required little or no professional relationship, judgement, discretion, and/or case knowledge. Oldfield (2002: 12) has suggested that what remained is a managerial system ‘…of monitoring, audit and inspection’, one in which rehabilitation becomes of secondary concern.

The 1993 Criminal Justice Act reversed much of the good to be achieved under the 1991 Act. Firstly, it reversed the restrictions placed upon the court for information regarding previous offences. Whitehead and Statham (2006) suggest that the 1991 Act had sent mixed messages. It had meant to focus the court report (Social Enquiry Report, later to become the Pre-Sentence Report, and Specific Sentence Report) and its writer, on the current offence before the court. With the exception of sexual and violent offences (which remained exempt from this provision), it had in fact tied their hands and left the courts short of information regarding the individuals’ behaviour, offences and response to previous sentences. Second, the 1993 Act removed the provision of the unit fine and replaced it with
a system of fixed penalties, but reminded the courts to take account of the financial circumstance of the offender before setting the financial penalty (Dunbar and Langdon, 1998). Consequently, Ashworth (2010) argues that with the notable exception of the enduring profile of dangerousness and persistent offenders, throughout the 1990s and 2000s, following changes made in the Criminal Justice Act 1993, the 1991 Act was rarely referred to again.

A number of authors (including Ashworth, 2010; and Hucklesby and Marshall, 2000) note that events took place over the following 18 months, which made the 1991 Act almost untenable leading to the so-called law and order counter-reformation, which took place under the leadership of John Major, and which is synonymous with Michael Howard’s statement at the Conservative Party conference of that same year that ‘prison works’ (Burnett and Maruna, 2004).

Whilst enacting change remained high on the agenda of the probation service and the Conservative government, rehabilitation and notions of social support waned in light of a number of tragic events that were to take place. Hucklesby and Marshall (2000) for example, make reference to a spate of high-profile offences which had been carried out by persons bailed by the courts and awaiting trial, and who (they suggest) were popularly referred to as Bail Bandits, in the local and national media. Similarly, media debate about the rise in persistent young offenders only added fuel to the fire, and was no doubt, further highlighted by the murders of James Bulger in February, and Stephen Lawrence in April, 1993. Government, it seems, was left with little choice but to pay greater attention to the media fuelled public outcry, resulting in the prime minister’s statement that “we” – as a
society – should understand a little less and condemn a little more (MacIntyre, 1993). As Crow (2001) notes, this increased the emphasis being placed upon the offence and behaviour, rather than the background and social circumstance of the offender.

For the probation service the 1990s were of great interest, not least because of the change in role and ethos that was seen, but also through a change in the training of new officers, as they moved away from the social worker qualification, which had followed more closely the original auspice of the probation service and concentrated far more closely upon the issues of public protection, risk of harm and the management of behaviour (a discussion which is returned to in chapter 2). As Whitehead and Statham (2006) correctly state, if there is a wish to change the direction of an organisation the easiest way is to change the staff in it. This brought with it even greater moves toward a more managerially led service and provided a greater opportunity for specialism, and although the auspice to advise, assist and befriend remained, for the main grade probation officer, it was very much an ethos in decline. Specialism meant that although the probation officer was responsible for the case work undertaken with the offender, there was also recognition that offenders often led chaotic and disjointed life-styles, which required the support and guidance of very specific professional services, such as drug misuse counselling, health and welfare, and that if left to their own devices, they were likely to offend once more.

Nutley and Davies (1999) suggest that these changes took place amidst a period of renewed optimism that in fact ‘some things do work’, and it is of no surprise that the conclusion that some approaches work better than others, fed directly into the government’s interest in more structured ways of working with offenders. In this way a move towards a greater use
of partnerships and targeted intervention for offenders provided the cost-effective and efficient systems government was looking for in light of the growing prison population, escalating costs within the penal system and a loss of direction for the probation service. Conversely, Nash (2001) has argued that the probation service had little ability to resist change, owing to the growing numbers of alternative providers that could play a part in the management of community justice. As the voice of the service, all that ACOP could do – it seems – was to help influence or shape the policy (as they had tried to do with the paper More Demanding than Prison, highlighted above) and the impact that the changes would have, thereby limiting the opportunity for other organisations to encroach upon the work of the probation services.

Conclusion

Importantly for this discussion potential difficulty lies in the move towards a more managerially focussed service that has also brought with it even more confusion for the offender and the officers. The probation service was born of an ethos that first provided support and guidance in an effort to change behaviour based in the welfare(ist) social discourse of the late 19th - to- mid 20th centuries, to the more neo-liberal base which has seen a return to a blame culture which has placed the action and decisions taken firmly at the feet of the offender. However, the rehabilitative ideal has remained true throughout the history of the probation service and wider criminal justice ethos, even when it has been relegated to the shadows of a managerial system. Individuals, offender or not, are a product of their social environment and the ways in which they experience that environment, their behaviour a consequence of that experience. Their exclusion – whether through transportation, custody or death – has never led to a circumstance where crime has
been successfully ended, but where they return, it has brought with it greater need, exclusion and fear of the ‘other’ (Ward and Maruna, 2007).

Chapter two reflects upon a number of the changes in policy that were to take place at the end of the 20th and in to the early 21st centuries, driven – at least in part – by an increasing prison population, and a change in emphasis for the probation service which saw it move further toward management, control, enforcement and punishment (Boateng, 1999), whilst maintaining a hand in a change in behaviour. This included the first legislative recognition of the importance of employment, providing for an intervention to support offenders in securing the training and/or education they needed to attain, sustain and maintain employment and thus reduce re-offending. Political change and developments in policy regarding rehabilitation and personal change are important because academic discourse considered in chapters 3 (regarding interventions) and chapter 6 (a discussion of the findings from this research thesis) also point to a growing body of evidence surrounding the development of personal (and social) skills key to feelings of social responsibility, attachment and engagement, rather than isolation and exclusion.
Chapter 2: Confusion, Criticism and Change.

Although providing for an historic debate, the previous chapter also set the context for the development of a structured platform for interventions to take place (discussions focussed upon in chapter 3). It highlighted the very contradictory nature of the work undertaken and the changing ethos that guided the work and principles of the probation service in England and Wales. Mair (2004), McNeill (2004), and others have suggested that there exists evidence that the probation service was being pushed towards becoming a punitive service, one which was to be guided by the need to manage risk and provide for greater public protection. However, this neoliberal view frequently neglects the needs of those most often requiring the greatest support and guidance following offending and most certainly when they begin to rebuild their lives (see for example, Maruna, 2011; Wacquant, 2011; Bain, 2005; and McGuire, 2004).

This next chapter concludes the historical discourse (Aim 1), considering the role of policy and practice which began in the 1980s and has continued beyond the first decade of the 21st century. It is a period which has seen the ever increasing drive toward correctionalism and with it individual responsibility (McNeill, 2004), but which is also an important period for the development of such services as ETE. It has also seen the first discussion of the important role played by such services in the support of change, appearing in government research and development (SEU, 2002); as a specified activity (as part of the CJA, 2003); and in the white paper Breaking the Cycle (MoJ, 2010). The chapter explores the changing ethos of the probation service and its impact upon the work done, the support provided to the offender, and the introduction of the non-qualified/part-qualified (interventions) officer. Each of these
points may have added to, or resulted from, moves to ever increasing central control, and the joining up of services to provide for end-to-end management which was guided by contestability, effectiveness and efficiency.

Crime and the Influence of Circumstance

Although the emphasis of the work undertaken by probation service was to change a great deal throughout the 1990s and well into the 2000s, it is not to say that innovative ways of working with offenders or partnerships had not existed before. However when it did take place, it tended to be on a voluntary and often ad hoc basis (Maguire and Raynor, 2010), which lacked central government support, relying entirely upon funding from the local probation area, or charitable organisations. Whitehead and Statham (2006) provide a number of examples of day centres and drop-in services to describe the work carried out throughout the 1970s and 1980s, which could offer guidance on (amongst other things) skills and employment. Attendance was often based upon the number of (punitive) hours that were ordered by the courts, with services offered on a voluntary basis to those serving less than 12 months. The suggestion was that these services would act as a safety net, providing for a structured environment in which the offenders could get support and guidance not readily available elsewhere (Nash, 2001). In addition to day centres, other areas had similar experiences offered by groups such as NACRO and other NGOs (see chapter 1: p33), and which provided the fore-runner of the service provided firstly by the Sports Counsellors (SC) and Community Links Officers (CLO), and the Employment, Training and Education Officer (ETEO), from the beginning of the 1990s (Creasey, 2005).
Although discussed later in the text (see for example the discussion of ETE as an intervention in chapter 3) it is perhaps worth briefly highlighting these developments here in order to contextualise the changing role of interventions that was to take place during the 1990s. Gibbs (1998) notes that a host of organisations and projects were contracted throughout the early-mid 1990s and included (but were not limited to) women’s groups, disability, motor vehicle, and leisure groups. The research area staffed and developed the role of a Sports Counsellor in order to occupy the offenders on a day-to-day basis in a constructive and purposeful manner. This role made use of sport to guide and motivate change, a role that also included leisure, volunteering and outdoor pursuits, not dissimilar to those highlighted by Gibbs (1998). By the end of the 1990s the role had changed significantly, with staff employed on the basis of specific knowledge that could support a change in behaviour through education, benefits and debt management, skills and employment training, and housing, as well as recreation and health. These individuals were specifically employed by the probation service to provide the guidance and support that had previously been a role of the probation officer and were referred to in the research area as Community Links Officers (CLO). CLOs would source grants for equipment and clothing to help the offenders gain places on training programmes, which could be used to further develop the skills and knowledge of the offender and support them in securing employment.

However, this form of intervention was not necessarily the normal experience of all offenders. In a national survey conducted by Walmsley, Howard and White (1992), one third of offenders were found to be unemployed prior to receiving a custodial sentence, a figure, says Crow (2001), that increased still further following the end of the sentence.
Where issues of unemployment (as well as other social factors) had been resolved, Farrall (2002, 2004) found that terms of desistance were far more successful. In contrast, John Major’s statement that ‘Society needs to condemn a little more and understand a little less’ (MacIntyre, 1993: para 1), highlighted the calls for a strengthening of criminal justice policy. Yet there may also have been a secondary and perhaps more influential reason for the political hardening toward offenders, and that was the emergence of the New Labour party under the leadership of Tony Blair.

Mair (2004: 18) states that ‘...policies are about choices and these choices are made by individuals who always have personal stakes in the situation’. This was clear in the statement made by Tony Blair as the Shadow Home Secretary (1993), suggesting that there needed to be a realistic recognition that crime was influenced by circumstance. Policy would be formulated under a New Labour government, he said, that would be both tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime; a statement that was to become the political mantra of the Labour party, throughout his period of leadership.

For the probation service, Howard’s statement that prison works, only served to compound the state of confusion. Only a few years before, community penalties had been hailed as the way forward, enabling effective work with offenders and a reduction in a hugely overpopulated prison system (HO, 1988a). Indeed, much of the academic research seemed to be in support of this. Howard’s position was clearly set against this and offered the judiciary release by stating that ‘I do not flinch... We shall no longer judge the success of our system of justice by a fall in our prison population’ (Dunbar and Langdon, 1998: 115).
Walklate (2001) notes that this popular political statement may have occurred in direct response to the growing voice of the victim of crime. The implication of Howard’s words suggested that to argue against the use of imprisonment, was to ignore the victim, and also suggested a lack of concern for the public at large. For Walklate (2001) the implications are that statements such as these add weight to the argument that the victim of crime has increasingly been used to provide a justification for a more punitive stance on crime and criminal behaviour. What seems missing from such a position is the concern that many offenders are/were also likely to be victims of criminal behaviour. Raynor (2007) notes that the continued drive toward punitivism left the probation service in need of a new direction and more effective way of working with offenders, which became known as the ‘What Works?’ debate, developed from the meta-analytic studies of the 1980s-1990s.

It seems clear that politically the more traditional work of the probation service, providing for a case worker (trained in the social work ethos) was no longer considered appropriate for dealing with offenders. Since the introduction of the green paper *Supervision and Punishment in the Community* (HO, 1990), the probation service had been told that ‘...it was a criminal justice not social work agency’ (Whitehead and Statham, 2006: 113). Its role was concern for the victim, the protection of the public, and to challenge offending behaviour, and resulted in a rather more fragmented system in which case work became increasingly more specialised and often required the offender to work with an increasing number of individuals in addition to the probation officer (Robinson and Crow, 2009). However, Rex (1999) found that this was to the detriment of work carried out with offenders and noted that those who reported that they had built a relationship and felt engaged by an officer were more likely to report a positive outcome from supervision. This has been similarly
noted in a number of more recent studies, concerning what the Exodus study has termed soft skills, or soft outcomes (Jacobson and Chenery, 2008). The suggestion here is that sustained employment – as an outcome – does not take place in a vacuum, but is often dependent upon other factors within the individual’s life. Indeed, in his seminal work Farrall (2002) noted that in terms of a desistance-focus, supporting change, there was a need to meet the concerns of the offender, rather than the concerns of the criminal justice system, a position further highlighted in the discussion of the findings in Chapter 6.

By 1994 the government had set definable targets, measurable outcomes and a set of key performance indicators. Thus, the probation service was faced with a progressive move towards becoming a more robust agency of criminal justice (Whitehead and Statham, 2006). This was only furthered by the political wrangling of the Conservative and Labour parties in the media as the country headed toward the 1997 general election (Millie, Jacobson, and Hough, 2003).

There were a number of consequences of the populist policies of the 1990s. In 1995 the government again revised National Standards for the probation service which, says Hedderman and Hough (2004), provided for greater restrictions upon the discretion of officers. In particular, Dunbar and Langdon (1998) point out that the 1991 Act was based on a number of years of consultation, where in contrast the 1996 Crime (Sentencing) Bill was rushed through, ensuring that it was ready for the Conservative Party conference in the October. Where the 1991 Act had sought to provide for a clear direction for the parole system, the 1996 Bill acted to withdraw it. In a similar way, the 1991 Act was a move away from the (inappropriate) use of imprisonment in favour of community based sanctions for
those non-violent offenders, which could support change in behaviour, and yet by 1996 the message was clearly far more punitive and enthusiastically applied the use of custodial sentences (Dunbar and Langdon, 1998). This would seem to be further evidenced in interviews that Millie et al. (2003: 370), conducted with five senior judges. In this instance the belief was that as a consequence of ‘changes in the climate of opinion’, sentencing severity had increased. ‘One [senior judge], for example, commented that the rise in the prison population had been caused by ‘external pressure’, that is, the public’s desire to see people punished’.

It was against this back-drop of public and political hardening that Howard was able to suggest a link between the falling (recorded) crime figures and the sharp increase in the prison population (Hicks and Allen, 1999), rising from a figure of 44,800 (1991) to – what was then – an all time high of 55,300 (1996). This provided further supporting evidence for the deterrent effect the Conservative government expected to arise from the further freedoms they had given the judiciary to make use of custody. However, criticism surrounded the use of such populist policy which saw a ratcheting-up of the system in an effort to appear ever more ready to put the victim first. Dunbar and Langdon (1998: 135) for instance, suggest that the setting of ‘...mandatory minimum sentencing is a gross interference with the courts’ ability to deal with different cases differently, according to the circumstances of the offence and the offender’. The further implications of such a move would be the continued and unsustainable increase in the prison population.
Conversely, as suggested by Blair’s statement, criminal behaviour does not take place in isolation, but must be understood in context in order to provide a constructive framework within which to reduce the likelihood of it happening again. Whitehead and Statham (2006) conclude that the 1990s was a period which saw ever increasing political pressure to remove the social from the individual and to place responsibility firmly upon the offender for their behaviour (Kemshall, 2002). Conversely, Wacquant (2011) has argued that at present society is faced by a system that is divided between social policy and penal policy, when in reality what is needed is a return to discussions of poverty policy. It is no secret, he says, that the use of prison has been expanding at an ever greater rate, and yet it is invariably a system that is filling up with the poor; those driven to rash decisions based upon need.

Similarly then, when understood in these terms, Hill (2009) provides a compelling argument for a rational choice theory, suggesting that people make choices to act in their own best interest, based upon the relative risk and reward offered. Therefore, in his discussion of public policy, Hill argues that (criminal justice) policy should increase the risk and lower the relative reward thereby formulating a deterrent effect. Burnett and Maruna (2004: 391) state that such ideals appeal ‘...to the reactionary politics of the time by arguing against welfare dependency and calling for a return to moral discipline, family values and individual responsibility, more social controls and less welfare dependency’. This would seem to be more than a retrograde step, as what can be taken from these arguments is the need to provide for a system more able to support change and enable the offender to make amends.
for their behaviour, which ultimately enables the rehabilitative ideal identified in the introductory chapter and chapter one of this present study.

The neglect, which Hill (2009), Wacquant (2011) and Burnett and Maruna (2004) make reference to, may be evidenced in a number of ways. First, the requirement for probation officer training in England and Wales changed and removed the need for officers to be trained in social work (a position which was not followed in Scotland), and provided further evidence of a move toward a punitive service (Savage and Nash, 2001). The incoming Labour government (1997) recommended that a new training programme should include an emphasis upon the need for public protection, a reduction in re-offending, and effective work with offenders (or challenging offending behaviour). The new programme of study linked a full-time degree programme in Community Justice (studied over a period of two years) with an NVQ IV: Community Justice, which would be supported through on-the-job experience and further training, leading to the award of a Diploma in Probation Studies, and qualified status (Chui and Nellis, 2003). Perhaps more significantly, what the new training regime did was to change the whole value set of the service, which undermined any remaining notions of assistance and understanding and replaced them with greater examples of governance and control. The new qualification (framework) highlighted the need for greater identification of risk and risk management, and removed much of the professional discretion that officers had enjoyed, requiring a much more stringent adherence to procedure and uniformity (Chui and Nellis, 2003).

Second, although the Labour government continued to support change through public expenditure to enable people to realise their potential (Savage and Nash, 2001), little
evidence exists to support the claim that the government was tough on the causes of crime (Bain and Parkinson, 2010). For example, funding was extended to improve individual access to education, healthcare, and employment, etc. However, further barriers were put in place to restrict and control those that worked in industries which previously had high offender populations. This is exemplified by the introduction of the CSCS card for the building and construction industry which limited employment to those that had successfully completed a course of study, further alienating those with a poor or low educational standard. In addition to this, there was a continued push to repackage and toughen up community sentences, and a move toward a greater emphasis being placed upon the ‘What Works’ debate, providing for greater evidence, efficiency, and effective intervention.

The last year of the 1990s had seen a reduction in the recorded crime figures by some 1.2% on the previous year (although this may also be a consequence of the change in counting rules), yet did not slow or halt the growing public fear of crime and anti-social behaviour as reported in the national media. Indeed, Altheide (2009: 80) suggests that the media are often credited with promoting a moral panic and ‘...contributing to exaggerated public fears that support social control efforts and public policy changes designed to reign in anti-social behavior (sic) associated with deviance, crime and social disorder’, which to some degree is evidenced by the introduction of the Anti-Social Behaviour Order (ASBO) as part of the Crime and Disorder Act, 1998.

Centralising, Nationalising and Governing Probation

The advent of a Labour government also saw a renewed enthusiasm for the work of the probation service. It was a period which brought with it a drive toward a greater
understanding of what was effective in dealing with offending behaviour and how to control that behaviour, for which the probation service seemed to be in a perfect situation to support. The probation service was at the centre of the criminal justice system, preparing court reports, supervising offenders on licence or made subject to a court order, whilst also dealing with parole, the victim, and the prison service on a case-by-case basis. However, although the numbers of cases had expanded, the numbers of qualified staff had not, leaving a (probation) service woefully unable to cope. This was a position further exacerbated by Michael Howard’s statement that no new probation officers were to be trained in a system with social work at its heart, leaving the probation service short of newly qualified staff for a period of four years, a period more commonly referred to as the Howard gap (Annison, 2013). It seems inevitable then that as the numbers of qualified officers declined, and caseloads expanded, the important work undertaken by non-qualified staff only increased. Indeed, Annison (2013) has added that by the end of the 1990s PSO numbers had increased by 2.5 times.

The emphasis placed upon greater use of non-qualified staff also explains the move toward their partial qualification at the end of the 1990s. Initially, PSOs had been employed to support the work conducted by the probation officer, but increasingly toward the end of the 20th century saw the inclusion of their own caseloads (with often low level, low risk offenders), and specialisation. PSOs in community supervision teams were trained to the level of an NVQ III in Community Justice, which also has some bearing upon the government’s decision to set this as the criteria for running many of the group programmes (Bailey, Knight and Williams, 2007). Indeed, in the training of the PSO grade, the government was also able to further develop the drive for economic savings. This is a clear
reflection of similar moves developed in the police service, which saw the introduction of the Police Community Support Officer (PCSO) in 2002. When introduced PCSOs had little more than the civil powers of arrest, but it provided for a very public and visible show of force, providing the general public with a uniform on the streets, at a greatly reduced cost.

The development of the PSO role supported similar ideas, picking up on the high numbers of low risk offender groups, which enabled a better tasking of trained officers and resources to deal with high risk, persistent offenders (Bailey, Knight and Williams, 2007). However, HMIP figures for the same period suggest that as much as 80 per cent of serious further offences (SFO’s) were committed by low to medium risk offenders, supervised by PSOs (Nash and Williams, 2008). Such evidence would seem to support the argument for an increase in the numbers of qualified officers, rather than a decrease, and has led to questions regarding the development of the less qualified PSO role, in which the responsibilities and boundaries were continually blurred as further specialism’s developed.

An example of this was the ETE Officers (as interventions officers) who were required to undertake an NVQ III: Advice and Guidance, thus providing for a more professionally defined role (see Appendix 2: The ETE Job Description). This removed the wider parameters of debt management, benefits, housing and tutoring, provided for by the CLO role of the early 1990s. Much of this change in focus seems to have taken place in ignorance of the work of leading academics. Crow (2001: 201) for example, has stated that in whatever is done a concern for the probation service should be ‘...the offender’s social situation, including his or her accommodation, work training and employment opportunities, and family circumstances’. This is an argument which seems to be reflected in the statement made by
Blunkett (2003), is acknowledged in the SEU Annual Report (2002) and has been seen most recently in the consultation paper *Transforming Rehabilitation: A revolution in the way we manage offenders* (MoJ, 2013) previously noted in the introductory chapter.

**Keeping Up Appearances**

The Criminal Justice and Court (Services) Act 2000, was seen as an opportunity to provide further clarity and understanding, and to improve upon the confused state of legislation and services. It included a number of changes to the probation service, and provided the catalyst for a National Probation Service, a new set of National Standards, and the re-naming of a number of orders to provide for a more punitive appearance of the service, thus appealing to the general public and sentencers alike (Mair, 2004).

The new set of National Standards reduced the number of unacceptable absence from two failed appointments, followed by a warning letter of Breach action, to one failure, plus a warning letter. Breach action also carried with it the threat of a custodial sentence for non-compliance and was further supported by the threat of benefits sanctions, which could see the individuals benefits removed for a period of up to four weeks. This was unpopular with many of the longer serving personnel, and provided for a sanction which seems somewhat contentious and in contradiction to the Criminal Justice and Court (Services) Act. Section C (8) of National Standards 2000 (HO, 2000 – revised 2002) clearly states (in the last of its 6 bullet points) that:

C8. Supervision in the community of either post-custodial licences or community orders shall:
be arranged so as not to prevent the offender from being readily available to seek or take up employment if unemployed, not conflict with an offender’s entitlement to benefit...

In an effort to provide for a more punitive appearance, there had been some discussion surrounding a change of name for the probation service and resulted in the suggestion of a Community Rehabilitation and Punishment Service. However, as Savage and Nash (2001) note, this was short-lived when pointed out that it would also result in the acronym of CRAPS, and the officers would become a Community Rehabilitation and Punishment Officer, or CRAPO. However, the re-naming of a number of the orders did occur. The Probation Order became a Community Rehabilitation Order, Community Service became the Community Punishment Order and the Combination Order was renamed a Community Punishment and Rehabilitation Order. In all, these subtle changes to the names of the court orders were the preface to the final stages of the journey which began in the 1970s with the development of a more punitive, hard-hitting service, able to punish in preference to the (failed) ideals of rehabilitation (considered in chapter one).

The final and perhaps most fundamental change came in the nationalisation of the probation service (April 2001), which had been successfully defended against on a number of previous occasions. The National Probation Service reduced the former local areas from 54 to 42 and came more in-line with the local Crown Prosecution Services, courts and the police and provided for 10 regional offices (nine in England and a single region in Wales), each with its own director, and headed by a National Director. With it followed central control and also provided for 100 per cent funding from central government (Nash, 2001;
Morgan, 2007), and thus a political strangle-hold on the work, ethos and development of the probation service.

Much of the change that was to take place in the following years drew upon a number of findings and conclusions from the Halliday Report (2001) and had an impact not only upon the work of case managers, but also the providers of other services (such as Community Links and ETE). Halliday had suggested that if the government wished to see a 1 per cent reduction in the crime figures, it would have to increase the prison population by a further 15 per cent (Chui and Nellis, 2003), a position which was neither achievable nor welcomed. The report also brought a set of recommendations which included the use of custody plus and custody minus, intermittent custody, and the replacement of non-custodial sentences with a single community punishment order which could combine supervision, punishment, reparation and rehabilitation programmes (Halliday, 2001).

Central to his findings was the conclusion that ‘...while retaining the delivery of fair punishment as one of its core objectives, sentencing should be aimed more at the rehabilitation of offenders than was currently the case’ (Maguire, 2007: 402). However, proposals of intermittent custody, which proposed the use of custody only during those periods that an individual was most likely to re-offend or continue to offend, proved deeply unpopular and far too complicated and would require a great deal of restructuring of the prison service in order to support this form of punishment with a margin of success. In contrast, Halliday’s suggestion of a greater incorporation of prison sentences and community supervision was met with a greater level of optimism.
Halliday suggested that a prison sentence of less than 12 months should be replaced with a sentence which provided for a short-term of custody, but also provided a longer period of community supervision, to help support the re-integration of the offender (Custody Plus). In a similar way, sentences of over 12 months could also benefit from a similar restructuring process, suggesting that sentences of more than 12 months should provide for 50 per cent custody and 50 per cent community supervision. In this way Home Detention Curfew (HDC) could be abolished, and a system of discretionary release and extended periods of supervision could be set for those (dangerous) offenders expected to pose a higher-risk (Custody Minus). Yet despite the positive reception these latter sentences received, they were finally shelved amidst concerns of resources and availability for adequate supervision in the community (Bain and Parkinson, 2010; Maguire, 2007).

The driving theme for the probation service seemed to be highlighted in a number of other documents. A New Choreography (NPS, 2001) suggested that there was a need for greater emphasis to be placed upon public protection, enforcement and rehabilitation. However, the notion of rehabilitation had changed somewhat, and the focus was clearly placed upon the role of Cognitive Behavioural Programmes, greatly influenced by the meta-analytic studies of the 1980s-1990s, and accredited by the newly formed Joint Prison/Probation Services Accreditation Panel (1999), whose role was to set the standard for how offending behaviour programmes were to be judged (Robinson and Crow, 2009). Clearly by this time, in contrast to much of the work being undertaken and the findings of the government’s own research, rehabilitation (in its more traditional definitions) seems to be an after-thought; rehabilitation was now seen to be done if there was a change in behaviour and/or a desistance from crime. The government’s white paper Justice for All (2002), again made it
clear that the new direction for justice was a rebalancing of the system putting the victim first, and stated that sentencing *must* protect the public (HO, 2002). Yet, it continued by stating that punishment should be appropriate, and where community sentences were ordered, they should be robust and rigorous, provide for the rehabilitation of the offender and a reduction in offending.

Critically, this and a number of white papers also paved the way for the probation service to move ever closer to a National Offender Management Service. This was guided by statements which in much the same way as Halliday (2001) had suggested a seamless sentence, and Carter’s Review (2003) had suggested the move toward end-to-end management, and *Justice for All* had emphasised the need for a joining up of services. Their purpose was to better protect the public, centralise the position of the victim and community, provide for greater deterrence, and rehabilitation of the offender.

However, there was also a recognition that offenders, specifically those serving short-term custodial sentences had a high level of social needs and that many offenders (including 60 per cent of short-term prisoners) were likely to re-offend (Maguire, 2007). This prompted a number of reports on sentencing, social need and criminal justice policy – which included the Halliday Review of Sentencing (2001), the SEU Annual Report (2002) *Making the Right Choices* (2003), and the Carter Review (2003).

As local areas were moulded into the newly formed national service in 2001, the CLOs role moved to that of Employment, Training and Education. As highlighted in the introductory chapter, this meant that other agencies (such as the Citizens Advice Bureau) would support
the offender’s needs in terms of benefits, housing, debt, and leisure activities. It offered the opportunity to develop a professional service for working with offenders needs (see Appendix 2: The ETE Job Description). Conversely, with little in the way of consultation, it also brought renewed concerns for many that the new role of ETE officer would eventually be outsourced and staff members made redundant as the National Probation Service continued to look for ways to improve its effectiveness, efficiency and ultimately maintain its budgetary requirements.

Social need was more than a cursory concern. Evidence of the importance of employment to successful rehabilitation had been noted in numerous studies. For example, Farrall (2002) noted that positive changes (and thus a reduction in offending) were associated with changes in employment and family relationships, and in the Foreword to the government’s paper Making the Right Choices (2003), David Blunkett as Home Secretary, stated that a life of crime was not inevitable. ‘It is easier to make the right choices about crime if the basics are in place: a good education, a place to live, decent healthcare and paid work’ (Bain and Parkinson, 2010: 66). As the work of the probation officer dealt more and more with assessment, risk and desistance issues, so there was a recognition (certainly at a local level) of the important role that the social needs played in offending behaviour. Farrall’s (2002) discussion of social capital provided for a critical assessment of the role of those individuals often seen to be disaffected, excluded and/or isolated from the community in which they lived. It is a point worth bearing in mind as consideration is given to the events that took place in London (and a number of other cities around England) during the summer of 2011, and statements of a disaffected youth population with little or no stake in their local communities (Lewis and Harkin, 2011; Williams, 2011; Newburn and Shiner, 2005) and
political outbursts which suggest a need to condemn a little more, or even the suggestion to toughen-up on such behaviour.

Tonry (2004) suggests that the Criminal Justice Act 2003, was full of such rhetoric, but lacked the measures which were also ‘tough on the causes of crime’. In the first place, Tony Blair dubbed this act a “victim’s justice bill”, in an effort to rebalance the criminal justice system in favour of the victim, however, it also produced mandatory sentencing guidelines, both of which were bullied through parliament following a number of high profile cases involving known offenders. It is difficult to quantify the importance of such events, but the murder of Sarah Payne by Roy Whiting (July 2000), and those of Jessica Chapman and Holly Wells by Ian Huntley (August 2002), undoubtedly brought public concerns to the fore in much the same way as James Bulger and Stephen Lawrence did in the 1990s. These cases and the media coverage they attracted provided support for the greater use of extended sentences, the need for closer identification and monitoring of certain offenders in the community and the increased powers of Disclosures and of the Criminal Records Bureau. The knock on effect however, was to see the increase in prison numbers. More people were being held for longer periods under the guise of public protection and life sentences had increased both in length of sentence and the time served. This was only added to by the rising numbers of offenders that had been returned to court for resentencing, or returned to prison for a technical violation, rather than a new offence. Between 2001-2004 the number of people given a custodial sentence for breach of order and/or license conditions, had risen from 2,337 to a total of 8,104 inmates (PRT, April 2006). It is a figure which (as Table 2.1 demonstrates), has continued to grow and has only fuelled the resultant crisis in numbers currently observed in the prison population.
However, perhaps most distressing for the Chapman and Wells families was the news that although the new guidelines would mean mandatory ‘life meaning life’ sentences for multiple murders, Huntley’s conviction for the double murder in Soham would not be covered as the legislation came into effect too late (BBC News, 2003). The new legislation held in Chapter 7: Section 269 (4), although providing for the imposition of a whole life tariff, was only applicable to offences committed on or after Thursday, 18th December, 2003 (CPS, 2010).

Table 2.1: Numbers of recalls following breach of order or license conditions England & Wales 2005-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Recalled Numbers</th>
<th>% Recalls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>79,627</td>
<td>8,678 (10.9%)</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard League for Penal Reform 22/12/2006</td>
<td>Bromley Briefings: December 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>80,707</td>
<td>11,231</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard League for Penal Reform 21/12/2007</td>
<td>Bromley Briefings: December 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008</td>
<td>82,918</td>
<td>11,756</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard League for Penal Reform 19/12/2008</td>
<td>Bromley Briefings: June 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>84,231</td>
<td>11,840</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard League for Penal Reform 18/12/2009</td>
<td>Bromley Briefings: November 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>83,701</td>
<td>13,919</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Howard League for Penal Reform 17/12/10</td>
<td>Bromley Briefings: July 2010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Complexities of Compliance

The Criminal Justice Act (2003) brought into being, the Community Order (effective 1st April 2005), which enabled magistrates and judges to tailor community sentences to the severity of the offence and, at the same time, address offending behaviour. The Community Order was to enable the sentencer to provide for an order with one or more of twelve possible
requirements, such as supervision, mental health treatment, unpaid work or a combination of requirements, to be completed over a defined period. Appendix 3: The Community Order’s Twelve Requirements (CJA, 2003), presents a list of the twelve requirements made available to the court, which – for the work of ETE – provided for the ‘specified activity’ and can be supported through the ‘supervision requirement’ (London Probation Trust, 2011). Taylor, Wasik and Leng (2004) suggest that as a specified activity ETE supports the education and employment needs of the offender, where this has been identified as a factor in their offending behaviour, and seeks to promote the rehabilitation of the offender.

Raynor and Vanstone (2007) however, criticised the act as having the potential to overload both the service and the offender. For the probation service it was felt that the new order would mean a growth in the caseloads of individual officers, for the offender it would mean an order with so many requirements meant to support that it would make the order too demanding and complex, suggesting ‘compliance would become almost impossible’ (2007: 75). In contrast, and certainly far more positively, the act pushed ETE and concerns to support basic education levels, employability and training, to the fore. In effect the Criminal Justice Act (2003) had taken on-board the findings of the SEU annual report (2002) and recognised the importance of employment to the reduction of offending and the development of desistance.

The SEU report Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners, stated that

‘...of the current prison population 80 per cent had writing skills and 50 per cent had reading skills equal to or less than that expected of an 11 year old child. Indeed, where mathematics had been tested for, 65 per cent of
offenders were seen to have an educational level equal to or less than that of an 11 year old child’

(SEU, 2002: 6)

This was further increased by the recognition that where offenders were seen to have sustained, full-time and meaningful employment, they were almost 50 per cent less likely to offend, and that stable accommodation could reduce the reconviction rate by 25 per cent (SEU, 2002). These were the offenders likely to return to local communities and were also the group most likely to re-offend where these concerns had not been met (Nash, 2001). To this Crow (2001: 76) has added ‘It is one thing to get an individual offender a job, but this not the same as tackling unemployment’.

Crow’s statement suggests that although employment is important to a successful change (and desistance), it is also important to tackle those areas often less tangible, and certainly more difficult to quantify, such as morale, motivation, interview skills and social skills, often referred to as soft skills and/or soft outcomes (an area highlighted earlier in this chapter and discussed in greater detail in chapters 3 and 6). This has recently been highlighted by Meek, Champion and Klier (2012) who found that through sport offenders could be provided with alternative means of excitement, risk-taking and competition, as well as providing improved health and welfare, and positive role-models (in turn providing for the development of more pro-social identities), each of which supports successful desistance and a reduction in crime. This is consistent with findings of Fletcher, Woodhill and Herrington (1998) who noted that ten barriers existed to successful change and included (amongst the list): concern about disclosure, self-confidence, low self-esteem, a lack of qualifications, and a lack of recent employment experience; each, they said, were key to securing and maintaining
employment. Yet even though supporting evidence is available it is also far more difficult to justify the use of what little, often limited, resources the probation service had.

**Working in Partnership**

In order to counter the limitations of budgetary constraint, partner agencies and organisations had been identified throughout much of the probation services history. Mair and Burke (2012) have noted that partnerships were sought as part of the crime prevention initiatives of the 1980s and 1990s, and are clearly identifiable in the Home Office paper *Tackling Offending: An Action Plan* (1988b) (previously discussed in Chapter 1: p. 35) as well as the white paper *Partnership in Dealing with Offenders in the Community* (1990). This latter paper, says Worrall (1997: 143), had the purpose of encouraging ‘the probation service to see itself as part of a network of both informal and formal agencies within the criminal justice system’. This theme of joined up, or partnership working was to develop over the next decade and brought with it a change in the probation service ethos, moving from a service of support and guidance to one of control and punishment (Whitehead and Statham, 2006).

It is possible to see then why tensions grew with the relentless move toward a single service; which saw the eventual joining of the National Probation Service with Her Majesty’s Prison Service to form the National Offender Management Service at an executive level in 2004. A single service, Carter (2003) had said, would manage the offender from start to finish, thereby reducing the revolving door affect that saw many offenders return to crime following a short custodial sentence. It also provided a greater opportunity for contestability, whereby services could be bought in from the public, private and voluntary
organisations (Senior, 2008). End-to-end management was a way to combat many of the issues associated with limited resources, and in order to achieve best results Carter suggested that there should be collaboration and better use made of external agencies. The intention was that a single service would remove a great deal of the duplication experienced within both services and provide the opportunity for things that were begun in custody, to be concluded in the community.

The idea of end-to-end offender management has been further reflected in Towl’s (2002) suggestion that in moving towards effective ‘partnership’ working, there is also the opportunity to provide for joint performance indicators which can be linked to reducing reoffending. This he says also provides for an improvement in the operational capacity of services as there is less stress placed upon already limited resources.

However, no such joining up of service was to be experienced in terms of employment and education. Pressures placed upon the prison service by over-crowding have meant that individuals are often housed at some distance from their home. Consequently the local education provider may not be the same as that of the offender’s home town/city or even examination board. Hill (2010) has noted that ultimately working in partnerships should reduce reoffending, yet for those working with offenders in education, training and employment programmes the result was a continued tendency for duplication, which often resulted in a further depleting of the scarce resources and funding streams they had access to, rather than improving the service that could be provided. This was a discussion originally noted by Finn (2000) in work conducted into the Welfare to Work system and programmes. In his concluding comments Finn states that
If partnership or collaboration is not focused and well-managed it can become an irrelevant ‘talking shop’ that wastes time and resources...

There is also a danger... of ‘partnership fatigue’, where conflicting and confusing local demands are created through a plethora of initiatives with different departmental sponsors, budgets, priorities, timetables and spatial remits

Finn, 2000: 54

Hill (2010) is also quick to point out that duplication is often a result of poor communication between departments, or partners. The danger for NOMS says Senior (2008: 301) is that ‘...NOMS can end up with different forms of fragmentation rather than greater integration’.

It is an interesting statement when considered along-side that of the House of Commons, Justice Committee’s report (2011), suggesting shock that officers (Offender Managers) were spending up to 75 per cent of their time on paperwork and other duties rather than in face-to-face contact with offenders.

The continual pull on the very limited resources highlighted by Carter, resulting in calls for greater contestability, also had other implications. Under the Offender Management Act (2007), trust status removed the statutory duty from local and regional probation boards and placed it directly upon the Secretary of State, who would then contract with providers at local, regional and national levels (Criminal Justice Portal, 2007; National Archives, N.D.).

As suggested by Carter (2003), the service providers were to be drawn from public, private, charitable and voluntary sectors. It is interesting then that it took just 100 years to go from voluntary missionary workers in the local courtrooms (highlighted in chapter one), to a
national service with an international reputation, only to become a *nationally organised* local service buying in contracts from voluntary and charitable organisations.

Even as the changes were taking place, Gelsthorpe and Morgan (2007: 4), were discussing the battle lines being drawn between differing groups of NGOs and government agencies as they jockeyed for position, and formed meaningful alliances, ‘...in order to enhance their prospects of bidding successfully for major probation contracts’. However, as highlighted above, with regards to the formation of a National Service and that of NOMS gaps were also identified in the introduction and use of voluntary and charitable organisations. Meek, Gojkovic, and Mills (2010: 2) discussed similar concerns regarding the role of the third sector when working with offenders. These concerns included ‘...the quality and availability of regional commissioning, implementation strategies and the long-term plans’. To which they add that their own findings ‘...also indicate that increasing emphasis on competitive policy may put a strain on future inter-sector partnerships’ (ibid).

Further to this, Canton (2011: 208) has noted that one implication for contestability is the impact that it has upon people’s employment (particularly that of the probation services own staff) and the inevitable anxiety which follows. Conversely, work conducted with high risk (Prolific and Priority Offenders) and potentially dangerous offenders was seen as an area which required intensive supervision and something that could be supported by NGOs, voluntary groups, and private companies, thus reducing the pressure upon limited resources available within the probation service. However, as Canton (2011) has noted, this is a group which by definition is hard to identify, and the constant checking and surveillance often leads to higher incidence of detection, making a successful intervention difficult to quantify.
Is it a successful intervention because the detection rate is higher, or is it failing to support change because of the high rate of reconviction?

As an example, Creating Futures was a privately funded organisation that won a number of local area contracts to provide intensive support programmes to prolific and priority offenders (PPOs), between 2006 and 2009. However, with a lack of qualified personnel, local probation services often found themselves in the position of offering transfers and secondments of ETE staff to help support and train this and other partner organisations. In effect, ETE staff had been asked to train people from outside brought in to do a job that they had, thus far, been entrusted to do. In contrast to Carter’s (2003) suggested improvement in the service, contestability has resulted in further reductions in the limited resources available. A further consequence, noted by Canton (2011: 188), is that a drive toward contestability has also turned ‘partners into competitors... inhibit[ing] the sharing of good practice amongst service providers who might find themselves in competition for business...’.

Vulnerabilities and the Coming of Revolution

This concern changed little with the newly formed Coalition government’s suggestion that through a system of payment by results providers would be freed to use innovative techniques to challenge and change offending behaviour. The Green Paper Breaking the Cycle (MoJ, 2010) suggested that a new and radical way was needed to reduce offending and better protect the public, which included the public, private and voluntary sectors. Indeed, Clarke (as Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State for Justice) was steadfast in his belief that offending behaviour could be changed, thus supporting the rehabilitation of the
offender. Thus far it is too early to reflect upon results of such a programme. However, Clarke’s suggestion that reform comes from having a job, good relationships – at home and with peers, and a decent education, bear remarkable reflections to the statements made by Blunkett (2003), suggesting that a life of crime was not inevitable, it is not something the individual is born in to, but is something effected by their life experience (a theme continually reflected upon throughout this and the following chapters).

Positive words have come from the newly appointed Justice Secretary – Chris Grayling – who stated that it was his belief that “Although people may have to go to prison in recognition of the offences they have committed, it is absolutely right and proper that we should do everything we possibly can to ensure that they do not go back.” (Hansard, 18 Sep 2012, Column 764). More recently, this has been clarified in the consultation paper *Transforming Rehabilitation: A revolution in the way we manage offenders* (MoJ, 2013). In the Ministerial Foreword, Grayling states that what is needed is ‘…a tough but intelligent Criminal Justice System that both punishes people properly when they break the law – and also supports them to get their lives back on track” (MoJ, 2013: 5). Conversely, Goodman (2012: 207) has noted that ‘Working with offenders, empowering them, gaining their trust and helping them to change, cannot be achieved as a quick fix’. He has concluded that in recent interviews conducted with probation staff there is evidence of a fragile morale which ‘…cannot be helpful for the protection of the public and the rehabilitation of offenders’ (ibid).
Conclusion

Part of the difficulty for the work currently being undertaken by the probation service, seems to stem if not wholly, then certainly significantly, from the continued mixed messages that the probation service has endured over the last quarter of a century and more. Evidence of such can be drawn from many examples: confusion and anxiety as the probation service was pushed further and further toward a culture of management and control, and headline discussion first of ‘nothing works’ and then suggesting that community punishments were more demanding than prison; followed by the statement made by Paul Boateng (as Home Office Minister, 1999) that ‘…we are a law enforcement agency, it is what we are, it is what we do’ (National Standards, 2000: Foreword). In contrast, a good deal of academic and governmental research would seem to suggest that it is the structure, support and guidance that is needed most by offenders (Meek, et al., 2012; Canton, 2011; SEU, 2002; Ward and Maruna, 2007), and that officers should be able to manage through discretion (Ministry of Justice, 2010), thus enabling a process through which they can account for individual difference, need and circumstance. This has been supported most recently by the House of Commons Justice Committee (2011: S8) as they discussed the role of the probation service in the 21st century, stating that ‘There was no evidence to suggest that bringing together prisons and probation had yet had a positive impact’. Indeed, in his discussion of resettlement and the role of the What Works agenda, Maguire (2007: 411) has stated that

‘...whether it [What Works] continues to receive funding from government on a significant scale is likely to depend on evidence that it will benefit the wider public by reducing reoffending. This being the case, it becomes important to ask what kinds of intervention are most
likely to achieve this, and in what kind of framework they should be delivered’.

If there is to be a concentration upon risk, dangerousness, violence and persistent offenders, then there is the risk of having little real impact upon the offending/re-offending rates of the vast majority of individuals. This group in particular – those considered low and medium risk, who often serve the shortest sentences – accounted for 61 per cent of the further offences committed in 2008 (MoJ, 2010). As this chapter has noted many offenders have difficulty in the most rudimentary literacy and numeracy skills, indeed, in recent updates of the findings of the SEU (2002) the Prison Reform Trust (2012) has noted that 48 per cent of offenders have difficulty in reading, 82 per cent had difficulty writing and 65 per cent with basic mathematics. This is further compounded with 67 per cent unemployment when they enter the custodial system, housing being similarly affected. For the most part these are the same individuals excluded from schools and/or experience deprivation during childhood. These are interesting points for discussion and an area which provide the central focus for the remainder of this thesis. However, it is also interesting when considered alongside Farrall and Maruna’s statement that policy ‘...designed without reference to the needs of the recipients is unlikely to do much to help them desist’ (2004: 362).

Chapters one and two have provided for a discussion of the framework within which the rehabilitative efforts have taken place and have provided the underpinnings of the thesis. Rehabilitation and desistance have had an important role in the work undertaken with offenders and how that work is conducted. More specifically, chapter one considered the arena in which punishment takes place and situating the probation service and its work
within the historical context. This has been further developed in chapter two, in the brief discussion of the policy undertakings which have had an enormous effect upon the rehabilitative ideals of the service throughout the last decades of the 20th and the first decade of the 21st century. As the discussion now moves to chapter three the discourse will turn to the discussion of the interventions currently employed by the criminal justice system – and more pointedly those of the national probation service. This is an important discussion because it (intervention) places at its centre a change in the behaviour and encourages a move away from offending, and towards the offender’s rehabilitation, highlighting – in contrast to political rhetoric – the need to understand a little more and condemn a little less.
Chapter 3: Interventions: Impeding Progress, Supporting Change?

Interventions are by design – if not by necessity – consequentialist in that they seek to provide for a change or rehabilitation of the offender. This supports much of the discussion undertaken in the previous two chapters. Chapter one provided a consideration of the work undertaken and the importance of good social interventions, to support change and reflect upon the position of employment in the philanthropic ideals of Victorian Britain which guided and developed much of the work undertaken by the probation service from its humble beginnings to the mid-point of the 20th century. Chapter two was concerned with the development of policies that can be said to be retributive, seeking to punish past criminality although seeking behavioural changes, often neglecting the support or guidance the offender requires in order to sustain periods of desistance and change. Chapter two concluded with statements made by Grayling (2013) and Goodman (2012), suggesting the importance of supporting offenders to make a successful change, but recognising that this is a long process and cannot be viewed through a quick-fix mentality. Each of the previous chapters has noted the important place that interventions have, and although often hidden in plain sight, employability, training and education has endured in ideas of supporting a successful change, but exist almost outside of the ‘What Works?’ debate. This chapter considers the means by which interventions are used to support that change in behaviour, concentrating the discussion upon the adult offender (as stated in the second aim of the study), suggesting that it is a change in context rather than the intervention, which is needed.
Public protection has, arguably, displaced or at least qualified the priority of rehabilitation practice and the assessment and management of risk is now the single most important of probation’s objectives.

Canton, 2011: 23

It has long been argued that through guidance and support, and in a variety of forms, the behaviour of any individual can be challenged, changed and improved. Undeniably (as was considered in chapter one), a change in behaviour through guidance and support was set in to the original auspice of the probation service (1907) and continued to play a central role for the service throughout much of the 20th century. Academia provided further evidence of the important role to be played in changing behaviour. Psychologists such as James Watson (1919) set the context by suggesting a ‘tabula rasa’; in effect every child is born as a blank slate and with the right environment, conditions and guidance any child, any person could be moulded anew. Similarly, the behaviourist, Burrhus Frederic Skinner (1963), suggested that behaviour followed action, and hence through a series of rewards and/or punishments, an individual could be taught to behave in a particular way. Albert Bandura (1977) considered this further, suggesting that behaviour is a learned response to a particular series of actions or events, and that once the action or event is observed and the outcome to the individual’s liking, they learn to adapt that behaviour to their own needs. However, Bandura (1977) also noted that in the same way as behaviour can be learned as an observed action, so it can be unlearned.

There are as many supporters of, as there are opponents to the various approaches taken in the examination of the individual and their needs. The seminal works of Bandura, Skinner
and Watson provide insight to the individual and their psychology. That said this type of learning is very prescriptive and presupposes the same level of understanding and experience for everyone, a point which may not be as accurate as at first it seems. Indeed, the debate is just as well founded in the sociological discipline. No individual exists outside of their environment and what the individual approach neglects is the influence of the social and the powerful pressures placed upon each and every person on a daily basis. Behaviour should be seen as the responsibility of the individual, but the importance of social relationships can never be under-estimated.

It has already been noted (see for instance the discussion which begins in chapter 2: p47 concerning a growing punitive feeling to policy discourse) that during the last 30 years it would seem that society has placed more responsibility upon the individual for their own action and become progressively more punitive. Whilst evidence from the British Crime Survey suggests a reduction in crime (HO, 2010), there can be no doubt that the rate of imprisonment is at least in part attributable to concerns of increasing crime in the general public (Mulholland, 2007). Society is choosing to lock away more people than ever before, in the vain misgivings that this hard-hitting policy will cure a criminal epidemic, which is questionable at best. It is a position that Ramsbotham (2005: 239) challenged, stating that if ‘prison works’ in reducing reoffending then

‘...there would be work and education for every prisoner. If prison worked – we would be shutting prisons, not opening more... If prisons worked – we would not be imprisoning more people than any other European country... If prisons worked – we would be saving billions of pounds with fewer prisons fewer care homes and fewer court cases’
However, it is an offering which seems in contradiction to the penal policy developments discussed in the previous chapter and – in a wider context – the practices favoured during the last 30 years of penal reform, although not always well founded.

Even where the evidence exists for an effective way to reduce crime on a long term basis (SEU, 2002; Blunkett, 2003; Farrall, 2002, 2004; Clarke, 2010, amongst others), there is little evidence of a toughening on the causes of crime. Conversely, and as previously noted, boundless evidence exists for a growing toughening on crime. This was further evidenced in the sentencing practice following the riots and looting in England during August 2011, which has only added to a prison population now higher than it has ever been, and likely to rise still further (Bain, 2011). It is an expansion in population which has seen little or no growth in the resources needed to safely support the growing use of the custodial estate. In 2005 the Reform Bulletin noted that there had been a rise of barely 2½ per cent (in terms of staffing) since 1998, despite a 20 per cent increase in the number of prisoners, figures which cause greater concern as the POA (Prison Officer Association) noted that expected efficiency savings point to fewer staff ‘...savings being predominately aimed at [the] front-line, white-shirt level’ (POA, 2011: 32).

Consequently, as the prison numbers continue to rise (reaching a figure of 88, 179 in December, 2012) and the role of the probation service is once again refined and redefined: services transferred, others sold into the voluntary and private sector, the argument can be made that little literature seems to have developed the argument to account for the thoughts and concerns of the offenders themselves, a position which would seem to hold great importance. Warr (2012) has suggested that the offender’s voice provides an
opportunity to understand the thoughts and concerns of the individual, in an area where the ‘service user’ is central to the service provided and the changes society wishes them to make. Constantly offenders are told that their way of thinking and behaving is ‘wrong’, but according to Canton (2011) the time taken to talk to the offender has long since passed. National objectives and guidelines (1999) states that the probation service is now an offender management agency dealing in enforcement in preference to rehabilitation with an expectation that offenders will change and fall within acceptable parameters.

Mindful of the statement made by Maruna and LeBel (2010) that criminal justice interventions can work to impede rather than support change in behaviour, this chapter continues with an examination of the role interventions play in the supervision and punishment of the offender in the community. It is recognised that in terms of interventions, some (for instance, Community Payback) have the very specific role of placing a restriction upon liberty (see for example the Ministry of Justice consultation document *Punishment and Reform*, 2012, and; Worrall, 1997), victim awareness and ensuring the protection of the public (CBT/P and DRR), where others support a change in behaviour through re-skilling, or re-integrating the offender (ETE). The chapter will build upon Farrall (2002) and Byrne’s (2005) discussions of social capital and exclusion, and follows the argument that in order to reduce re-offending, in a meaningful manner, there needs to be a ‘significant’ change in the life/lifestyles of the offender (Ward and Maruna, 2007). As a result, the discourse critiques the apparent importance associated with ‘correct’ thinking skills, whilst considering the impact of labelling upon feelings of self-worth and individual behaviour, and reflects upon the implication of a service (NOMS) largely limited to a role of ‘...cajoling, influencing and attempting to engage other departments and local agencies in
the reducing reoffending agenda’ (Chambers, 2010: 35). Finally, it is important to note that there is a concentration upon the development and role of Education, Training and Employment (ETE) in successful desistance and rehabilitation, as the focus for the present study.

Intervention as Punishment

When first envisioned, the Wootton Report (1970) saw Community Service (now entitled Community Payback) as being a sentence that would appeal to all, being cheaper and more constructive than short term prison sentences as well as providing reparation to the victim and community. Canton (2011) recounts that the 1980s hailed punishment in the community as the way in which the rise in prison numbers could be managed, the emphasis being placed upon the hard-work that offenders could expect to undertake. This was added to in the 1990s by Prime Minister Major’s calls to condemn a little more (Whitehead and Statham, 2006), suggesting that offenders should be seen to be punished (see chapters one and two). This leads Worrall (1997) to suggest that much of the appeal of community punishment is its continued ability to provide for an intervention which both incapacitates and punishes the offender, and can be seen to be reflected in the decision to rename Community Service as the Community Punishment order in the Criminal Justice and Court Services Act (2000).

However, Whitehead and Statham (2006) argue that this was little more than a cosmetic change which afforded the illusion of a toughening of community sentences. The real test followed the white paper Justice for all (HO, 2002) providing the impetus for more
demanding and tougher community sentences, a position further maintained in the 2003 Criminal Justice Act.

As was previously discussed in chapter two, the new Act provided for a single order of the court, and a suggestion that offenders given the new Community Sentence could expect to undertake Unpaid Work as either a stand-alone requirement or just one of a combination drawn from twelve requirements, seen to support change in behaviour. This has been criticised by the Casey Review (2008) suggesting that more needed to be done to make punishments visible to the public, and to provide for more demanding activities, such that members of the public would not want to undertake themselves. Canton (2011: 147) states that even in its newest incarnation, Community Payback, it has a vagueness which evokes ‘thoughts of retribution or revenge as well as making amends’, and whilst providing for the more demanding forms of work it has also led some to question the motivation and shaming effect that it may have (see, Maruna and King, 2008, and Pamment and Ellis, 2010).

Worrall (1997) for instance, makes reference to Mclvor (1992) and notes that this form of punishment is not always met with such enthusiasm. In Sweden, says Worrall (1997: 90), it was felt that not only would community service, or unpaid work, not reduce the prison population, ‘...but that work should be viewed as a privilege, not a punishment’. Viewed in this way, it is possible to consider more rationally the statement of Maruna and LeBel (2010) who have noted that interventions are just as capable of impeding progress as they are of supporting it.
Punishments that seek to make the offender more visible also have the knock-on effect of making the individual more self-conscious. In individuals often seen to be vulnerable questions remain as to its appropriateness when labelled as offender or criminal, and the associated stigma that follows. In his discussion of stigma, Goffman (1968) states that once the label [in this instance offender] ‘...is successfully applied the individual is categorised and blamed for their position’ (Bain and Parkinson, 2010: 66). Indeed, Bain and Parkinson (2010) go further and note that the label of criminal, ex-offender, ex-prisoner, encourage an understanding of the individual in a particular way, but in doing so also provide for barriers to their successful re-integration. Therefore, the importance of self-awareness, confidence and feelings of inclusion cannot be under-estimated.

Jones (2008) has made it clear that a positive perception of self is key to any argument of behaviour and none more so than that of offending behaviour, and notes that a clear link has been drawn between deprivation (exclusion) and offending behaviour. However, he also provides a cautionary note, that just because someone is poor, under-educated, under-skilled, does not mean that they will automatically (become deviant or) turn to crime. If this were the case, says Jones (2008), then everyone in a similar circumstance would turn to crime and this is simply not true. What is true is that those individuals that come into contact with the criminal justice system invariably have multiple needs and thus require a multi-modal programme of intervention, as is often noted in the work undertaken with offenders where substance misuse is the focus of attention. These offenders often present as having poor social skills, poor or low self esteem, a poor work ethic and a lack of skills more generally, and are known to commit high volume, low level acquisitive crime (McSweeney, et al., 2008). Orme and Pritchard (1996: 92) note that where alcohol is related
to offending, individuals exhibit ‘...greater poverty, and had higher long-term unemployment; more money and debt difficulties and chronic housing problems’.

Substance – Misuse

Whether through illicit drugs or alcohol use, in many respects, substance misuse can be seen as forming part of the original work of interventions employed by the probation service. The work with those that had fallen from grace, most often those that had fallen foul of alcohol, provide for an important movement within the history of the probation service. In the 1870s the church temperance society set about to provide a way of turning those individuals away from the local courts and supporting a change in their lives which would see them become an active member of the community from which they came (Whitehead and Statham, 2006). It is laudable then that this remains a focus of the work undertaken with offenders even in today’s service, under the direction of the National Offender Management Service.

Rumgay (2003) suggests that with the collapse of the rehabilitative ideal in the 1970s, there followed a normalising of the offender, one which placed responsibility firmly upon the shoulders of the individual. McSweeney, Stevens, Hunt and Turnbull (2007: 470) state that drug dependency emerged in the 1980s ‘...as a strong correlate of offending in many industrialized countries’ and although a number of differing measures were brought in to try to tackle the rising numbers of substance misuse cases, the DTTO (Drug Treatment and Testing Order), as part of the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) alongside the cognitive behavioural treatment programmes, sought to reduce offending through the use of effective treatment programmes aimed at tackling substance misuse.
Drug and alcohol treatment today offers the individual the opportunity to recover their lives and become drug free altogether (Clarke, 2010). The replacement of the DTTO with the DRR under the Criminal Justice Act (2003), has offered far greater flexibility in the order and can allow the offender to receive treatment in the community as an alternative to a custodial sentence (McMurran, 2007; HO, 2007). The Home Office paper: *An introduction to the Drug Interventions Programme for prisons and probation services* (2007) notes that through a multi-agency approach, providing specifically tailored treatments and on-going support, record numbers of offenders are being helped, and that as a result, drug-related (acquisitive) crime has fallen by 20 per cent since the [DIP] programme started (in 2003). For Rumgay (2003) the message is clear, suggesting that the scale of drug related crime has ensured that it (and its treatment) remains a high priority of the probation service. Concluding that undoubtedly, drug intervention programmes have benefited from a number of advantages, including multi-agency working, which enables a holistic approach to dealing with the individual, which has been notably lacking from other forms of offender invention and rehabilitation programmes.

However, research has also shown that if the programme is to be successful, then ‘...special emphasis needs to be placed on supporting drug-misusing offenders as they approach the end of any treatment’ (HO, 2007). For example, McSweeney, et al. (2008), state that in interview they found that most of the PPOs on a DRR attributed a reduction in criminal activity to the (enhanced) specialised help and support that they had received. They also note that the current services have a limited capacity to tackle the wider social and environmental factors (represented in figure 3.1 below) which perpetuate drug misuse and
offending behaviour; housing, mental health, education, training and employment needs, self-awareness, etc., in order to maintain the reduction in drug related acquisitive, and alcohol fuelled personal crime, and further protect the public.

Figure 3.1: Offence Impact Factors

Although there can be no doubt of the importance of public protection, it remains moot if individuals perceive themselves to be in isolation to the wider social whole. This is a point raised by Wormith, et al. (2008), who (although discussing sex offenders and their treatment) made use of the ‘Good Lives Model’ as part of their analysis. In this instance, Wormith et al. explore the suggestion that by promoting ideas and principles that facilitate good physical, mental health and self-worth, the individual can show a marked improvement in their dysfunctional thoughts, feelings and behaviours. They go on to state
that whereas research has shown that ‘avoidance’ treatment has been unsuccessful, the opportunity for satisfying work, self-realisation, integrity, and altruistic behaviour (commonly termed a ‘Good Lives Model’), has generated great theoretical interest (Wormith, et al, 2008: 257). Ward and Maruna (2007: 108) raise a similar point in their discussion of the ‘Good Lives Model’ acting to promote self directed goals set by the individual. In this way ‘…non-offending methods may function to eliminate or reduce the need for offending’ (ibid). In fact they go further and suggest that in enabling the offender their behaviour is automatically changed (i.e. the conditions which once existed are no longer prevalent. Amongst a range of skills, there is an improvement in their knowledge and understanding, their ability to read and write, their employability skills, and thus their ability to engage).

Robinson and Crow (2009) note that there is some significance to regarding the individual as a whole person, someone who exhibits behaviour based upon their own social interactions, knowledge, experience and understanding, or as Gregory (2006: 50) would have it, it is based upon their ‘...status, which brings with it civil, political and social rights’ within the group and the ‘...ability to achieve ‘social inclusion’’. Therefore, it is interesting to question what comes first, exclusion or crime? If there is an equality of opportunity and life chances throughout society, then it stands to reason that everyone has the same responsibilities for their own action. In this scenario, the action taken leads to the position the individual finds themselves in and therefore provides a reflection of that action. Put more simply, if crime is the best way to improve social standing, then whatever the outcome (whether arrested and convicted, or successful and free); it is of the individual’s own making.
It is unrealistic however, to believe that every member of society starts from the same position, or has the same access, understanding and support as everyone else. Consequently, if the conclusion is, as Blunkett (2003) so aptly put it, that not everyone has the same opportunity in life, then help and guidance must be offered to support a change in behaviour and reduce crime. This is not so far removed from the statement made by the (then) Prime Minister, Mr Anthony Blair, when he said ‘I refuse to accept that crime is an inevitable part of our daily lives.’ concluding that ‘Public safety is not safeguarded when prisoners are released into homelessness, with no prospect of employment’ (2002: pp 5-6).

Yet, once the label of criminal has been applied the individual has then to fight to remove it over periods which may far surpass the original sentence in an effort to prove a crime free life-style (the achievement of desistance), a discussion considered previously in chapter two.

Desistance (as discussed in the introduction) is one of those terms increasingly considered in matters of policy development, which seeks to inform a wider public of the intention to support a cessation from offending on a long term basis, and in doing so protecting the public from further, future harm. There is a great deal of evidence which supports the suggestion that a successful desistance can be maintained if the right kinds of support and guidance are put into place to help the individual (Blunkett, 2003) including those of education, training and employment (Maruna and LeBel, 2010).

It is hard to see how the increasing pressure that builds upon, not only the criminal justice system but also society as a whole can be reduced without a further consideration of the individual (the offender) and their social need. Discussion of the need to provide for a safer and more secure community often remains segregated from discussions of the needs of
those who remain at greatest risk of increasing exclusion and social isolation (Bain, 2005). The discussion then turns to those who count amongst the most vulnerable in society, the families, the communities and the offenders themselves. Farrall suggests ‘...that motivation and changes in individuals’ social circumstances were the main ‘motors’ which drove desistance’ (2002: 216). Farrall is therefore able to differentiate between two forms of ‘capital’, often observed in isolation from the other. The argument centres upon the role of ‘Human Capital’ and ‘Social Capital’. In terms of the human, Farrall argues for the individual’s ability to acquire a level of skill, and/or knowledge, which in turn enables them to make a successful application for employment, and provide engagement in the wider social group. Conversely, where this does not take place, ‘poor or inadequate human capital’ says Farrall (2002: 216) ‘will make gaining and keeping employment... all the harder’. Inevitably, where successful, this personal, human gain, leads to a growth and development in the individual’s sense of social responsibility and provides for ties to the community which were previously weak or were not present.

This is an interesting point further supported in the earlier work of Clear and Karp (2000). In this instance they suggest that a strengthening of social ties is imperative to successful integration, and therefore desistance, stating that voluntary cooperation is born from the production of ‘...socially astute, emotionally intelligent citizens who are as concerned with and engaging in the life of the community as they are with their own lives.’ (Clear and Karp, 2000: 22), points which may be reflective of the underpinning principles of ‘What Works?’.
`What Works’ (Meta-Analysis) and Cognitive Behavioural Programmes

Any discussion of the ‘What Works’ principles must also include more than a fleeting reference to the meta-analytic studies of the 1980s and early 1990s (both of which have already received passing comment in the previous chapters), so instrumental were they in the direction that interventions was to take in the coming years. As noted in the previous chapters, the 1970s were seen to be something of a failure of rehabilitation in the work conducted with offenders. Rumgay (2003: 42) notes the doubts raised regarding the reliability of the meta-analytic approach in response to the negativity of nothing works, and offers it as a tool which provides ‘evidence that specific types of programmes are particularly successful in reducing offending behaviour’.

Mair (2004) is quick to point out that the positive results drawn from the meta-analytic studies number only in the hundreds, rather than the thousands as they so easily should have done, and questions just how successful these studies really were. Losel (1995) criticised the quality and rigour of the meta-analytic research to provide positive results for working with offenders. Much of the research stemmed from North America, and focused on young offenders, aged between 14 and 21 years, an age group which neglects a large proportion of the offending population. In a similar vein, Losel went on to comment on the lack of research undertaken with female and ethnic minority offenders, instead concentrating upon young, white male offenders, and where there is an argument to be made about the importance of investigating this majority group, it has always left questions of gender and ethnicity on the fringes of criminological investigation. Equally McGuire (2002), Friendship, Street, Cann and Harper (2005), amongst others, have also noted that regardless of its importance it is not always possible to assume that similar results and
conclusions can/would be drawn in Britain as they are in other countries. This contradicts the evidence-base that successive governments would put such stock and defence into a single resource.

Throughout the 1990s, both the Conservative and later the Labour governments recognising the influential steps which had been taken in North America, introduced a host of Accredited Cognitive Behavioural Programmes (CBP); beginning with the Reasoning and Rehabilitation programme, 1992, and the Thinking Skills (latterly Enhanced Thinking Skills) programme in 1993, in order to support the changes that were needed in the thinking strategies of offenders (Cann, Falshaw, Nugent and Friendship, 2003). In the tradition of 'What Works' CBP was set up as 'offering the most encouraging approaches' to effect change in offending behaviour (McGuire and Priestley, 1995). However, Mair (2004) was unconvinced, questioning the significance and positive support that these (and later) programmes offered offenders. Maruna and LeBel (2010: 69) offer further evidence to support Mair’s claims, stating that the literature surrounding ‘What Works’ typically begins from a review of the existing international studies, concluding that the same levels of success were not found in Britain as they were elsewhere. More positively however, they suggest that this has ‘...opened the door at least temporarily to desistance research in the UK’ (ibid).

Similarly, the (previous) Labour government suggested that it serves the system better to be ‘Tough on crime’ and ‘Tough on the causes of crime’, and although the growth of Accredited Programmes continued, Labour ministers were quick to recognise the social aspects which
can effect criminal behaviour, and was reflected in the introduction of the RNR (Risk-Need-Responsivity) model from Canada in the mid-1990s (Mair, 2004).

This model of rehabilitation seeks to address the offender’s risk of future offending, their needs and how these can be tackled to support change, or to elicit a successful response and reduce rates of re-offending (Mair, 2004). Risk of offending is used to determine the length and intensity of the programme, where those at greater risk would require significantly more intervention than those with a low or moderate risk. Need is divided into two separate areas, those considered to be crime related (criminogenic) and those that are not specifically related to criminal behaviour (non-criminogenic). However, where importance is often placed upon the criminogenic need first, Canton (2011: 76) has noted that ‘...it should be recognised that many needs are related to one another – a ‘non-criminogenic’ need could turn out to be an obstacle to a law-abiding life or to lie behind a more obvious criminogenic need’. Thus, to neglect so-called non-crime related factors, is to ignore the ‘whole’ person in favour of a set of calculable data.

More generally, it is important to note that there are other ethical dilemmas associated with the use of cognitive behavioural programmes (Worrall, 1997). Discussing treatment undertaken with sex offenders, she states that ‘treatment is still concerned primarily with the unacceptable behaviour - it is less concerned with more fundamental belief systems’ put more succinctly, the individual provides what is perceived to be the required answer without an actual change taking place. This may be true of any cognitive behavioural programme and does pose a question over the effectiveness of the programme to change behaviour. For instance, Cann, Falshaw, Nugent and Friendship (2003) were unable to
provide for a positive outcome following completion of the ETS programme, after the initial treatment effect had ended.

That is not to say that all programmes have failed. Positive results have been found in a number of programmes, including the Drink Impaired Drivers courses. For example, in an analysis of 215 drink-drive programmes Well-Parker et al. (1995) found a reduction of 8-9 per cent in reconvictions. At a similar time, McGuire and Priestley (1995) were arguing that programmes in the community would fare better if the individual was able to put into practice more readily the skills they had learned, a point made that would seem to lend support to McMurrnan’s statement that in contrast to the generic programmes, may be ‘…specific programmes have a place in the treatment development agenda’ (2007: 230).

Robinson and Crow (2009: 116) have argued however, that criticism was levelled at offending behaviour programmes on the basis that they tended to deal - specifically - with ‘cognitive deficits and antisocial attitudes’ rather than treating the individual as a whole person. Similar criticism has been levelled at the RNR model (see for example Ward and Maruna, 2007) where attention seems to focus upon the risk of future behaviour and as such neglects the importance that can be associated with so-called non-criminogenic needs, a discussion further developed in chapter six. More specifically Robinson and Crow (2009) suggest that unless equal attention is paid to other criminogenic factors, such as literacy difficulties, it is unlikely that the cognitive skills programme will exhibit positive success. To a degree, the importance seems to lie in the perception of whether the intervention involves something being done to, rather than helped with. To this Maruna and LeBel (2010: 71) have added that
Although the preferences of criminal justice clients are not typically viewed as being highly relevant to policy-makers, it needs to be emphasised that if members of this target population do not engage with or commit themselves to an intervention, the ‘treatment’ is unlikely to succeed.

The introduction of the single community order (initially referred to in chapter 2: p56), enables assessment of individual needs based upon the results of the OASYS tool (Offender Assessment System). According to Canton (2011: 95) ‘OASYS offers a rigorous and consistent approach’ which makes it possible to set objectives and formulate a plan of action (or sentence plan) agreed in order to tackle both dynamic and static risk factors and can be seen as supportive of the RNR model. This then would seem to go some way to tackling the issue of an holistic approach. However, OASYS – as with any assessment tool – calls for a judgement to be made about the importance and/or relevance to the case of a particular issue. Raynor and Vanstone (2002: 50) argue that this provides further evidence that community supervision has ‘...been driven by attempts to change individual behaviour’, and still neglects the wider social circumstance of the individual offender.

This, and other criticisms (such as questions of applicability to gender, ethnicity and cultural difference), have led Merrington and Stanley (2007) to argue that there are problems with using tools such as OASYS to predict risk of harm in this way. OASYS uses a statistical programme to calculate risk, but offending is something that exists outside of statistical coding. Offending is, as Merrington and Stanley correctly note, a multi-dimensional event, which is impacted upon by events and people in everyday life and individual responses to them. What may cause distress or anger in one person has no such effect in another, and
vice versa. To this Burnett, Baker and Roberts (2007) have added that other critics have suggested that to concentrate upon risk and public protection is to pathologise the individual (see for instance Horsefield, 2003). Canton (2011: 103) states that without fair access and opportunity for social inclusion ‘...personal change is unlikely to be sufficient to bring about desistance’.

In recent years there has been a move away from the notions of an evidence-base toward a paradigm based more in how it works than what works (Maruna and LeBel, 2010). This is an important distinction because as the offender ages so active criminality decreases, an argument which can be seen in the work of Glueck and Glueck (1940) – previously discussed in chapter 1. Where evidence suggests that most crime is committed by young white males, in their teenage years, criminal activity ‘decreases sharply as the young adults progress through their twenties’, requiring a much greater focus upon the biographical context of the individual (Maruna and LeBel, 2010: 68). Canton (2011: 103) notes similarly that a number of areas have been identified as key to positive change in the individual.

Like the work of Canton (2011), such biographical impact factors (represented in Figure 3.1 above), provide clear evidence of influences which exert themselves upon the individual, and which need much greater consideration and support through interventions, ultimately leading to changes in offending behaviour.

ETE as Desistance Focussed Success

One such intervention is Education, Training and Employment (ETE) and although often seen as a pathway out of crime (Gelsthorpe and Morgan, 2007), ETE does not seem to enjoy a
similar standing or level of priority as other forms of intervention (Bain and Parkinson, 2010). It is a recurring theme present in the work undertaken with offenders, as part of the wider Community Sentence, if not specifically referred to in each of the interventions examined thus far. As was noted in the introduction to this chapter, ETE – certainly employability and education – has seemed to endure for the last 200 years in some shape or form where others have seen limited success or influence, and although present in the work of the probation service throughout its history, the service of ETE was born out of the notion to be tough on the causes of crime. Earlier in this chapter reference was made to the importance of a number of factors above and beyond those of the offence itself. This has been further supported by Whitehead and Statham (2006) who highlight the importance of (amongst others) accommodation, finance, relationships, drugs and alcohol, education and employment, if a successful change is to be achieved in the offenders behaviour.

Although previously noted, the development of the ETE service bears some examination, in order to clarify the situation. Education, training and employment were areas highlighted in the SEU (2002) annual report; as important for the reduction of future further offending, and were reflected in the statement by Blunkett (2003) in his response to the Carter Review of the same year, in which he stated that ETE was integral to a successful reduction in (re)offending. Yet, it was the introduction of the 2003 Act that saw a dedicated ETE service come to the fore. Prior to this Act ETE – like so much of the probation service – was left to local area discretion and seen as part of the role of the probation officer – a jack of all trades and master of none. For the first time, the 2003 Act made ETE an intervention available to the courts as part of the new Community Order, where it was felt that a lack of skill and/or education could be a barrier to employment and a successful rehabilitation.
Interventions, such as ETE, can be seen as reflective of suggestions made by researchers such as Maruna (2004), Rakis (2005), Ward and Maruna (2007), Robinson and Crow (2009), Maruna and LeBel (2010), Bain and Parkinson (2010), and Canton (2011). In each of these instances the importance of numerous factors have been noted as being imperative to a successful change in behaviour and often include more corrections-based educational and vocational training programmes which teach marketable job skills, and more vocational and work programmes, developing good work habits’ and better, more meaningful links with services in the community.

However, the findings of the SEU annual report (2002: 9) also suggested that part of the cause for re-offending stemmed from the fact that ‘ultimately’ no single person or group is responsible for the rehabilitation of an offender. Services are often interrupted, and consist of a great deal of duplication, which more often than not may be a consequence of a lack of communication, resulting in an ineffective service, frustration, confusion and negativity on the part of the service user (in this case the offender). Due in part to the often chaotic lives of the individual, ETE is something which is often seen to require a multi-agency, multi-disciplinary approach, providing for a sustained level of support over a prolonged period of time (Wormith et al, 2008). However, this has also been found to be the cause of further confusion for the individual.

This would seem to provide further evidence for Finn’s discussion of confusion and fatigue (2000). However, it seems that where Finn was suggesting fatigue played out amongst service providers, similar feelings may be observed in the individuals supervised by the
probation service as they struggle with the requirements to keep to a strict timetable of events and appointments with a variety of people and services.

Employment, as noted by Whitehead and Statham (2006: 67) is not simply a means of making money, but also personal development and growth, providing ‘...a stake in society and most importantly something to lose’. Critically Rhodes (2008: 2) has noted that the future position of offenders is of great importance to all in society, especially when faced with the negative attitudes of the vast number of employers who are ‘...simply unwilling, to employ individuals with a criminal record’. Importantly however Rhodes (referring to the Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD), 2007) goes on to say that this reluctance remains, despite the fact that ⅓ of all males under the age of 30 years have a criminal record (Rhodes, 2008). Crow (1996: 53) is similarly quick to point out that employment is not the only factor important to discussions of criminal activity and provides the analogy of the tea-drinkers as an example, suggesting that although ‘...a high proportion of alcoholics drink tea does not mean that tea-drinkers will become alcoholics’. It is similarly important to find out what other factors hold significance for the individual. This is somewhat reflective of the TUC report (2001: 4) which concluded that according to Jack Straw as Minister of Justice ‘crime breeds when individuals are left without a stake in society’. The importance of a whole range of personal and social factors as this chapter has sought to highlight (such as education, employability skills, identity, self-worth, emotional wellbeing and unemployment) are intertwined and should not be played down.
Soft Skills and Outcomes

The employment of quantitative data in assessing hard outcomes of employment, training, and education, or turnover, retention and successful completion, are fairly straightforward. It is much more difficult to assess the success of the work undertaken to support the development of interpersonal skills, the maintenance or improvement of self-confidence, and the presentation of self, and can compound the negative feelings that individuals associate with themselves as they receive little or no recognition of change, growth or development. However, these skills also provide evidence of the adaptability, motivation, and flexibility, which employers consider important in their current and future employees. This is something that has been considered by ECOTEC (1998), who suggest that soft skills (in terms of employability) can be conceptualised in terms of attitudinal skill: self-esteem, responsibility, confidence, and motivation; life skill: time-keeping, attendance, hygiene, and personal presentation; and transferable skill: problem-solving, communication, evaluation, and teamworking. In other research, Lloyd and O’Sullivan (2003: 5) interpreted soft outcomes as intrinsic stepping stones to employment, regarding them as ‘outcomes that represent intermediary stages on the way to achieving a hard outcome’.

Soft skills have been variously defined as ‘skills, abilities and traits that pertain to personality, attitude and behaviour rather than to formal or technical knowledge’ (Moss and Tilley, 1996: 253). Yet whilst there are many organisations across the employment sector who are working with clients who are unwilling, unable, or do not qualify to undertake accredited learning, it is something which is frequently missed from the funding stream. Significantly, the Learning and Skills Council (LSC) noted the importance of non-accredited learning – such as the acquisition of soft skills – and stressed the need to recognise ‘learning
which does not lead to an accredited qualification, yet demonstrates learners’ achievements’ (LSC, 2003: 20).

Many offenders are convicted of petty and minor offences, often compounded by the associated lack of skills, qualifications, and employment experience. This has been supported in the findings of the SEU Annual Report (2002) which noted the multiple deficits offenders exhibit in both soft and hard outcomes, suggesting that a large proportion of offenders enter and leave prison with low educational standards (and as noted previously in chapter two), 64 per cent having literacy skills at or below that of an eleven year old child. Rhodes (2008) has noted that sustainable employment can reduce the re-offending rate by between one-third and a half, and although figures for unemployment are no different for offenders than they are for non-offenders, offenders are also faced with the addition of discrimination (based on past behaviour), social-stigma, and alienation associated with a criminal record.

Crucially, Nickson et al. (2012: 67) have argued that the social skills which many people take for granted, such as appearance, attitude, work ethic, team work and communication are often missing in others, and conclude that ‘...the focus on qualifications ignores some key issues in skill formation’. These are the same skills offenders often lack and are the same skills more likely to support them successfully gaining and maintaining employment in the future.

NACRO (2006) continued to raise the importance of skills in education, training and employment for offenders and highlighted the discussion in a briefing paper produced as a
response to the government’s green paper: Reducing Re-offending through skills and employment. In it NACRO stated that of those offenders sentenced to custody, 67 per cent were unemployed in the month prior to the start of their sentence, significantly they also noted that 76 per cent of offenders have no job to go to once released (2006: 3). This same group of offenders often lack the simple life skills and are simply not ready to move into employment. Thus NACRO (2006: 7) conclude that ‘...people often need help with benefits, accommodation or health issues’ before they are ready to look to the next step. This is where strong offender management is key, with the supervising officer actively involved at all stages, helping the offender to make sense of the order and its requirements, ensuring compliance and success in the intervention (Canton, 2011). With hindsight it is easy to question why these outcomes were ignored, but as Burrowes and Needs (2009) state the associated hard outcomes (of education, training and employment) and latterly the desistance from crime, often follow on from successful work undertaken in supporting a readiness to change in the individual.

Supporting Change through Advocacy/Mentors

Insecurities in individual and/or social position often lead to a rush for self-justification, which although well-meant can have a knock on effect for other services (and service users). The title of this chapter suggested an impeding of progress or support for change, and evidence would seem to suggest that interventions have a key part to play in desistance from crime and a successful change in life-styles. However, the constant development of services seems at odds with evidence, a successful life-change will only be enacted if there is a supportive environment and advice and guidance which addresses the needs of the individual rather than the needs of the service (provider). This is a point raised in the
Government’s Green Paper: *Reducing Re-offending through Skills and employment* (HO, 2005: Foreword) in which it was stated that ‘...we cannot properly protect the public by focusing on punishment alone; we must also address the underlying causes of crime’. As previously noted, many offenders simply do not have the life-skills to cope with the work environment and require much greater support in order to prepare them for a life without crime. Just as good employment has been found to be related to ‘stopping’ offending, Farrall (2002: 15) has also noted that poor or irregular employment, or prolonged periods of unemployment have all been associated with reconvictions. This is particularly important for the work undertaken with offenders, as it only adds to an increasing body of evidence which suggest a focus on the self and feelings of worth, often referred to as soft-outcomes, improve job-readiness and support a desistance from crime (NACRO, 2006).

Canton (2011) reminds the reader that much of the work undertaken, and certainly that of interventions, is targeted, but soft-outcomes do not always lend themselves to measurement in the traditional sense. In this instance, the method of study would need to establish where the individual started and at what point they are at following the conclusion of the intervention (in relation to no other) and then make a positive decision about a successful change, relative to where they began. Targets require a measurable outcome and (as noted earlier in the chapter) this is not always observable in an individual who has never worked, or completed a course of training.

Whilst the emphasis remains firmly focused upon education, training and employment for offenders, the challenges and successes achieved along the way are often ignored, forgotten or disregarded. Indeed, Carter and Pycroft (2010: 227) note that changes can be
unpredictable, they can be ‘...gradual or quite sudden and often there may be specific triggers or a ‘threshold’ reached where a change in perspective and/or circumstances marks a turning point’. This may further evidence the importance of good relationships with a supervising officer (probation or otherwise), who can guide and motivate the offender, thus supporting the drive towards change.

In many respects this supportive relationship could be suggestive of a mentoring role which aims to provide the offender with ‘life’s essentials, such as finding a dentist or registering with a GP, and ensuring they know where to go to get help with things like housing, employment and money worries’ (Surrey Care Trust, 2012: para 1). Although more commonly associated with young offenders (see for example the discussion provided by Newburn and Shiner, 2005), these and similar services have risen in popularity with work undertaken with adult offenders (MoJ, 2008), who can just as easily be considered vulnerable individuals due to multiple needs. This has most recently been highlighted in the Coalition government’s consultation document, Transforming Rehabilitation (2013), in which they have noted the invaluable work that can be done by volunteer mentors meeting offenders at the prison gate. In a similar way to the statement of Surrey Care Trust (above), the Coalition Government have suggested that through a greater use of voluntary mentoring services, offenders could be supported in all aspects of their lives: finding work, accommodation, addressing educational need and supporting them with drug and alcohol addictions (MoJ, 2013).

This may go some way to supporting cost-cutting strategies, but as Carter and Pycroft (2010) note, not everything is positive. In their example of working with offenders on a Forestry
Commission partnership, they correctly note that implications exist for the training of and resourcing for mentors, not least in terms of funding for such projects, especially in such a strict and regimented regime as offender management. This is a concern where Phillip and Spratt (2007) – in evaluating the evidence of previously published work on mentoring schemes – have argued little conclusive evidence exists of the effectiveness of such a service to support the individual in achieving a ‘hard-outcome’, such as education and/or employment. This may be due to the fact that it is often difficult to isolate the impact of mentoring from other guidance, support or experiences the individual has.

Conversely however, although not reported as mentoring, Maruna (2001: 102) found that ‘offenders often discover that they are quite good at counseling (sic) other ex-offenders’. To this can be added the more recent findings of Maguire and Raynor (2010: 243), who note that whilst the supporting evidence for mentoring (with adults) is limited, the work that has been undertaken ‘...can generally be described as ‘promising’’.

**Conclusion**

Anything undertaken with an offender is in some way, shape or form an intervention. It is not so much that which is at question, as what the expectation is of the individual to gain from the work undertaken with the service provider. The focus of chapter one concerned the purpose of punishment, and it was suggested that much of the attention has centred upon (1) the roles played by deterrence and rehabilitation to support successful desistance and, (2) punishments often seen as volatile and contradictory (O’Malley, 1999). The discussion which followed in chapter two highlighted the way in which policy formation is often influenced by the perception that deterrence is more effective at reducing crime than
rehabilitation. Deterrence suggests something to lose, where rehabilitation suggests something to gain.

However, it is more often the case, as this chapter has shown, that the individual begins from a position where ‘the gain’ is often related to achieving the same standard already afforded others; the so-called level playing field suggested by both Blunkett (2003) and Blair (2003), in their leading roles for the previous government. Interventions which seek to punish, coerce or cajole, often miss the vital understanding and knowledge of the individual and it is this which drives the remainder of the thesis – seeking to hear the voice of the offender, their own experiences and understanding associated with interventions which seek to support desistance and the rehabilitation of the offender.

The remainder of this discourse turns its attention to the present research undertaking and considers the question of whether a successful change, leading to a desistance from crime, can be supported in a community sentence. Chapter four provides for a discussion of the methodology of the study and is set against an analysis of research methods more generally.

Chapter five presents the findings of the data generated from 83 (completed) assisted questionnaires, interviews with both offenders and the staff (and management) of a local area ETE Team and concludes with an analysis of outcomes achieved following a period of intervention. The chapter puts in to context the role of ETE as an intervention which supports a change in behaviour by offering opportunity, knowledge and understanding, a growth and development of the individual, in preference to that of a retrospective punishment.
In the final chapter (six) the discussion will turn to an examination of these findings and offer some insight into the data in relation to the wider literature, and evidenced through the individual experience. In all, the following chapters will enable a short conclusion, recommendations and reflections to be made in relation to the positive role played by interventions, whilst considering the importance, effectiveness and ability of a service of ETE to provide the supportive environment and to aid successful desistance.
Chapter 4: Methodology

Before moving on to discuss the findings of the research, it is of benefit to provide a brief summary of the methods used and the decision taken to work with this methodology. The following sections of the chapter deal with the population and sampling; Data collection, Data analysis, the Ethical considerations and Limitations of the methodology.

As a case study examining the personal experiences of a programme of intervention in a local community setting (identified as aim 3 in the introductory chapter), this study made use of a number of research methodologies in order to achieve its goal. It intended, primarily, to obtain the views of offenders (their voice) on the ETE provision, and these experiences were further explored through in one-to-one semi-structured interviews with members of the ETE team in the same local probation service area. In making offenders the principal focus of research attention it is acknowledged that they are a vulnerable group, due to their position, which when under supervision leaves them with little power or control over their situation. As such any work undertaken requires care and consideration. In order to aid this (as a localised study) the research made use of a mixed methodological approach for a number of reasons.

In the first place, the use of more than one method also meant more than one visit would be made and therefore provided a greater opportunity of building a rapport, with the individual. Furthermore, this methodology was chosen as it enabled a triangulation of data, which offers the opportunity to enhance both the validity and the reliability of the study,
and has led Nastasi, Hitchcock, Sarkar, Burkholder, Varjas, and Jayasena (2007) to suggest that a mixed methodology can generate information that individual methods cannot.

The programme of research made use of a convenience sample with offenders and offered them the opportunity to take part in two initial stages: utilising Assisted Questionnaires and a semi-structured Interviews. Additionally, ETE staff and managers were also interviewed in order to provide a holistic picture of the structure, experience and implementation of service. The final stage of the research was to make an examination of the outcome related to the individual case, whether the individual had completed a programme of intervention with the Education, Training and Employment team, or not.

Each stage was undertaken with two questions in mind, which both reflected and built upon the aims of the study:

1. Is the intervention (of ETE) made available to the offenders in the community helping to support a reduction in re-offending rates? (Aim 2), and

2. Do the offenders perceive the service offered through the ETE officers/team as a positive form of support, helping them to desist from crime? (Aim 3)

Population and Sampling

Following suggestions made by Teddlie and Yu, the study made use of a convenience sampling technique which involved ‘...drawing samples that are both accessible and willing to participate in a study’ (Teddlie and Yu, 2007: 78), which although providing for some degree of bias also meant that those who did participate were generally open about their experience and felt they had something to say and therefore engaged in the discussion. In
this instance the population was drawn from those individuals undergoing some form of supervision (with the National Probation Service) in the community, either as an order of the court, or following a period of custody. Recently available figures suggested that in the research area the offending population was made up of 88.5% male and 11.5% female. More generally in the local probation service area of study, almost 80% of crime was committed by male offenders and similar figures were reflected in the research sample. In total, the research area reported supervising up to 7,000 offenders at any one time, and included those made subject to a community punishment (of sorts), those on licence, and a number of cases that were active even though the individual was currently serving a custodial sentence (NPS [...], 2008).

The research aimed to examine the experiences of those individuals who had received advice and guidance from the ETE team, and the sample for the study was drawn from the active caseloads of that same team. The caseload was defined as being those offenders that had been made subject to a period of supervision, either as part of a licence condition or an order of the court, and whilst the probation area of study suggests a caseload of almost 7,000 offenders the ETE team has a remit to provide guidance and advice to 40 per cent of those offenders made subject to an order of supervision, and who are unemployed at the start of the order (Creasey, 2005). This was a task made difficult for a team that had been subject to low staffing levels; personnel away from work – either as part of a secondment, or others that were off work (long-term sickness), and further budgetary cuts throughout the period of investigation. During the period of study the team was made up of ten officers (8 female, 2 male), six officers were employed full-time officers and four officers were part-time. However, one full-time member of the team remained on long term sick throughout
the duration of the study (and eventually left the service), effectively providing for nine staff members located throughout the county.

Data presented in the ETE Annual Report [...] (2008-09) suggested a total population of 798 offenders actively engaged with the intervention (either through guidance provided for by the ETE Officer, a local college, or a training provider), in the year prior to this study. This figure accounted for approximately 11.4% of the total cases active within the local probation service area, and thus gave rise to a target figure of between 10 and 20 per cent (80-160 offenders) in order to provide for a representative sample in the initial stage of questionnaires (Appendix 4: Referral Figures by Office, provides a breakdown of the total figures for ETE referral).

In this instance, the study made use of a sequential sampling strategy (as suggested by Teddlie and Yu, 2007) in which information drawn from the first procedure would then be used to draw the second sample, i.e. in the first stage a questionnaire would be administered to a calculated percentage (10-20 per cent) of the whole population, in order to provide the sample population for the subsequent (10-20 per cent) interview stage (each of which are reflected in Appendices 3: Referral by Office; 4: Questionnaire Planner; 5: Interview Planner – ETE Team; 6: Interview Planner – Offender).

In total 138 offenders were offered the opportunity to complete an Assisted Questionnaire, and achieved a response rate of 60.1% (83) completed questionnaires. Stage two of the study provided for the semi-structured interviews and again aimed to offer interviews to between 10-20 per cent (8-16) of those that completed the questionnaire. Prior agreement
to participate in the interview process had been agreed at the questionnaire stage, and all participants had been informed of what their involvement would require. They were also informed of their rights as part of the research programme and informed of their right to withdraw at any point (see Appendix 5: Introduction, Consent and Guidance Form). Members of the ETE staff were asked to provide diary appointments for those that were happy to take part in the interviews and arranged for an interview room to be made available. In order to provide for a representative sample 17 individuals were offered interviews. This figure was reached by multiplying the numbers of participants that completed the assisted Questionnaire, by 10 and 20 per cent, providing a sample size of between 8 and 17 interviews and was further arranged by office. Of the 17 interviews offered, 9 were completed and a further 8 failed to report.

A second sub-set to the interviews were the staff members and managers themselves, who were also offered the opportunity of an interview and was primarily undertaken to examine whether the expectations and experiences of the offenders matched with the work undertaken by the staff, the policy and direction provided by the service. In total, nine officers were offered interviews: one declined due to long-term sickness; eight officers and five members of the management team were interviewed. Officers were drawn from all over the area and the management structure included the Line Manager up to and including the Director of Interventions.

Non-response

Due to the nature of the ETE service it was inevitable that people would not attend interviews (or complete questionnaires), and there are a number of reasons why this was
the case. For instance, due to the chaotic life-style which offenders with an illicit drug misuse habit lead, they can become unreliable in other aspects of their lives. Spencer, Deakin, Seddon, Ralphs and Boyle (2008) have noted that persistent drug-users must be motivated to change in order for change to take place. Similarly, it is possible that the individual may find gainful employment, or take on a training programme which takes them away from the office, requiring them to report at another office or during an evening report scheme. Both of these points needed to be considered as they may have had the potential to leave the sample short in a number of areas. Other facts that may have had an impact upon the response rate include ill health, their own or a family member, or indeed, caring responsibilities, all of which can impact upon their ability/willingness to attend.

In this instance, each of the participants was a volunteer and as previously noted were given the opportunity to withdraw, or refuse to take part, as part of the code of ethical practice for any research study (see Appendix 5: Introduction, Consent and Guidance Form). Again, this has the potential to leave large gaps in the research, as there is only the opportunity to assess the impact of the interventions with those that comply with the order, but in another more positive way, it provides the opportunity to interview individuals that are open and feel more comfortable with the situation that they find themselves in. For instance, in making them aware that they are free to leave (and indeed, free to refuse to take part), they are also freed of the burden of conforming because they think that it is what is expected of them. This would seem to suggest that a Hawthorne Effect is less likely to occur. According to Pole and Lampard (2002), people give the answers to particular questions or in a particular way because they believe it is what the researcher or authority figure wishes to
hear. This ‘effect’ can affect the reliability of data as it is not possible to know if this is truly the beliefs of the individual or just what they think is expected.

In this instance, although questions remain as to why such a large proportion did not attend appointments or refused to take part, the response rate of over 60 per cent was considered to be an excellent sample, surpassing the ETE teams own reported attendance figure of 48 per cent (NPS, 2008). However, this may also have some impact upon the data collection and the findings of the research as the sample of offenders may not be wholly representative of the (offending) population in the area of study. This would provide a bias, or limitation of the findings as only those that wished to participate were able to relate their experience and understanding of the service.

**Data Collection**

As previously noted the study made use of a mixed methodology (or Triangulation) as suggested by Robson. In recent years, says Robson (2002: 5), there has been a growing trend towards designs ‘...which make use of two or more methods, and which yield both quantitative and qualitative data’, thus strengthening both internal and external validity and providing greater depth of knowledge and a wider (more general) application. However, in this instance the decision to use a triangulation method was also influenced by the conclusion reached by Nastasi et al. (2007) who note that mixed methods are particularly relevant to the comprehensive evaluation of conditions necessary for effective interventions and can thus help to facilitate translational research. A single qualitative, or quantitative, approach would have failed to provide the depth of knowledge and understanding required within this study.
In order to maintain the requirements of confidentiality all names of staff and participants were removed. For identification purposes, individuals were then coded according to their involvement in the study. Therefore, those offenders who took part in the initial Assisted Questionnaires were coded by a number followed by a letter (for example: 01B), the number representing the case record in the SPSS data set and the letter representing the office where the questionnaire took place. Where a participant consented to an interview the record was reversed (e.g. B01). In relation to members of staff and managers who consented to interview, the process was complicated by the movement of staff around the county/area and the fact that managers do not always have ties to specific locations. To simplify, all staff members – regardless of position – were identified by a pre-fix of ETEO (staff), followed by a number, representing the location where the interview took place, similarly managers were given the prefix ETEM or SM representing the position of either a member of the ETE Management team or the Senior Management, which was then followed by a number.

**Assisted Questionnaires**

As noted earlier in the chapter, the programme of study was designed to make use of a combination of data collection techniques. In the first offenders supervised in the research area were offered the opportunity to complete a questionnaire, in order to build a relationship with the offender and to generate some basic knowledge and understanding of individual perception of the service they were provided.
An assisted questionnaire was chosen in recognition of the findings of the SEU (2002) and others, who suggest that for a large proportion of the offender population literacy and numeracy, may be an area for concern. One such finding was reported by the House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts (2008: 3) stating that ‘...half of those in custody have no qualifications and almost 40% have a reading age beneath that expected of a competent 11 year old’. Thus by assisting the participant with completion of the questionnaire, feelings of awkwardness and misunderstanding can be avoided. The data collected through the assisted questionnaire was analysed using SPSS (18) and examined the cumulative totals and frequency of data.

Semi-structured Interviews

Those that completed the questionnaire were then asked if they would be willing to take part in a short interview based upon their own experiences of the Education, Training and Employment provision, and reflected the importance of individual knowledge and understanding.

In order to obtain a full and representative picture of individual knowledge and understanding, a semi-structured interview was booked for seventeen offenders (making up 20 per cent of the total population), and was successful concluded on nine of the seventeen occasions (providing a response rate of 52.9%).

A semi-structured interview was chosen as it offered the opportunity for the researcher to understand more fully the individual needs. A structured interview would only have guided the participant to very specific information without the opportunity to explore a particular
understanding, whereas an unstructured interview lacks controls and could have led to rambling, and information that was irrelevant to this study. Interviews were not recorded as there was a wish to provide as comfortable a setting as possible, a point highlighted by Milne and Bull (2006), who suggest that in interviewing victims (and vulnerable people) the interview should – where possible – resemble a conversation and not in the strictest sense that of an interview per se. This decision was further supported by the findings of Holt and Pamment (2010) noting that this form of methodology offers the opportunity to overcome the rather awkward situation of offenders refusing to take part as their last experience of interviews may have been whilst in the custody suite at the police station.

Outcomes Analysis
The final part of the study required an analysis of data generated by CRAMs (Case Record and Management System) in the research area. CRAMs is a computerised system for managing the day-to-day case information, movement and activity of individual offenders (such as group work and participation in or on unpaid work groups, as well as the outcome of any court appearances or case proceedings). Importantly however, CRAMs also has a page dedicated to crimino-genic need including: training and employment, accommodation, and relationships, each of which are seen to form part of the pathways out of offending initiative (previously discussed in chapter 3).

The outcome analysis was completed based upon data which has been collected by the ETEO and/or Offender Managers and put on to the CRAMs system. It is believed that, following the initial interview with an ETEO, those individuals that have chosen to work with the ETEO will be better prepared for a crime free life and are those less likely to re-offend.
The research was further supported through an examination of the stated outcome attached to the case file. This stage was independent of the first two and did not need either of the previous two investigations to be completed in order to draw the data. It provided for an opportunity, based upon an analysis of CRAMS input and data, to examine the position of the individuals offered an appointment and a skills assessment by the ETE team following a period of not less than 18 months, and not more than 24 months. The National Probation Service report that reconviction studies take a minimum of 2-3 years to complete and researchers gain little feedback on changes in behaviour and attitudes in periods much reduced from this. This was a period which fit the wider parameters of the research timetable originally set (eighteen months investigation, plus a six months period of analysis).

This analysis does not provide definitive and positive proof of change as a direct response to the intervention, or if the intervention is the catalyst for change, but it does provide some idea as to the support offered and the importance of that support to the individual, and thus the successful period of desistance following intervention. Again, Nastasi et al. (2007: 165, 167), suggest this combination of data collection processes, can inform the direction and implementation of the intervention in the future – a future and important objective of the thesis as set out in the aims of the study in the introductory chapter (page 8).

Data Analysis

Although in this instance it was important to consider the use of and results drawn from the statistical analysis, this does not always mean ‘number crunching’, indeed Sandelowski,
Voils, and Knafl (2009) make the point that a researcher should consider what added value there will be to converting data generated through qualitative investigations. In a similar way it was felt important to remember that a key focus of the study was to listen to and understand the individuals knowledge and understanding and it was believed that this would have been lost if the data had been reduced to a series of numbers and percentage points. Thus, statistical analysis was only conducted upon the data drawn from the first and final stages (the Assisted Questionnaire and Outcomes Analysis) and not the interviews undertaken.

In this instance then, a mixed methodological approach – using a consecutive sequential process, where each part of the methodological procedure was informed by and followed the completion of the last – was conducted. Initially, the study utilised an Assisted Questionnaire in the form of a Likert Scale, where offenders could provide quantitative and in-depth qualitative data. It was then possible to cross reference this data with the findings in the interviews, those with both the staff members and – importantly – those views of the offenders. Secondly, following the standard period of collection for reconviction data (2 years following conviction), case records were re-examined to assess the level of re-offending/reconviction which has taken place following the successful completion (or otherwise) of the community based intervention (Education, Training and Employment).

**Stage 1: The Assisted Questionnaire**

The assisted Questionnaire made use of both quantitative and qualitative questions in order to look for common themes, but also to enable a fuller response where the participant wanted to provide clarification on a certain point. A likert scale was employed in order to
collect and analyse the quantitative data. However, the decision was taken that the scale would not be reversed as is normal in such a test (Appendix 6: Assisted Questionnaire and Likert Scale). In reversing the scale, even in a proportion of the questions, there can be a gain in validity due to the fact that it is then harder for the respondent to complete the questionnaire by picking and circling the same number all the way through without first reading the questions.

In this instance however, consideration was also given to the educational level of many of the participants who were currently undertaking some form of punishment as a result of criminal behaviour and in light of the fact that many offenders have a reading and writing level equal to that of an eleven year old child (see the House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, 2008; and the Nescot Report, 2007 for further discussion). As such the participant may have become frustrated and confused, leaving the questionnaire incomplete if asked to complete it alone.

It was expected that using a Likert scale to inform the coding process and through the use of SPSS (18), a degree of statistical significance could be tested for, determining levels of experience, understanding and (once an outcomes analysis was added and calculated) the personal success (or distance travelled) could be determined. Sandelowski et al. (2009: 212) note that number crunching ‘...is usually taken for granted as a mundane and transposable process and, thereby, as an objective and transparent process not requiring much scrutiny’. However, it is always possible to go too far and search ordinal/interval data until meaning is found. This investigation made use of both quantitative and qualitative data methods and as
such provided for an investigation not only of the numeric value, but also the associated meanings.

Although there is an examination of the standard deviation and mean values as the primary indicator, the data analysis does not go further as the sample size was not strong enough to provide for a more generally representative body. The resources taken up in terms of time taken to input the data and then in learning levels of statistical analysis, before looking for trends in the data etc., is an influencing factor in the decision to not ‘count’ the interviews. It is the meaning and understanding that each individual attaches to the experience of the intervention that is of greatest importance, which could not be achieved in placing a numeric value upon a statement.

Cross-tabulation and frequency counts were made in order to look for patterns in the data. Once completed, it was then possible to cross reference this data with the findings from the interviews which had been undertaken, those with both staff members and – importantly – those of the offenders, and was done in order to look for trends or commonalities which reflected good practice, and/or positive and negative experiences.

**Stage 2: Semi-Structured Interviews**

Interviews made up an important part of the data, not only because of the depth of knowledge and understanding gained, but also because of the wide array of participants: ETE officers, the Management Team (both Supervisory and Interventions), and the offenders (see Appendix 7: Participant Interview Schedule; and Appendix 8: Staff Interview Schedule).
The interviews with staff members (including the management team) consisted of 3 areas for investigation and were further broken down into a series of areas for discussion. Similarly, the interviews with offenders were based upon the responses made to the questionnaire, divided into education and training, employment, offending behaviour, and future expectation. Each of the questions were selected to provide for a structure which were both clear and goal orientated, but at the same time retaining the flexibility, which Jupp, Davies and Francis (2000) consider of the upper-most importance. The themes in the interviews with members of staff were structured in such a way as to mirror interview questions that were asked of offenders, and where this was not possible then the question was asked in order to enhance or develop upon points of interest raised through the interviews with offenders.

A matrix, containing each of the questions asked at interview was then produced and the data generated examined for evidence of areas that participants held similarly positive or negative views about (Appendix 9: Interview Matrix – Exemplar). These then formed the basis for the thematic discussions which develop in the following chapter (6: Discussion, conclusions and implications for future practice).

**Stage 3: Outcome Analysis**

Finally, following the standard period of collection for reconviction data (2 years following the original offence), case records were re-examined to assess the level of re-offending/reconviction which has taken place following the completion (successful or not) of the community based intervention (in this case Education, Training and Employment).
Case numbers had been retained throughout the period of the study in order to enable this final stage to take place, and was vital to enable an examination of the record held on CRAMs. This data was then entered into the SPSS data table and offered the opportunity for further analysis.

Ethical Issues

In addition to following the guidance provided by the University of Portsmouth, key notes on ethical practice were drawn from a number of academic texts and the British Society of Criminology (2008). This was especially important when considering the needs, background and experiences of the individuals taking part in the study, many of whom would be regarded as vulnerable. This supported the development of an ethics notice and a consent form (Appendix 5: Introduction, Consent and Guidance Form) which both introduced and informed participants of their rights: within the study; to withdraw from the study; to have their data destroyed – even where this could be detrimental to the final outcome (Robson, 2002). Additionally, participants were also provided information about what would happen to their data in the future, and following a similar observation made by Sanchez-Jankowski (2002: 152) offered the opportunity to review what had been written about them at intervals throughout the study. By affording the offender the opportunity to read the data collected, and therefore have their data removed from the study, it was possible to instil a confidence in the study, which may have been otherwise missed.

The consent form also informed the participant that, wherever possible, their data would be anonymised providing safe-guards against their identification. As was noted earlier in the chapter, questionnaires and interviews were coded with a formula which enabled future
tracking of the participant. On the questionnaire/interview schedule, the individuals were identified with a number – which corresponded to the case number in the SPSS data sheet – and a letter which identified the office/location where the questionnaire and/or interview were completed. During the assisted Questionnaire the number was followed by the locator (i.e. 01B) and if an interview was later arranged with the participant then the locator and case number were reversed (i.e. B01). A record of the CRN (criminal record number), was kept throughout the study in order to book the follow up interview, or to gather data as part of the assessment of individual outcomes, where this was both appropriate and possible, and in the interests of full disclosure and anonymity, it also meant that the record of the CRN could then be destroyed once the research had been completed.

Participants were informed that anonymity could not be guaranteed where the information provided informed of a crime which pertained to the harm of another and for which the offender(s) had not been convicted (Robson, 2002). This reflected agreement made with the local probation service who (with public protection in mind) required to be informed at the earliest opportunity, both in meetings with members of staff and/or the management team, and was highlighted in the proposal of the research. This openness on the part of the researcher was (in part) also done to gain the greatest understanding of the individual, and to help support the openness of the offender, whilst waylaying any anxiety around the identification of individuals.

Limitations of the Methodology

However, it is acknowledged that this form of data collection has its own limitations, which include (but are not limited to) the fact that the individuals undertaking the questionnaire
and/or interview were attending the premises for a pre-arranged appointment with a member of staff from the probation service. Their willingness to give up their time to undertake a questionnaire/interview may also have been influenced by the need to show compliance with the supervision order, as much as supporting a greater understanding of what would help them now and in the future.

The research was undertaken with one small interventions team as a localised case study, and within a fixed time-period, and as levels of service differ it is questionable whether the findings could be generalised to a wider (national) populace. Further to this it is recognised that there is not a large enough sample to give the study the power to conduct a more stringent statistical analysis, or to undertake regression analysis (to any meaningful degree). The strength of this methodology come from its examination of comments made during the assisted questionnaire, analysis of the interviews conducted, and the meaning attached to the statements made by the individual.

In this instance however, it was felt that the mixed methodological approach provided for the greatest opportunity to assess the (positive) impact of an intervention of Employment, Training and Education in a non-custodial setting, and to consider the (centrality of) the ETE role to the wider probation service – a service geared to risk and public protection – which often neglects the ability and potential of such an intervention to support change and guide desistance. There were seen as key aims from within the research, and guided the direction and evaluation of the study throughout.
Chapter 5: The Findings

Previous chapters discussed the role of punishment, providing for a particular focus upon community based sanctions, the role and importance associated with education and employment (chapters 1 and 2), and considered the wider base of interventions, the implementation of such and the role they play in supporting change in the offender (chapter 3). For the greater part the literature is formulated in a discussion of policy and carries with it a level of expectation. Of course there is often a considerable difference between policy expectation and the implementation of service. An important factor in the implementation of service is the human element associated with the individuals undertaking the duties of an interventions officer – in this instance an ETE officer – and those made subject to the court order or Licence period.

This chapter will make use of an integrated discourse which will follow a series of identified themes drawn from the assisted questionnaires (AQs) and semi-structured interviews undertaken with both offenders and staff members of a National Probation Area Trust, described in the previous chapter (chapter 4). This is important to note as the focus of the study was to gain a greater understanding of individual knowledge and experience (Aim: 3), and not necessarily to provide a broad brush-stroke of the work undertaken through interventions. In part this was influenced by two statements, the first made by Lewis (2005: 127) in which she noted that ‘…offenders have little to say as to how they are to be rehabilitated’, conversely the argument can be made that little attention has been paid to the help required by offenders, and to ask them what would help. This was further cemented by Maruna and Matravers (2007: 437) argument concerning the importance of
the individual’s voice to any research, in which they argue that ‘...the life narrative(s) of a single individual can generate at least as much insight into offending as getting to know a little bit about 200 or 2000 human beings in a large-scale survey’. If the conclusions are that the service of the ETE team is *important* to supporting change, then it is also *important* to understand it from the perspective of the individual, how they view the service, the things that they hold *important*, and how the service is to be improved and move forward in the future (noted in Aims 2, 3 and 4). In May 2011, this was highlighted by the Ministry of Justice in the review of offender learning. It was noted that ‘...the vast majority (97%) of offenders say they want to stop offending, and they say that the biggest factor in helping them to do so (68%) is having a job’ (MOJ, 2011: 10). This finding will be explored both in this chapter through the associated findings drawn from the data and later as part of chapter 6: Discussion, Conclusions and Implications for Future Practice.

This chapter concentrates upon the findings of an investigation to examine the work carried out by the Education, Training and Employment team in a single area. This is represented through the consideration of a number of themes that have emerged from the research and which play a key role in understanding that the provision of ETE in a non-custodial setting has on individual expectation and reducing re-offending (as set out in Aim 2: Consider the role of interventions in supporting a reduction in offending behaviour to achieve periods of desistance in adult offenders). These are: 1) ‘hard outcomes’ and the part they play in desistance; 2) The importance of ‘soft outcomes’ to change and desistance from criminal behaviour; 3) The work of other organisations and the important place they have in supporting change; 4) The crucial role of the offender-staff relationship; 5) Changes worth making; and 6) Effective supervision.
Population and Analysis

The research began with an assisted questionnaire (AQ) administered to a convenience sample (as suggested in the methodology), taken across a medium sized probation area (with Trust status) in England & Wales, and yielded a return rate of 60.1% \( (n=83) \) ‘completed’ AQs, with 39.9% \( (n=55) \) who ‘refused’ or ‘did not attend’ the appointed session (4 refusals and 51 DNA). Initial data concerned the demographic make-up of the sample and (as noted previously in chapter 4) although this could not be examined until the end of the project, it did prove to be representative of the local probation area. Information was gathered concerning the gender, age group and ethnicity (see Tables 5.1 a, b, and c, below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1a: Attendance recorded by Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>68 (81.9%)</td>
<td>15 (18.1%)</td>
<td>83 (60.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Attendance</td>
<td>44 (80.0%)</td>
<td>11 (20.0%)</td>
<td>55 (39.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112 (81.2%)</td>
<td>26 (18.8%)</td>
<td>( n=138 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1b: Attendance recorded by Age</th>
<th>17-21 years</th>
<th>22-30 years</th>
<th>31-40 years</th>
<th>41 years +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>21 (15.2%)</td>
<td>24 (17.4%)</td>
<td>21 (15.2%)</td>
<td>17 (12.3%)</td>
<td>83 (60.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Attendance</td>
<td>19 (13.8%)</td>
<td>16 (11.6%)</td>
<td>17 (12.3%)</td>
<td>3 (2.2%)</td>
<td>55 (39.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40 (29.0%)</td>
<td>40 (29.0%)</td>
<td>38 (27.5%)</td>
<td>20 (14.5%)</td>
<td>138 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.1c: Attendance recorded by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2</th>
<th>W3</th>
<th>M1</th>
<th>M9</th>
<th>BME</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(54.3%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
<td>(60.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Attended</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(37.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>(39.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(92.0%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
<td>(2.2%)</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
<td>(2.9%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*W1 – White British  W2 – White Irish  W3 – White Other
M1 – Mixed (White & Black Caribbean) M9 – Mixed Other  BME – Black & Minority Ethnic

The study used the demographic classification system employed by the research area for ethnicity and was found to provide for comparable levels. As was expected, the sample was predominantly White British, accounting for 94.1%, where Mixed and BME was recorded at 6.5% of the sample population (for comparative purposes the local ETE service area recorded White British at 91.4%, with Mixed race and BME recorded at 8.6% for the same period). Offender groups were also divided by age and once again calculated for attendance. Those expected to be in the largest offending population, are also those able to access the greatest amount of funding and will be aged between 17-21 years. Gelsthorpe and McIvor (2007) concur, and note that the peak age for offending is 18 for males and 15 years of age for female offenders, with access to free further education, apprenticeships and career services, and accounted for 29.0% of the sample and achieved an attendance of 25.3%. A similar size was recorded for those offenders aged between 22-30 years (29.0% of sample) and was recorded at an attendance of 28.9%. The third age group (31-40 years) accounted for 27.5% of the sample and 25.3% of those that attended the initial meeting. The final group in this sample were recorded as being 41 years (+), accounting for some 14.5% of the sample, and although a smaller group, it was still a significant number in the sample. Although a point that will be returned to in chapter 6, it is worth noting here that what appeared in this sample was a picture of an ageing criminal population, one in which
the offender group are either able to avoid detection until much later in life, or fall foul of criminal proceedings much later in life (see Mann, 2012).

As Table 5.1a identifies, the total sample was made up of 81.2% male offenders \((n=112)\) and 18.8% female offenders \((n=26)\). When calculated for attendance figures remained stable with 81.9% of the population recorded as male \((n=68)\) and 18.1% female \((n=15)\). However, as the research made use of a convenience sample, this provided for two interesting findings to begin the study. Firstly, data was recorded as being within the expected attendance figures for the research area, recording a gender division (for the same period) of 88.5% male and 11.5% female, thus providing for representative groups within gender, but perhaps more importantly, it also reflected a decision made (on the part of the participant – offender) to take part in the study. This decision may have been made in the belief that not attending would be seen as a failure to attend, but as all participants were provided the information that it was a voluntary meeting (both in terms of the questionnaire and the interview) attendance was seen as a positive decision to take part – and ultimately – to be heard. The impact of this upon the findings then (as previously highlighted – see chapter 4) is that the sample only represents those that believe they have something of worth to say, or those that believe it will go in their favour should they support (take part) the study.

Detailed data regarding age groups were not recorded in the (ETE) annual report for the local probation service area (NPS, ETE Annual Report [...] 2008-09), but an examination of the data entered in to CRAMs would suggest that the sample taken during the research reflected the wider caseload of the ETE officers from within the area of study.
### Table 5.2: Is this your first experience of the ETE intervention provided?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were asked whether this was their first experience of working with the ETE officer, or if the same/similar service had been offer to them before. Overwhelmingly (81.9%) participants stated that this was the first time they had experienced the service provided, 18.1% stating that they had received a similar service before – from either the current probation service area or from another probation service within England & Wales. Those that had already received some support from the ETE team were asked why they had come back to the (ETE) service, and answers varied, but remained positive:

[N1] “This time I’ve seen him [ETEO7] 3 times and I’m seeing him right after this.

[AB] Yes I know. So what are you seeing him for?

[N1] Plumbing. We’ve been talking about it for a couple of weeks now and I think it’s definitely where I want to go.

[AB] So why didn’t you do this before?

[N1] They only take people on in September. I was just messing around last time, but now it’s the right time and I guess I’m ready to do it.”

[T2] “This is a new order, just started a couple of weeks ago.

[AB] So you’re seeing the ETE officer.

[T2] Yeah. I need to look for work. I had a job... (shrugs shoulders)
[AB] Cash?

[T2] Yeah cash, but it was work. Then it dried up.

[AB] So what’s next?

[T2] He’s helped me but there’s no money for training.

[AB] No money? Why?

[T2] I’m too old to get funding from a lot of places, so it’s kind of first come – first served, if not a youngster, so we’ll keep looking at the jobs I can do.”

This was interesting and important as it showed a level of positivity in the work being undertaken. There was no mention of an expectation that the ETE officer would provide for the participant, only that they felt the officer had in the past provided the guidance needed and that they could provide similar guidance this time around. However, it was also positive as it provided the first insight to a level of trust and optimism in the advice and support offered. This form of engagement could be seen as a positive statement of the contribution of the ETE intervention to reducing reoffending through active participation and guidance of the offender (an important consideration for Aim 2 of the present study).

Initial Observations with ETE Staff Members

As was noted in chapter two, as a Specified Activity, Employment, Training and Education became one of twelve requirements that can be attached to a community order as part of the sentencing process (London Probation Trust, 2011; Taylor, Wasik & Leng, 2004). As ETEM2 noted:

“The CJA 2003 was the first time that ETE was made an order in its own right. It was like finally we had some recognition... and NOMS clarified our position as an intervention and not
part of the supervision team. This was important for us as it made us autonomous as a service.”

This would seem to suggest an element of rehabilitation at the heart of the work undertaken with offenders and the desire to change behaviour and support desistance from future criminal behaviour, rather than a concentration upon compliance. This is important if members of staff are to foster a meaningful working relationship, without the need to coerce the offender into making decisions, as demonstrated in the previous transcript of T2 (chapter 5: 132).

Initial observations provided an opportunity to take a look at the types of work completed with offenders, as well as the sources and resource information available to the ETE Officer. This presented a number of interesting themes to be developed in the interviews with members of staff from the ETE team, including the provision of training (types and levels); resources available in local offices and across the local probation area; time allocated to each case, paperwork, staff development, sourcing new resources, and meeting providers/employers; and the supervision and support offered by management (see Appendix 8: Staff Interview Schedule).

Observations provided clear evidence of knowledge and understanding on the part of the ETE staff. ETE officers appeared to have a very good system for cataloguing information and gathering local resources, each maintaining and updating a ring binder of local services and providers: Colleges, Training Providers, Employment Groups, Job Clubs, etc. In the introductory discussions, officers were able to provide a comprehensive overview of local
training providers, employers, and educational establishments, which could be utilised, and areas that they wished to see developed in the future. For example:

[ETEO3] “It’s really about getting out there and networking, so I get to visit places once in a while, but nothing like we used to. I have the college prospectus sent through to me, information from OLASS, Job Centre (+), that sort of thing. I keep in contact with other colleagues – if I need to... We give each other information and advice, otherwise there’s the telephone, internet and email.”

These observations were further supported through the data collected in the interviews with both ETE officers and the offenders, and evidenced in responses provided in the assisted questionnaire (Appendix 6: Assisted Questionnaire & Likert Scale). Questions such as I think that the work with the ETE team will help support my future plans, elicited a positive response in 78.3% of all questionnaires, and was reflected in additional comments made in response to later questions: In what ways will the work help you achieve your objectives?

[53F] ‘She [ETEO3] has helped me move in new directions I hadn’t even thought of.’

The positive experience was further noted in interview, with statements such as:

[H1] “…she [ETEO9] has been really nice, she’s even helped getting me into a computer course, and has helped look at the jobs I can do.”

On more than one occasion responses were added in recognition of the advice and guidance that they had been provided, offenders offering comments such as:
“It’s been an experience and [ETEO1] has given me some great ideas and opportunities of where to go and what I can do.”

and

Last time we met you were on a drug rehab course and interested in short courses, so how are you getting on?

“Yes. I’m doing well. She [ETEO5] says I’ve done well and we are looking at college and stuff now. It’s really great.”

This experience was further added to by W1 who noted:

“I saw [ETEO1] and she set up an appointment with OLASS and they got the test for the CSCS card – I’ve got that now. It’s [ETEO1] that helped me plan for things; helped me look at things properly...”

Clearly, these initial statements show some support for the strong contribution ETE has made to the reduction of offending and guiding periods of desistance (Aim 2).

However, this was often countered by the limited knowledge ETE officers had of services or events that were available, although not always in their immediate vicinity. When questioned about this officers often commented that although they met up occasionally (monthly when possible) they never really got a chance to find out what was available in other locations. ETEO2 stated that:

“I’d definitely have more operational team meetings. You know, what is everybody doing and how they doing it. What works here or there...”

A comment that was furthered by a number of other officers, for example:
[ETEO7] “There are too many cases so it’s in and out as quickly as I can and get whatever outcomes I can. […] College come in to do essential skills, and I’ve got all the local college prospectus, but otherwise I don’t know what else there is.”

[ETEO9] “There isn’t a guide because everyone is individual; the offender and the officer. I’m missing resources, groups, agencies, that sort of thing, you know, and it’s so varied about what’s available to you at each office and so much is about who knows what and who can pass it on to someone else.”

This was a statement further reflected in the later findings, when staff members were asked what could help them further in the role of an ETE officer. ETEO4 noted that they each needed

“To be given clear and precise guidelines, what the expectations of us are – from the management and upper management of Probation… When I joined it was just about ETE, now it’s ETE, trainers, employers, agencies, and going out to give presentations. It’s not a bad thing but it’s time. We are expected to act as a case manager from within the ETE role. We manage where they go, who they see, what and why. We do so much more recording and record-keeping than ever before and we are constantly re-active to things and never pro-active. It’s always the same. It’s about covering your back, never about improving the way we do things, or the support we provide.”

There was also a feeling amongst the more established members of the team that paperwork and expectation changed so quickly, it was often hard to keep up-to-date with what was required of them, leading to feeling of frustration and isolation, a point raised by ETEO9 concluding that:
“Training is poor. (Shakes her head and looks down to the floor, pausing to gather her thoughts before continuing.) *I think things should be refreshed. There is so much more out there.*”

These and other such comments have also been recognised in the following discussion of the themes developed from the data collection. Offenders were asked to comment on their experiences of the ETE service, both in the questionnaire and later in the interviews. Offenders and staff members were asked what they felt would help (Table 5.8), what further support could be offered to help change in behaviour (Table 5.12) and what other factors may influence their own personal situation and that of others in the future (Table 5.13). The data provided for in the tables above identify a number of interesting points for discussion, each of which gives rise to the themes addressed in the final chapter.

In part what seems a recurring theme from the initial observations (and which arose later in the study), was the feelings of confidence and positivity shown by the offenders in the work that was provided by the individual staff members, even though staff members often lacked the same recognition of their skill and success. This may be because of the (often uncritical) emphasis placed upon hard-outcomes (such as employment) discussed below, where clearly the offenders valued the guidance and support offered in achieving a ‘readiness’ to engage (or preparation for employment).

**Hard Outcomes/Hard Skills**

The term ‘hard-outcomes’ can also refer to education (qualifications) and training (skills) which increase the potential for employability. However, for many of those involved in this
study formal education had not provided for a positive experience and was evidenced in questions such as *I have had good experiences of education in the past*, seen in Table: 5.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, when participants were asked to consider their experiences of education in the past only 34.9% (n=29) were able to reflect upon the experience positively, where 45.8% (n=38) said that they did not find formal education a positive experience. In order to explore this further, the participants were asked if they expected the work with the ETE Officer to help them achieve their goals in education, training and employment (Table: 5.4).
Table 5.4: I am expecting the work with the ETE Officer to help me achieve my goals in Education, Training and Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For one participant the expectation was clear:

[65NF] ‘There’s good coming out of this through good, long-term employment. This [ETE] has given me the opportunity of an apprenticeship – which I wish I’d done after school.’

In this research, there was good reason to consider the experience of the individual. For instance, Rumgay (2007: 551) has noted that ‘the challenge of increasing the employment prospects of a group with complex needs is formidable’. In this instance, 89.2% of participant offenders (n=74) believed that the work with the ETE officer would support them to achieve their goals in education, training and/or employment. One participant stated that:

[T1] “I’ve got the Welding level 1, but that’s not enough to get a job. That’s why I want to do the level 2 and [ETEO7] is looking at that for me.”

Whilst others said:
“I didn’t need to see her much (ETEO), she set it up (Basic Skills) so I was seeing [...] in Essential Skills for quite a while and learnt quite a bit... I got my CSCS card and that has helped quite a bit... now I’m looking at short courses to go with my CSCS card.”

“I’ve got my maths and English now, that’s gotta count.”

This level of expectation would seem to support the idea of an active engagement with for instance, essential skills: literacy, numeracy, and now including information technology, and life skills. However, they also suggest a form of active change taking place on the part of the offender, and which is considered further, later in the chapter.

However, as previously noted above, formal (traditional education) qualification was not seen to be the most important outcome for those engaging with ETE. In this instance participants preferred instead to participate in vocational/skills based training. This may be due to their previous experiences in school, or the fact that they saw a skills based training course as being one directly related to future employment (see Table: 5.5 below).

**Table 5.5: My previous experience of training was positive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vocational training was seen to provide a positive experience for 51.8% (n=43) of the offenders participating in the study, a figure far greater than that for formal education highlighted in Table: 5.4 above. Indeed, it has been noted that – in this instance – positive experiences for vocational training are almost 50% greater than that of education (n=29).

Staff members said that the most important thing to the offender was being able to earn money:

[ETEO9] “They want training qualifications. Not academic. They just want a qualification that they can get a job with. That’s what they want. Fork Lift Truck, that sort of thing, you know.”

[ETEO3] “Work! They might not know what or how to get there, but that’s where we come in…”

[ETEO7] “99% of them want a CSCS card because they know they can walk into an agency and get a job and get money in their pocket and get off the dole, which is really what they want.”

As was pointed out by ETEO9, formal qualification was often seen as being a long process with no guarantee of a successful outcome, where vocational qualification (even in short courses) provided evidence of a skill to do a job and this provided income, enabling the individual to move on in life. According to ETEO7 the individual often wanted the opportunity to “…get on with life and disappear, be left alone.”

This was further evidenced in interview with one ETE officer [ETEO9] based in a rural location where opportunities were often limited. She noted that there was a clear
preference for short courses and skill based qualification which had a direct relation to employment:

[ETEO9] “They (offenders) want more training, short courses and stuff; like the one’s run by OLASS: CSCS, FLT, 3 month construction courses, that sort of thing. The sort of thing that leads to a job.”

This was exemplified by an offender from the same location that had recently been working with ETEO9, and highlighted their wish to gain a qualification or skill that would get them into employment. H3 had worked in construction prior to his four years in custody and noted that

“I’ve already been in construction (20 years self-employed), now I need to get my ticket and I’m back in work. ETEO4 and ETEO9 have been very good and I’m working towards my ticket now.”

To provide further clarification, participants were asked which form of study they favoured, either academic or vocational, whether at school or post-compulsory education (often referred to as further education or FE), the results of which are provided in Table: 5.6 below.
Table 5.6: I enjoyed the opportunity for academic study (at school or FE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first instance, relating to academic study as a preference for learning (Table 5.6 above), only 32.5% of participants (n=27) agreed that this was the preferred form of education, where 48.3% (n=40) stated that this was not their preference. In contrast to this, when asked the same question, but relating it to vocational study, the outcome was reversed. As Table 5.7 (below) shows, 88.0% of participants felt that vocational study was their preferred form of learning (n=73), and only 4.8% of participants (n=4) said that it was not.

Table 5.7: I enjoy the opportunity for vocational study (at school or FE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>88.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This data may be influenced in some part by the way in which people learn (an argument further considered in the final chapter of this thesis). In this instance it would seem appropriate to suggest that the majority of participants felt more comfortable in a situation where there was the opportunity to experience, to do something, to try the act/action in order to gain the skill. This was further reflected in 75% of the interviews conducted with participating offenders, where (job related) training was identified as a specific goal. In one instance, the participant had found what he believed to be a niche in the local market (industrial and commercial welding), and although frustrated by a lack of local training, he was prepared to move away on a temporary basis to qualify, before returning home to secure employment:

[T1] “I’ll go to London and do the course, I know they’re doing them there.

[AB] How? I mean how do you know that the course is done there (London)?

[T1] *My mate has done it. Then I’d get my own kit and work.*

[AB] Where would you work? A garage, a site, what would you do?

[T1] *I’d set myself up self-employed. I know plenty of guys that need welding done and if you’re good... you’re sorted.*

The lack of provision was later confirmed with local colleges and training providers, welding courses rarely being offered as they required space, expensive (and specialised) equipment, separate insurances, health and safety training, as well as the danger of having fire hazards and potentially explosive gas cylinders on site with students. The ETE Officer was aware that it was an area a number of offenders had considered, because of the lack of local skilled and trained welders which – in a semi-rural location – would offer an excellent opportunity for employment. However, this was the first (offender) that had pursued it and was
prepared to move to the training in order to enjoy the benefits he believed would come from his new found trade.

In general, these are positive examples of the work undertaken. Whilst the intervention provides for the opportunity to enrol upon a programme of education or training, or to gain (legitimate) employment, for the majority of offenders getting and maintaining employment was just one concern and provided for only half of the answer. This is reflective of the discussion held in chapters one and two which also provided for the importance of improving employability skills. For example chapter one considered the importance associated with offering a level of skill or training to young offenders in order to set them on a new course once they had completed their time in prison. However, skills for employment is also something that provides for a stake in society, an argument raised in chapter two, and further considered in the data presented in this chapter.

**Soft Skills**

In both assisted questionnaires and interviews, staff and offenders identified similar areas of importance. Both groups clearly stated that if the goal of the government was to reduce the rates of re-offending and provide for change (a reduction in, or cessation from, offending also being seen as a hard-outcome, clearly noted in the Ministry of Justice, Consultation Paper (2013), *Transforming Rehabilitation*), then achieving that often required support and guidance in a way that did not fall within the targets. For example, ETEO4 noted that:

“They want help and they want honesty. They want to know that something can be achieved and probably a bit of grounding as well. A bit of structure I mean. Once they’ve
got that they just want you to be there, to be around for advice and stuff if it starts going pear-shaped.”

This was a statement later added to by ETEO5, noting that:

“They want support. They want hope and reassurance... an advocate and a bit of trust. Sometimes you’re the only one willing to show them trust and that’s hard. They want support to take the first steps.”

These were interesting remarks that should be given careful consideration as it seems that for the staff there is recognition that soft skills can make all the difference to moving people on and supporting a change in behaviour, leading to desistance:

[ETEO3] “Ultimately they want the job but a lot of them really want to improve where they are before they worry about the job.”

Although most spoke of the good work undertaken with the supervising officer and the ETE officer, it seems that there was some favour for a form of guidance or mentoring service. Indeed, this was something that T2 felt strongly about when asked the question: In working with the Probation Service and other organisations, what would you like to see more of?


[AB] Like a key-worker?

[T2] Yeah. If I’m doing something it’s good to have someone there to talk to, someone who’s got an idea of what is going on. Someone talked about them before and it sounded a good idea.

[AB] Isn’t that what the ETE officer does?
Similarly, the knowledge that someone is there and is looking to help and assist the offender can build a relationship and a familiar bond which many offenders fail to experience in other areas of their lives, something which is discussed further later in the chapter (see later in this chapter, Relationships in practice: p.155). For the purposes of this discussion however, it is interesting to note (as was argued in chapter two) that this was a role originally performed by the probation officer pre-What Works. Indeed, as noted in chapters one and two, historically groups such as NACRO and (to some extent) the probation service offered assistance and advice of a practical nature on a voluntary basis, providing links or acting as an advocate on behalf of the offender with other service providers, such as employment, benefits and housing. Yet, these same services (voluntarily provided or not) appear those that offenders seek the most support for. Participants talked of the need to get things right, of having other concerns, which they believed took precedence before they considered their own education, training or employment needs. In the examples below, 27B and P1 noted the key factors as accommodation and family:

[27B] ‘I need to get my accommodation sorted first.’

[P1] “I need to look after me and my partner and kids.”

A further point was raised by one participant who noted the consequence of his own actions and what that meant for the rest of his family. He stated that:

[67NF] ‘I feel I’m going to get a better future now ...I nearly lost my family, I nearly lost everything. There’s always a consequence and that’s it for me.’
In addition participants also acknowledged the importance of presentation (of self), both in preparation for interviews, at the interview itself and often following the start of a new role. Statements regarding confidence building, motivation, and support were found in every office, but emphasised in cases such as P1 and T2:

[P1] “Yes. I guess so. It’s given me some ideas I’d not considered.”

[T2] “Yes. I got my Level 2 Maths and my Level 1 English.

[AB] Wow! That’s really good.

[T2] Yeah. I’d like to carry on now and go to college, maybe do Open University. (smiles at AB.) I don’t think I could do the university thing really. But I’ve done a lot.”

This was highlighted further in the statement made by F4:

“[ETEO3] has helped build up my confidence and that for employment, so it will give me greater independence.”

Similar evidence arose in the AQs. When asked: ‘In what ways will the work with the ETE Officer/NPS help you achieve your goals and support your rehabilitation’, a total of 43.3% (n=36) of offenders believed that the greatest help would come from the officer in providing links to other services or agencies – Community Liaison (13.3%) and presentation of self (30.1%), (i.e. how they were presented, but also how they present themselves). A figure almost equal to that of the 46.9% believing that the help would come in the form of services currently provided by the ETE team (Preparation for Employment, 12.0%; Disclosure, 3.6%; Grants and Finance and Funding advice, 3.6%; Education, 6.0%; and Training and New Skills, 21.7%). It would seem then that for the individual to make the changes in their behaviour, how they felt about themselves, prepared themselves and presented themselves was
(almost) as important as achieving the final goal or hard outcome (education, training and employment).

Table 5.8: In what ways will the work with the ETE Officer and/or the NPS help you to achieve your objectives and support your rehabilitation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparing for Employment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Self</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Liaison</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants/Finance/Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training/New Skills</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importantly, when calculated as hard outcomes: Disclosure, education, training and/or new skills, grants/finance/other, versus soft skills: Preparing for employment, presentation of self, community liaison, participants recorded the soft skill as the most positive, achieving a total of 55.4% (n=46). When broken down further, presentation of self was found to be the most popular answer provided. The presentation of self was considered to be confidence, motivation, self-belief, and was recorded in 30.1% of all cases (n=25). Community liaison and preparing for employment proved similarly popular, achieving positive comment in 13.3% and 12.0% of all answers recorded. This was considered further in the interview, participants noting such points as:

[B1] “Yes. ETEO1 has been great. It’s made me more active, you know. Like she’s helping me so I don’t mind doing something”.
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In relation to hard-outcomes, 21.7% (n=18) of participants believed that the work undertaken with an ETE officer would provide them with opportunities for training or to learn new skills, and 6.0% (n=5) of participants believed that it would help them to access an educational course/programme. Resulting in such comments as:

[P2] “I think [ETEO2] will help me gain better qualifications, greater opportunities and get a better job.”

This was a point later added to by a second participant in the same office, and regularly noted elsewhere

[P3] “It’s providing experience of new things, new skills. I don’t know where to go without this help”.

[F1] “I’ll gain new qualifications, this will help me find and get a job”.

3.6% (n=3) of participants believed that they would be provided with information regarding the disclosure of offences, or grants, finance and funding (respectively). Finally, 9.6% (n=8) participants said that they were unsure (did not know) of how the work would help them to achieve their goals and/or objectives.

These final points may be reflective of the fact that many offenders come with a very chaotic history, which may include illicit drug dependency, alcohol abuse, broken homes and/or dysfunctional families, as well as a lack of skills, qualifications or employment experience. This was highlighted in more than one instance. When asked about their employment history participant offenders recited long periods of unemployment or cash work which helped them make ends meet (see Table: 5.9 below).
Table 5.9: How long has it been since you were last in employment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6 months</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12 months</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-24 months</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-36 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-48 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-60 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 months (+)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never worked</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently employed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although 47.0% of offenders reported a period of up to three years (0-36 months) since their last employment (n=39), almost as many participants reported periods of more than three years (37 months-Never worked) without employment (n=36). This latter group would face numerous barriers associated with the lack of employment, including out-dated skills and qualifications, low morale, lack of confidence, loss of self-belief and low levels of motivation, also seen in individuals who do not have a criminal record. However, it is the label associated with a criminal record that will also compound the difficulties faced by the offenders, as they struggle to leave the past behind them and make a fresh start.

This was noted in interview when asked what could help them for the future, participants offering statements such as:

[N1] “Money. Job. House. (N1 counts them off on his fingers.) I don’t expect that to be dropped on me, but I gotta get a chance and that’s what I don’t have.”
[T2] “I have a record now. Nobody wants to employ me.”

When offenders were asked how the service could be improved to address their needs, participants were often more practical:

[T1] “I already told you, money. It’s the cost of the course – if you can find one. It ain’t fucking cheap you know.”

[T2] “Transportation if you can’t afford to get here. Like I said I live in a different catchment area, but this is where the courses are and I’m expected to pay!”

[I1] “[ETEOS] has been a great help, but I got to sort my stuff first you know, get the basics done.”

In each of these cases, the offenders were concerned with the lack of co-ordination and support between departments/agencies. For example, although living in a rural area – often experiencing poor public transportation – the expectation remained that T2 would accept the need for travel cost in order to attain the qualification and improve his opportunity for employment. In the cases of T1 and I1 similar feelings existed. A great deal of support and guidance had been provided about courses that could be taken up and/or employment training available, but with a lack of transportation and the associated costs, this would make it a good deal more difficult to take up the opportunity.
Table 5.10: How do you sustain your living if you are not in employment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends &amp; Family</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash or Crime</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 5.10 (above) shows, the largest proportion of offenders were in receipt of benefits and had no other means of support. 53.0% (n=44) said that they relied heavily upon the benefits system to help them make ends meet, and remain crime free. Others, 15.7% (n=13), noted that in additional to benefits, their family and friends were of great importance in helping them through a tough period. In interview however, one participant noted that:

[An4] “Friends, family, benefits. My mum helps out when she can”

Finally, a large group of the offenders – 31.3% (n=26) – admitted to cash work and/or offending in other ways, in order to make ends meet. It is noted however, that even though this number is quite high (almost ⅓ of the offenders completing an AQ) more may have been wary of admitting to further offending, put off by the location of the study, as all AQs and interviews took place in an office of the National Offender Management Service, with notes made by the interviewer as the discussion unfolded. It is also recognised that for some of the group, the last time they were interviewed is likely to have been with a police officer and thus it is only natural that they would have been wary. Some were forthcoming however, such as A1 and A2:

[1An] ‘Cash work. How else?’
What is important in this study was the association that support had for making change, whether an individual felt that it was the support they received from family and friends or the guidance they had been provided by the ETE team that made the difference, it was support of some description that helped offenders to take the first steps towards change.

Relationships in Practice

One consideration perhaps, is that it may be the first time (and possibly the only time) the participants have been asked to reflect upon the services provided and the work completed with a member of the probation service. Although noteworthy at this juncture (as an important part of the findings), feedback is also something to be considered for the future. As was highlighted earlier in the chapter, there can be no doubt as to the importance and the application of soft skills, such as interview preparation, basic computing skills and self-motivation, and the part they play in breaking the barriers to desistance and rehabilitation. Similar conclusions can be drawn regarding personal experience and understanding of the service provided:

[59I] ‘[ETEOS] makes you do things, think about things. She motivates you.’

With this comment in mind, it is interesting to note that staff continued to comment upon the importance of building good relations to the success of desistance. In each of the interviews with staff members (ETEO) there was a hope that more staff could be brought in to supplement the team, so enabling a greater concentration upon one-to-one work. Not one officer suggested a smaller caseload, but all agreed that with more staff they could
devote more time to working with the offenders on a one-to-one basis in order to support change. ETEO9 stated:

“It would be nice to have the staff to see everyone. See every offender and do an introduction and Disclosure with them. Make sure they know what is needed, make sure they understand how important it is.”

The time allocated to case-work was important as it meant that the staff felt better able to provide a more individual approach, with structured programmes of events. As in the comment above ETEO9 felt that more staff would mean greater opportunity to provide service information to all of the offenders, therefore ensuring that even if the offender was in employment when the order started, should they lose the job, or want to make a change, there was a person there that they knew they could talk to. This was about making the ETE service more widely available, providing consistency and accessibility.

As previously noted, in over half of the AQs (n=47) offenders commented that how successful they were was also dependent upon other things in their life, such as the support of their family, the money they had in the household already, skills and qualifications and the reaction of an employer to their criminal record (if asked), but each felt sure that support in ETE was a good place to start.

This was further supported in interview, W1 had completed a number of appointments with training providers and colleges in the past and had not been particularly impressed, but with the ETEO he found a difference:
“You can only do what you can do. It’s no good when people promise the world, because it’s never going to happen. People need to step back and look around. Do what you can and if you can’t, no biggie, just say so. I like that about [ETEO1]. If she can’t do it, it’s a no. That’s important.”

The interview concluded with a comment which provided further evidence of the importance attached to a good relationship:

[W1] “It’s good. I feel much better about myself. Doing some English [Literacy] has helped me, but I know I need to do more. I’ll do it when I’m ready and at my choice.

[AB] Do you mean pace, slowly?

[W1] “Yeah. (…) Probation has been good for me. It’s helped.”

Similar experiences were found with the participants that lived in a more rural setting where it was often harder to get information or know where to go, but for one participant when that was successfully overcome it provided for a great opportunity to change:

[N1] “I’m not doing any crime. [ETEO7] has sorted the course for me, we are looking at funding and hopefully he’s going to tell me about that when we are done here.”

Later in the same interview the participant was asked what he would like to see more of, in the support provided through ETE, again the response was overwhelmingly positive:

“Like I said [ETEO7] is good. He said he’d get me on the course and he has. He said he’d try and help get tools and he has. That’s good enough for me.”
This kind of statement is important to the work conducted with the offenders, because the trust they build in the relationship they have with the ETE officer can affect how they see their own futures. This was further investigated by asking the question: ‘Having spent some time with the ETE officer how far would you agree with the statement nothing will prevent me from achieving my goals (in education, training, employment)’. Data provided for some interesting results and highlighted just how positively the participant offenders found the service provided by the ETE team in general.

Table 5.11a: Having spent some time with the ETE officer how far would you agree with the statement ‘Nothing will prevent me from achieving my goals in education’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first instance participants were asked about their ability to achieve their own goals in education. Data shows a positive response in 60.2% of cases (n=50) and were supported in additional comments made during the assisted questionnaire:

[66NF] ‘My family are there to support me, so I’m pretty confident.’

[78F] ‘People have always been negative and I’ve just accepted it and gone along with it, but [ETEO3] has given me the confidence and stuff to do it [education].’
Negative cases amounted to only 14.5% (n=12) of cases and it was often substance misuse or poor choices which was seen as the cause of failure and not the service provided

[37So] ‘Alcohol’s the problem. Nothing else. That’s probably what will get in the way of everything else.’

In a second example, the participant noted association with his previous peer group as being the problem for getting on and achieving in education:

[67NF] ‘Being around the same bad crowd. That’s what would prevent me.’

This participant had something to say about all three areas for question, but none reflected badly on the work undertaken. In discussions regarding training he said that:

[67NF] ‘That kind of thing [ETEO7] has really helped with and I’m going to do P&D [Painting and Decorating] at [...] college.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to educational attainment, when asked to give a numeric response to the statement ‘Nothing will stop me from achieving my goals in Training’, participants were
more positive of a successful outcome than they had been in discussions of education. In this instance, 71.1% of participants (n=59) felt positive that they could/would achieve their own goals in training. In a number of instances participants saw a direct relationship between attaining a skill or trade and gaining employment in the future. For example, 41SO noted that:

‘A new skill will give me a new direction, new options.’

For 81B it was simple. Having recently completed a CSCS card, and now on a Bricklaying course he said:

[81B] ‘The new course I’m doing will help, give me the opportunity, and the certificate will definitely help me get a job.’

Conversely, in interview, when asked if a new qualification had made any difference P1 said:

“No, not really. I guess I’m just happy as I am.”

Similarly in the assisted questionnaire, negative responses accounted for 7.2% of participants (n=6), each believing that they would not be successful in achieving their goals in training and invariably negativity was drawn from experiences of substance misuse, a lack of opportunity, or a bad experience in the past which had put them off:

[48B] ‘If I went back to using, that would cause the problems for me.’

[72B] ‘I never really got the chance before, don’t know why I would now, and I’m not sure I’d even want to.’

[37So] ‘I never really had any advice from the tutor so I kind of got it wrong. I didn’t bother going back.’
Finally, participant offenders were asked how they felt about their ability to achieve their personal goals in employment.

Table 5.11c: Having spent some time with the ETE officer how far would you agree with the statement ‘Nothing will prevent me from achieving my goals in employment’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.11c provides evidence drawn from the AQ when asked the same question in relation to employment. Although 65.1% of the participants (n=54) felt that nothing would prevent them from achieving their goals in employment, once again comments were added in order to clarify a position or address the point further. For example, 75NF noted that her criminal record may be a cause for concern:

‘I’d like to get back to work, but I don’t know about that, my convictions might be a problem.’

In this instance it was the amount of convictions and not the offences themselves which caused the greatest concern. Furthermore, when experience of long term unemployment was added, negative feelings were very evident. One such case related to 2H who had been in and out of short term employment for over 10 years:
‘The promise of help really isn’t enough. Just because someone says they are going to help doesn’t mean that it’s going to get you a job.’

Others however, had a much clearer and more positive view of the situation:

‘It’s down to me really. If I try hard enough and get down to it then yeah I’ll get a job.’

Where others still, looked for the positives but also acknowledged the difficult position they found themselves in.

‘There are some things that might slow me down, but not prevent me from getting employment.’

Such as?

‘I don’t know, skills, qualifications, criminal record [Laughs].’

Consistently however, participants were far more positive than they were negative about the way in which they were being supported, and believed that (following the help and guidance provided) nothing would prevent them from achieving their own personal goals in education, training and/or employment.

Participants were asked if they believed there was anything further that could be done to support them in achieving their goals (see Table 5.12).
Table 5.12: What things are missing from the work that you are doing with the ETEO/NPS which could help you achieve your goals, and stop offending?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nothing &amp;/or Happy with service</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training, Employment</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Self</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Links/Grants, Funding</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Referral On’ needs to work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 51.8% (n=43) of participants said that they were happy with the service or nothing further could be added to improve the service. The next largest concerns were ETE 16.9% (n=14) and Community Links 15.7% (n=13), and in both instances participants noted that they would like further help and support.

Community Links was defined as help, support or guidance with benefits, housing, welfare, leisure services/activities (usually family orientated and often went hand-in-hand with what to do with children or siblings), or activities which could fill time, such as volunteering. This was something considered in the interviews conducted with the management team, questioning the role of the Community Links Officer (CLO; the fore-runner to ETE), compared to that of the two Engagement Officers recently employed to support offenders in the community. The duties of engagement officers included (but were not limited to) attending interviews, taking the offenders along to the job centre, or acting as an advocate/mentor – as previously noted earlier in the chapter. One member of the ETE Management Team (ETEM1) had started with the probation service in the early 1990s and
was originally employed as a Sports Counsellor, before moving to the role first as the manager of the Community Links team and then ETE manager:

[ETEM1] “ETE began as a combination of Sports and Leisure and quickly moved to Community Links. Some staff stayed, some transferred and I was left to manage the lot. The ethos was on engagement and motivation – like […] [an Engagement Officer, previously an ETE Officer] but we used sport to motivate and we were there to help with local services.”

ETEM2 recalled Engagement Officers being brought in as part of a drive to keep offenders out of prison and was funded from a pot of £22 million that local probation service areas could bid for:

[ETEM2] “I think that the Engagement Officers are something to do with it (the money) as well.

[AB] Yes.

[ETEM2] “Well their job is to be that link, to make sure that people get to their appointment or interview, half the time they don’t turn up because they are worried about going [on their own] and not because they don’t want to.

[AB] It sounds rather like the Community Links role I started off in all those years ago.

[ETEM2] “Yes. I guess there are some comparisons to be made.”

For the most part the irony of this being something done previously by the same staff was lost, yet it was something offenders saw as an important role. The importance associated with understanding need was perhaps best summed up by a member of the Senior Management Team (SM1) who noted:
“The probation service has really improved in public protection in the last few years, but perhaps as a consequence of that we have lost our focus on engagement/intervention.

[AB] Why is that? What happened?

[SM1] “Because of the performance agenda coming in. Since then we have gone a bit too far towards ‘punitiveness’. We’ve concentrated upon quantity and not the quality of service. Consequently you lose something. So for instance, a sentence plan has to be there within five days. The importance is about the timing and nothing to do with the quality of the plan that needs to be written. Now it seems all about Trust status and buying back in enforcement and engagement.”

External services being brought in to support change was something that offenders also reported negatively, and may have hidden consequences for the proposals presented by the Ministry of Justice (2013), concerning the greater use of the private and voluntary sector (an area considered for discussion in chapter six). 6.0% (n=5) of the participants stated that this was a concern for them, and stated that if they were to be referred to outside agencies, then this service should work properly and appropriately. In addition comments made the participants acknowledged that it was often the organisation outside of the Probation Service that had let them down, and not the service of ETE or others within the probation service. For example, B1 noted that:

[B1] “There’s been a lack of contact from OLASS, so I’ve kind of given up on them. She [ETEO1] chases it up. Then you’re just left waiting. It’s not her fault, but that sort of thing – other people – it needs to be sorted out.”

Following a referral to a local training provider, 75NF commented that:
‘It all seems to be taking a great deal of time to get sorted.

How long have you been waiting?

‘I don’t remember, four, five, six weeks.’

These points were compounded by comments made by SM3 and his belief that:

“We know that of all of the criminogenic needs offenders have employment is the one thing that proves to help them and prevent them coming back.

I agree. The SEU Annual Report (2002) and the Nescot Report (2007), amongst so many others, both said that it [employment] reduces reoffending rates by up to 50%.

That’s my point exactly. We know what we need to do to support change and make a difference, so why aren’t we putting more and more money, time and effort in to that? We have been working really hard to forge stronger ties and links with local employers and local [training] providers, but with insufficient budgets it’s almost impossible. That’s when you have to work with the providers that meet budget, rather than the ones you really should.”

This was further supported by ETEO2 and ETEO9 who both agreed that the referrals made to other agencies needed some work to ensure a positive outcome for all:

“I kind of work with Job Centre, Learn Direct, OLASS, [...] College, Shaw Trust – although I haven’t heard from them in a while. The thing is, they go to all the trouble of coming to see you, tell you what they are doing and then just disappear. I’ve phoned and left messages, emailed, still nothing. It’s frustrating, for me and the guys I’m working with.”

“Outside agencies have got to be there. They have the money. I can’t say OLASS are fantastic though. Things just don’t seem to happen. The other day I was seeing
someone that I referred months ago and they still hadn’t heard anything. They only wanted a college course, so I walked them round there myself and signed them up.”

In ‘buying in’ services, the suggestion is that there is a better use of resources and less pressure on the service provided by the local probation area. For example, Job Centre (+) was charged with improving the employment and employability provision, OLASS (under the DfSE) was charged with providing skills and education, and private providers such as Creating Futures and Springboard can work with specific groups of offenders, with more specialised need. However (as noted above), discussions with the participants during the AQ and the interviews suggest a service which is anything but impressive. This may have had more to do with the relationships and rapport that had been built up with the ETE officer and the positive experiences that this had brought which, when not matched by an outside organisation, produced negative feelings. In the examples of B1 and 75NF (provided above), the feeling was that although the ETE officer was trying hard to get the task completed, to engage the outside agency, the experience was proving anything but successful. In a third example, N1 noted similarly:

[AB] Have you worked with any other organisation (for ETE) whilst you have been on your order?

[N1] “I think it was someone in town I saw, but I ain’t gonna do all that and not get anything from it. I never heard anything more, so I ain’t bothered.”

There were some positives however:

[W1] “I saw [ETEO1] and she set up an appointment with […] from OLASS and he got the test for the CSCS card – got it now (smiles and looks pleased). So now I’m looking at trades
and stuff, and I need to ask (OM) for another ETE appointment to look at trades: Bricks, Roofing, and Carpentry. [ETEO1] helped me plan for things. Helped me look at things properly and I really wanted to do well... and I did. Getting the CSCS card has given me more confidence and that’s down to the help I’ve had from [ETEO1] and OLASS.”

There appears a greater level of integration, but there has been little or no practical engagement with local job-centres, housing providers, or Primary Care Trusts, each of which are noted as key to successful desistance. To this could be added an over-complicated system of referral which sees a high level of repetition and duplication of paperwork, reflective of the statements made by ETE officers when interviewed:

[ETEO3] “I work with groups like OLASS [laughs], the Job Centre, Connexions, Sure Start, Local Colleges, Next Steps, Princes Trust, Hampton Trust, Welfare, and Learn Direct.

AB So why did you laugh at OLASS?

[ETEO3] Too many hoops to jump through and a lot of it is repetitive.

[AB] The paperwork?

[ETEO3] Yes. I ask them [offenders] about funding, jobs, training, and then they get referred to someone like OLASS and they ask them about funding, jobs and training...”

This was added to by ETEO8 who stated that now, more than ever it was about:

[ETEO7] “Targets. Everything is these days. I fill in paperwork to show that I have seen someone, or that they failed to attend, that I have contacted ‘X’ employers and training providers, etc. I have to account for my time in days, hours and even minutes, so I waste the time I need to be seeing people.”
Of growing concern for both the offenders and the staff were the importance of supervision and the formation of a good relationship between the offender and officer (whether an ETEO or OM). The perception of supervision, guidance and support offered may have a knock on effect for the way in which an offender participates, engages and ultimately changes in behaviour.

**Changes Worth Making**

Many of the participants felt that they had reached a point in time when they needed to make a life (and life-style) change if they were to enjoy a normal life. Decisions to make life-style changes were however, dependent upon motivating factors, evidenced in two ways (1) family or relationships, and (2) the wish to move on in life. This was evident in the case of 81B who, serving an 18 month prison sentence had time to reflect:

[81B]  ‘At the time [of the offence] you don’t think about what you’re doing, but thinking about it inside I felt really bad. Being away from the wife and kids was hard. They did the prison time too, as it were.’

This was an attitude similarly experienced by 19To, who had made a decision to change now that he was a father:

[19To]  ‘I hung around with the wrong types of people, the wrong area. My daughter may be the greatest influence for me...’

The need to change, to move on in life was experienced by 30B, all of his offences were alcohol related:

‘Look I lost my licence, I got community service. I got stopped again, I nearly went to jail. I’ve seen what happens and I’ve had enough.’
Reflecting on his past behaviour and what that meant for the future 47B said:

‘I wish I wasn’t here this time and I hadn’t done the things in my youth, but you can’t change where you’ve been…’

Others, such as 82F used one to stimulate the other:

[82F] ‘I’ve got a baby on the way now, so that might slow things down a while.’

However, she still felt confident that ETE could help her achieve her objectives

‘I think it will help me gain the qualifications that I need, and find and get into a job.’

Although offenders did not refer to themselves as ‘desisting’ from crime, they did talk about going straight, and staying clean:

[I1] “Like I said it’s been o.k. so far, but I gotta stay straight.”

[77F] ‘I was stupid then. Now I just want a steady life.’

[2H] ‘I’ve been through it and out the other side. I am enjoying life now. I don’t want to go back [into custody].’

[78F] ‘I’m more motivated to change and have learnt to control my anger [If I had the opportunity to start again] I’d do everything differently. It’s really upset my family having social services involved and that.’

Participants were also asked what other factors may be an influence on future offending behaviour.
Table 5.13: What other factors may be an influence on future offending behaviour?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance Misuse/Alcohol/Health</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Social/Human Capital</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing I’m not Re-offending</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lack of employment/income</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lack of opportunity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Record</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp;/or Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13 (above) indicates that it was the recovery of self which held the greatest importance, regardless of reason. 31.3% (n=26) said that their greatest concern was returning to, or continuing to (mis)use illicit substances or alcohol. However, interestingly there was also a recognition that this would impact upon their mental health and well-being. In addition to this, 25.3% (n=21) said that they felt that engagement on a social and personal level, i.e. the attachment and/or bonds they had with the social group/environment, would have an impact upon the future offending behaviour.

Additionally comments included statements such as:

[24P] ‘Alcohol. It’s always been the same. Alcohol makes me trouble’.

[7P] ‘It’s more to do with confidence. I haven’t really ever known what I’m capable of.

ETEO2 has shown me new opportunities/option’.

[2NH] ‘I have got rid of all the bad friends I had. It’s been a nightmare basically. The shame, the worry and the upset I’ve put my family through. I ain’t doing that again’.
The statement that they had no intention of offending again is neither naive nor should it be taken too lightly. As noted above, many had already made the decision to change and had good reason to move on, go straight, or desist:

[9P] ‘I’ve got a partner and two young kids now. That’s it for me…’

Table 5.14: At the end of this order I will not offend again

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>90.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>94.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of the participants stated that they felt that at the end of the current order they would not offend again (81.9%: n=68) and was accompanied by such comments as:


Others were more reserved or negative in their answers. Indeed, 9.6% (n=8) of participants said that they disagreed with the statement, providing statements such as:

[63H] ‘I’d like to say no, but nobody really knows their future, do they.’

[61I] ‘There’s an incentive not to, isn’t there... but you can’t really say can you... (I won’t offend) not intentionally anyway.’

[34HN] ‘Never say never!’ (smiles).
This may be accounted for by their previous experiences, a lack of engagement, or more pointedly a lack of readiness to change – often associated with the pre-contemplators of Prochaska and Di Clemente’s (1992) stages of change (considered further in chapter 6: p.211).

Table 5.15: If I had the opportunity to start again I would still have offended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.15 above represents the answers to the statement ‘If I had the opportunity to start again I would still have offended’, and provided similar outcomes to those addressed in figure 5.14 above. Overwhelmingly participants said that they would not have offended in the first place if they had the opportunity to go back and start all over again. Indeed, 89.2% of all participants said that (with the knowledge they have now) they would avoid the behaviour, friends (peer group), or situation that had led them to the first offence.

When asked to explain this further, answers ranged from ensuring that they studied hard at school to avoiding certain people [LR19] and/or never starting to use alcohol or illicit drugs [591]. For example, when asked what that would mean for them, one individual noted:
I’d do everything properly. Education, get a job, I’d be in a career by now. I’d work hard at my relationships, and I’d still be married.’

This was added to in the comment:

‘It’s been a nightmare basically. The shame, the worry and the upset I’ve put my family through.’

A second comment was made by a middle-aged male recently convicted of his first offence:

‘I’d love the chance to start from scratch and not make the mistakes I’ve made.’

Conversely, there were those that remained defiant in their behaviour and direction in life. This finding only came through in 7.35% of the population (n=5), but this was an important group nevertheless. This was brought to life by the statement made one participant:

‘Shits and giggles [smiles]. It’s been fun!’

When asked what he had meant by this he said:

‘You had to be there. There has been some really great times, exciting and fun. That I wouldn’t change.’

In all what this data did show was that for the majority of offenders there was a motivation to make changes – and to look for positive opportunities for change – and often reflected the feelings of support and guidance that were provided. This is interesting because it would suggest that guidance from a single, appropriate person (such as an advocate or mentor) is far more important than having access to a great many services, which can often become confusing and counter-productive. As this chapter has shown whether referred to
as a Sports Counsellor, Community Links officer, ETE officer, or advocate, what many of the staff and offenders had envisioned was some type of mentor. A person that could speak for them, introduce them, offer advice or help with alternatives – a point which was first considered in chapter 3, and returned to in the closing chapter.

With this in mind, a final point to consider whether ETE provides for effective supervision, and how successful ETE was as a service supporting change in behaviour, if considered one year after the end of the initial data collection period (a question which reflects Aim 2).

**Outcomes Analysis**

The final stage of the research was to return to the research area probation trust following a period of not less than one year from the initial contact with the participant. It was felt that this would provide ample time for work to be conducted, and in the majority of cases concluded, and thus support the assessment of the level of reconviction following the initial interview and assessment of needs with the ETEO. This was an important observation because it highlighted the impact of education, training and employment, among other factors, and its ability to support a change in behaviour, as noted in the original aims for the research (Introduction: p.8).

Using data entered into CRAMs, outcomes were assessed as either *positive* (education, training or employment, order revoked/terminated for good behaviour, and/or order complete no further action) or *negative* (reconviction, breach action or unworkable order), and frequency was analysed by attendance. Cases were included for examination where there had been an update of the CRAMs system recording either a positive or negative
outcome. From the original sample of 138 cases, offered an opportunity to complete the assisted questionnaire, only 7 cases remained missing as no update had been made to CRAMs. This provided for an n value of 131 cases for examination.

In the first instance it is important to note that positive outcomes – those that were not breached and/or reconvicted – accounted for 62.6% (n=82) of all cases (see Table 5.16 below). However, no distinction was made between those individuals that either completed a period of supervision, guidance and support from an ETE officer (of the sample), or those that received similar support and guidance from their supervising officer (OM), and had declined an appointment with the ETE officer.

When examined further, it is interesting to note that those offenders who refused the support offered by the ETE officer (or failed to report) were more successful in gaining education, training or employment as an outcome than those that attended an ETE appointment. Indeed, 20.0% (n=10) of offenders that did not attend an ETE appointment secured education, training and/or employment. Conversely, although no less importantly, those offenders that attended an ETE appointment were more likely to see the order completed and/or revoked for good behaviour (60.9%: n=39). This would seem to add weight to the earlier finding that it is the relationship with the member of staff (ETE officer, OM, Drugs worker, etc.) which is of importance, more than the professional role of they occupy, and is more generally reflective of the important work conducted by all members of the probation service.
Table 5.16 below provides evidence of the success of this cohort. In total some 13.7% (n=18) of individuals offered an assisted questionnaire attained an outcome of education, training or employment, and a further 48.9% (n=64) successfully completed their order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Attended ETE</th>
<th>Supervision Only</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education, Training &amp;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>(9.9%)</td>
<td>(20.0%)</td>
<td>(13.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Complete, Order</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revoked for Good Behaviour or Progress</td>
<td>(48.1%)</td>
<td>(50.0%)</td>
<td>(48.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Breached or</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unworkable</td>
<td>(8.6%)</td>
<td>(4.0%)</td>
<td>(6.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconviction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(33.3%)</td>
<td>(26.0%)</td>
<td>(30.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>131*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*6 cases were missing from the data, and could not be examined in CRAMs.

Figures for a Breach of Order or Reconviction are similarly higher for those that attended an ETE appointment than those that did not attend. Breach action was taken in 8.6% (n=7) of cases and a reconviction was recorded in 33.3% of cases (n=27) when the individual attended ETE appointments, where only 4% (n=2) were found to be in breach of their order, and 26% (n=13) were convicted of a new offence when they declined an ETE appointment.

There may be a number of reasons for this and one plausible explanation was provided by ETEO8 after working with a high percentage of cases involving female offenders:
“A lot of the women I’ve worked with are very regretful of the offences that they have committed, shop-lifting and such. Most of mine are a victim of circumstance, usually doing the wrong thing for the right reasons.

[AB] How?

[ETEO8] Kids, family, influenced by their partners or trying to make ends meet.”

An alternative explanation may come from the concerns raised by participants of the numbers of appointments they were expected to keep, with a variety of programmes, interventions, or external agencies. This was reflected in interviews when participants were asked what would you like to see less of in the work with the probation service and/or other organisations and agencies. Comments included:

[B1] “I started off o.k., I had six appointments to make, I missed one and ended up (back in court) with another fifteen days.”

[I1] “Appointments. I’d like less appointments. I’m here today, tomorrow and I think I’m back again next week.

[AB] Don’t you have to come weekly?

[I1] No, usually my probation officer will come see me alternate weeks.

AB So what are you here for?

[I1] Today to see you, tomorrow I have to come see my probation officer, next drugs worker, I mean it’s all over the place.”
Table 5.17: ETE as a Specified Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA attached</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No SA attached</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAPPA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 case was recorded as being missing

However, identification of need is a positive to be taken from the data. Those with the greatest need, either through self-identification or as determined by the Pre-Sentence Report (PSR) were often those referred to the ETE team by the supervising (probation) officer, if it was not a specified activity. Specified Activities accounted for 36.5% (n= 50) of the total sample population and are reflective of a target group requiring additional support identified in the numerous reports and academic studies undertaken in recent years (previously noted throughout the review of literature and considered further in the discussion of the findings in chapter six). This is further evidenced through the initial observations undertaken with ETE officers and participants, which was considered earlier in the chapter. This point was also reflected in the comments made by members of the management team, and summed up in a statement from SM3:

[SM3] “How do we affect change? I think for the 40% we [Interventions] deal with they get an excellent service. Let me qualify that. I think the staff provide them [offenders] with an excellent service for ETE and its not necessarily the process they go through that supports them, but the ability of staff to identify need, identify service and then put the work in to support them. The service is a mish-mash and it’s an attitude from the staff that works. All of them [ETE] to my mind, work exceptionally hard.”
Yet, this positivity was somewhat lacking in statements made by members of staff, often feeling isolated and lacking support. A low morale was reflected in statements made in a number of responses, but most prevalent in response to the question: *What could help you in your role as an ETE officer?* For example officers suggested:

[ETEO1] “Better management and personal development.

[AB] How so?

[ETEO1] Well, being managed on site for starters, that would help. Someone who is aware of local need, that sort of thing.”

[ETEO3] “I enjoy the job still. I must do, I’m still here [laughs]. But it’s the outside influences that make it difficult.

[AB] Such as?

[ETEO3] Management.”

[ETEO4] “To be given clear and precise guidelines, what the expectations of us are – from the management and upper management. If they weren’t trying to run ETE on the back of a fag packet, with the expectations of reducing re-offending by half on yearly targets…”

[ETEO7] “Feeling that my manager is listening to me! No really!”

This final point it seems was not without merit, and whilst some managers saw the benefit of such a service to support individual offenders to stop offending, others did not. Of greatest concern was the feelings expressed by one member of the senior management team:

[AB] “Does ETE work to support change?

[ETEM1] Maybe. The latest thing is about cost exercises, that sort of thing.

[AB] But working with offenders is an extremely specialised role. Isn’t it?
[ETEM1] It is specialised, but to be honest, I could reach these targets even if we didn’t have an ETE team. I know if they came back to me [directly] I’d get rid of them.”

Summary
This chapter has presented the key issues and findings to emerge from the analysis of data collected through interviews and the assisted questionnaires conducted with the members of staff from an ETE team and the offenders they were working with, in a local area of the National Probation Service in England and Wales. The evidence suggests three key findings central to the examination of an ETE provision in a community setting. These include relationships: professional as well as personal, therefore how they felt in the social; the professional role: experience, knowledge and understanding (which could also be termed as support for change), i.e. the help, support and guidance afforded by the team; and the self: how they (the offenders) felt about themselves, their motivation, their self-esteem, and their identity. These were considered in a number of ways and there appears a relative cycle of support which guided change, not dissimilar to that of cycles of change associated with illicit drug use.

(1) Relationships support change: The purpose of the study, whilst making use of frequency and cumulative data gathered through an assisted questionnaire, was to listen to and understand the individual experience which provided for the rich and diverse data drawn from the interviews conducted. In this sense, ETE can be seen to have been, and provides for, a positive endeavour. Offenders felt that the ETE officer had provided a good, clear and supportive service, which had helped them to move in a new direction, and away from offending behaviour. The ETE officers were often able to assess individual motivation and
offer support and guidance for choices that the offender may not have considered previously. This also meant that offenders saw this process as positive, and key to their success. An ETE officer was seen to be a “real good guy” [N1] providing for someone who showed an active interest in their situation. One ETE officer commented that in regard to the work undertaken:

[ETE01] “I don’t hear much negativity from the offenders or the OM.”

Another said:

[ETE04] “They want to be listened to. They want help and they want honesty.”

These and similar discussions were considered throughout the chapter. This type of support enabled a positive, trusting relationship to be formed, which is important as it can provide positive outlook for the individual offender. This in turn strengthens their resolve, supporting an expression of change and provides for a positive self-image.

(2) The Professional Role: A professional approach to the work undertaken enabled ETE officers to plan more thoroughly, gather important documentation, complete application and funding forms, or general information for other appointments, as well as to complete paperwork and organise meetings, which further encouraged and fostered a positivity in the relationship and guided individual change. However, ETE officers had a perception of low priority being placed upon resource investigation and investment, acting rather as a sign-posting activity rather than an agent (of support), not unlike the management role associated with probation officers (Offender Managers) today. Offenders also identified difficulties with working with outside organisations. This was observed in the frustration felt
by the participants at having to recount information on numerous occasions, where someone (the ETEO) already had specific information about the current issue, and had access to further information to support their case which could be verified quickly, easily and without the need to forestall the programme/activity any further.

Finally, although the staff maintained a strictly professional demeanour, many felt that there was a lack of discretion – their decisions often being called into question, and their own frustrations often came across in feelings of isolation and insecurity, leading to defensive decisions instead of defensible decision-making; consequently the team suffered a lack of morale, resulting in over half of the team actively seeking new employment, both within and outside of the probation service.

That said, the frustrations faced when working with a generic service such as OLASS or the Job Centre (+) may go some way to explaining the almost entirely positive assessment of ETE. As a specialised service ETE deals with a small number of those given a supervision order or a licence period (approximately 40%) and as such work with a very specific set of needs and circumstance. Thus, a named individual deals with the case, seeing them on a week-by-week basis and has access to all of the positive aspects of the supervision order (money, grants, training, employment contacts) and perceptibly none of the negatives (breach action, withdrawal of benefits, etc.). This may also explain why many of the participants saw ETE as a catalyst for change, offering a supportive environment within which that change could take place.
(3) **The Self:** Frustrations aside, offenders and members of staff reported that there was, or had been, a personal development on the part of the individual, which was considered key to supporting change and maintaining that change in the future. For some it was about having the ideas or knowledge which they could use in the future, for others it was about dealing with – what they perceived to be other – greater needs first:

[N1] “[ETEO7] has helped me look at money, job, house. I’m doing alright.”

[P1] “I’m doing good. It’s been an eye opener. She [ETEO2] has given me some ideas and maybe I’ll look at them again sometime, right now I have other things to sort out and that [ETE] has been a help.”

This is very close to the definitions that were examined in the introductory chapter of this thesis and provide evidence for what could be termed desistance work. This was further acknowledged by the staff members when similarly asked what offenders want from ETE

[ETEO1] “It depends on the offender really. He [names offender] would not have gotten that job if he hadn’t had the further support that was available.”

[ETEO3] “Ultimately they want to work. They just might not be able to get it straight away.”

[ETEO4] “They want support to take the first steps.”

The interplay of each of these points can be seen as a cyclical turn of events, one feeding off the next in support of the future. Relationships between staff and offender that Support Change encourage a Positive Self Image (and motivation to change), through a service which is built upon notions of Trust, Support and Guidance, and which in all, can be seen in the formation of successful, strong and positive Relationships.
In the following (final) chapter, these very specific outcomes will be set against the background of the wider academic literature. This will enable a consideration of the service and provision as it currently stands, and allow for a discussion of the role of the ETE service in the context of the rehabilitation revolution and its development over the coming years, as government looks to a revolution in the way offenders are managed, and seeking to transform rehabilitation (MoJ, 2013).
Chapter 6: Discussion, Conclusions and Implications for Future Practice

The previous chapter presented the research findings and noted the importance placed upon a number of key aspects of the work undertaken between the offender and the ETE service. The purpose of this final chapter is to place these findings within the context of the existing literature, as identified in the Literature Review – whilst continuing to examine the role of ETE as an intervention and a way of supporting change in the offender. In order to pursue such a discussion, the chapter will reflect upon the key findings, set within the context of the broader themes of: (1) Hard-Outcomes: ETE; (2) Soft Outcomes – Supporting Change; (3) The Future Implications, more specifically the role of ETE as an intervention to support a positive change and a move away from a life of crime (identified as the fourth aim of the study). This will inform the wider conclusions and provide an opportunity to consider the centrality of the ETE service to supporting change – as identified in the opening chapters of the thesis. It will also enable a discussion of the role and effectiveness of punishment in light of the recent statement from the Ministry of Justice (MoJ, 2013), that far too many offenders are no better off when they complete their sentence, returning to the same or similar situation and circumstance they were in previously.

Discussion: The Key Themes and Findings

The aim of this study was to explore the success of ETE, as an intervention, to support a change in offending behaviour and a move toward desistance in a community setting. In order to achieve this, chapter 1 undertook an examination of importance associated with education, training and employment as a successful means of supporting change from a social and historic perspective. It charted the importance of education and employment
from the philanthropic notions of Victorian England, and the belief that through hard work and education individual behaviour could be changed, or moulded anew.

Chapter 2 built upon this historic debate, by questioning the position of such interventions during the first decade (and more) of the 21st century. It considered the position of ETE as part of the new community order, under the Criminal Justice Act (2003), and the implications of a rehabilitative revolution; finding that in all, education and employment has always had an important role to play, but has often found itself on the periphery of the criminal justice system as punishments become popularised and turn to the management of risk in preference to supporting change.

Chapter 3 considered the ways in which interventions are used and the place they hold in the supervision of the offender and in the reduction of crime. Key to this chapter was the finding that although ETE is seen to be central to supporting change and rehabilitation it is often found on the peripheries of the work undertaken. Yet ETE can and often will support a reduction in risk of further offending and the number of victims where the offender is successful in life changes, a finding reported in chapter 5.

Chapters 4 and 5 considered the method of investigation, concentrating upon a case study of the ETE intervention through the use of an assisted questionnaire, which supported the findings of a short semi-structured interview with staff and offenders. The key finding here was that the quality of the service, guidance and support provided was of greatest importance, rather than the focus on ETE more specifically that was important to those undertaking the intervention. Participants reported that the support and guidance afforded
them by someone who showed an interest in them as an individual was often far more important than the (hard) outcome of employment, training or education.

Finally, chapter 6 reports these findings in relation to the wider literature reviewed throughout this thesis, providing for a number of implications for the future of the ETE (and probation) service in supporting a reduction in offending behaviour.

The table below, first provides a summary of the key themes and findings from this study and relates them to the objectives set in the introductory chapter, before going on to discuss the importance of these in more detail.

Table 6.1: Key Themes and Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explore ETE within the social and historic context</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Concern for ETE always important, but often found on the periphery of work undertaken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider the role of Interventions in supporting a</td>
<td>3, 5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>ETE is an important part of the interventions undertaken but often neglected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change in behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate ETE in practice</td>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>Although important, it was the service and support provided that was often important and not the end goal of ETE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider future implications for the role of ETE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ETE provides an important service to a specific/minority group. Consideration needs to be given to its provision through private and voluntary sectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the purpose of punishment is deterrence it is only likely to be successful with those that are unlikely to offend in the first place. These are the same individuals that generally have something of personal worth or value, something that they wish to hold on to and something that they do not wish to lose (see for instance arguments by Hirschi, 2002; Farrall, 2002; Flynn, 2010; Gough, 2005, amongst so many others). Yet, if the purpose of
punishment is to rehabilitate; motivate and support change, enable the individual, to reduce crime and therefore reduce the potential harm to victims, then there is a greater need for a service which is able to further support, guide and enthuse such change. This was evidenced in the positive statements made by offenders when asked how the service of ETE would help them achieve their goals for the future and included discussions of ETE, but also led to statements – although not framed in these terms – which considered personal growth and development (chapter 5: 149-50). Officers and offenders alike, regarded employment and employability as key to successful change, and this was the case for almost all that were interviewed. Important as employment was, participants also regarded trust, understanding, knowledge and guidance (areas more often associated with advocacy or mentoring, previously noted in chapters 3 and 5) as being of equal – and often more important – than the final goal or objective (reflecting the statement in Aim 2), and it is perhaps worth discussing these findings as two separate, but related areas.

**Hard Outcomes: Employment, Training and Education**

**Employment**

ETE officers and offenders recognised the importance of employment, and employment was seen to be the objective for each of the offenders interviewed, even where it was a longer term goal. ETE officers were able to identify skills in the individual’s life which lent themselves to particular types of employment, and in application often led to positive comments as offenders recognised the wider application of their skills. This was important because it often resulted in positive statements about the prospects of finding, and retaining employment, reporting that the ETE officer had helped change the way they thought or the ideas they had about employment and their belief that this would help them
to stop offending. Farrell et al. (2007), make reference to the numerous academic publications, government papers and reports of NGOs which have concluded the important association between employment and rehabilitation, which are key to arguments of protecting the public (see for instance: Hedderman, 2007; Crow, 2001; Ward and Maruna, 2007; NACRO, 2006; Nescot Report, 2007; SEU, 2002). An argument similarly reflected in the work of Latessa (2012) who correctly points out that although not the only reason, employment is a clear factor in further reducing rates of re-offending.

However, offenders also recognised other barriers that existed; such as illicit drug use, alcohol misuse, and a criminal record. They were also quick to identify problem peer-groups and a lack of skill and/or opportunity as areas that make change difficult. As highlighted throughout the review of literature (chapters 1 and 2), according to numerous authors and social researchers employment can help reduce the individual propensity to commit crime (see for example: Crow, 2001; SEU, 2002; Nescot, 2007; Robinson and Crow, 2009; Flynn, 2010). However, ex-offenders are more typically employed in such areas involving manual labour and/or industry, where they are less likely to need high skill level and they are less likely to be questioned about their (past) offending behaviour. Flynn (2010: 204) concurs, and has added that in isolation it is unlikely that employment would reduce offending behaviour, as many of the occupations open to offenders are ‘repetitive and poorly paid… crime providing far more money than could be realistically achieved in legitimate forms of employment’. Conversely, Laub and Sampson (1993: 146) are more positive and state that although employment by itself does not achieve desistance, ‘coupled with job stability, commitment to work, and mutual ties binding workers and employers’ a reduction in reoffending can be achieved. Crow (2001: 206) has also noted the positives associated with
employment and states that where employment interventions have been made available ‘...the proportions of offenders who took up employment doubled’. Similarly, Uggen (1999) and Uggen and Staff (2001) have noted that former prisoners, who rated their job as high quality, were less likely to reoffend, compared to those who rated their job as low quality. Thus, it is not employment itself, but rather the quality of employment, that reduces reoffending. A high quality job can be defined as one paying a decent wage, with the opportunity to express creativity and intelligence (Shover, 1996).

In spite of this life course theorists propose that employment does not directly reduce reoffending, suggesting instead that criminal behaviour naturally declines with age. This is evident in the age-crime curve, which describes the peak in criminal behaviour in the mid to late teenage years (Hirschi, and Gottfredson, 1983). Indeed, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990: 139) stated that ‘employment does not explain, or help to explain, the reduction in crime with age’, suggesting instead that it is possible that offenders simply grow out of crime, as the intrinsic desire to engage in criminal behaviour declines after the age of 25 (Glueck, and Glueck, 1940).

In the current undertaking a decline in the age of offenders was identified, but much later in life. Offenders were grouped into four ages: 17-21, 22-30, 31-40, 41 years (+), and little difference in the size of the age groups identified up to the age of 40 years, each group accounting for between 27.5% and 29.0% of the sample. Although this contradicts the previous findings, it is in keeping with the findings of Howse (PRT, 2002) that the numbers of prisoners over the age of 60 years was three times higher in 2000 than it was in 1990. More recently Le Mesurier (2011: 3) has suggested that there is a significant increase in the
numbers of ‘older’ prisoners, stating that the aging offender accounts for ‘the fastest growing section of the prison population’ and highlighting this growth in numbers as one which needs careful consideration.

Additionally however, the majority of offenders in this study also reported being out of employment for prolonged periods, ranging from less than a month to those that had never worked and although a difficult economic climate may explain these experiences to some extent, for others it was a lack of skill or qualification which presented as their major barrier to employment. Where this was the case, offenders (and staff) often reported having a plan to achieve, or attain, legitimate employment, which could include periods of training where this was seen as a direct requirement of the job they wanted.

**Education and Training**

In every interview with ETE staff, training for employment was suggested to be the initial goal – often linked to a CSCS card (Construction Skills Certification Scheme) which entitled the holder to work in the construction industry, and was a requirement for working on-site. This was also the case where offenders were already skilled and knew the occupation they wanted to follow, understanding that periods of custody or a criminal record could be an obstacle overcome with an up-to-date skill or qualification.

This has been similarly identified by MacKenzie (2006: 94), estimating an 11 % reduction in recidivism as a result of participation in vocational education. Interestingly, recidivism rates have been seen to be significantly lower for offenders receiving vocational education, and significantly higher for those receiving academic education (Wilson, 1994). This may reflect
the type of employment opportunities available to ex-offenders (Saylor, and Gaes, 1997). In this study many offenders reported that they felt happier and more able to achieve their goals through vocational training than in formal (academic) study. Many reported that they had poor or negative experiences of education in the past (often at school), and felt uncomfortable with the idea of returning to the classroom. However, it is recognised that female participants reported formal academic qualification as being of higher value than in vocational study. As noted in chapter 5 (Table 5.7), people learn in a variety of ways, not always attending to the situation or experience in same way. Although considered in a number of ways, this was perhaps best identified by Honey and Mumford (1992), and has been adapted in Table 6.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic Learning Styles</th>
<th>Reflector</th>
<th>Theorist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Considers the implications of past action in preparation of future act through the observation of completed tasks</td>
<td>Likes to think about and identify the process before taking action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Learn through experience of the task at hand. Doing the task is key to understanding</td>
<td>Plans each event step by step before taking action, thus understanding the process through experimentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This group of offenders may be reflective of those Honey and Mumford (1992) have referred to as activists or pragmatists, understanding and retaining knowledge through ‘doing’ the job/activity, essentially practical and want to get the work done, rather than (thinking about) theorising or reflecting.

Experiential learning (active or pragmatic) is no less valuable than theorising or reflecting, and in vocational education and training the individual is able to put in to practice that which they observed. These and similar findings have been reported by the SEU annual
report (2002), Hughes (2009), Veysey, Matinez and Christian (2009) and Flynn (2010), and should come as no surprise. However, Duffy (2008) has also noted that engagement with education and/or training can reduce the likelihood of further offending.

It has been found however, that as a service, ETE, like much of the probation service, is fragmented. It provides an opportunity to support change, but in this instance was found to be under-funded, under-staffed and staff often reported isolation in their role, leading to feelings that it was seen as a possible intervention rather than a requirement of successful change. The move away from crime is a process it is not the end result. Thus, the argument can be made that many offenders are in a continual process of change which needs support and guidance in many forms and more so than can be provided through such a narrow engagement (as employment, training and education). Indeed, for many offenders in this study there was an increased confidence, self-esteem, and motivation in the individual, each of which were areas that the offenders considered noteworthy. For example, as evidenced in chapter 5, on a number of occasions offenders talked of the important support and guidance that had been offered, and the confidence that they had built (see statements made on pp.146-48). This Dewson, Eccles, Tackey and Jackson (2000), have referred to as distance travelled and note its importance for understanding just what has been accomplished, i.e. measuring the point at which the individual starts and then assessing change at periods throughout the intervention, these were points many staff felt important to their work but not taken into consideration.

To summarise, this study found that employment was identified by staff and offenders as being important to reducing re-offending. This was related to the perception of support and
guidance that the offender had received from the ETE officer, and the skills, experience and personal barriers (such as substance misuse) which they had identified as areas to overcome. However, where offenders lacked skills and qualifications, formal (academic) education was less preferable to that of vocational training. Short vocational courses were seen as offering the skills needed to attain a job in their chosen line of employment, and were often seen to provide the quickest opportunity to provide an income.

**Soft Skills Support Change**

Dewson, et al. (2000) have defined ‘hard-outcomes’ as quantitative outcomes such as the numbers of people going into jobs or the numbers gaining qualifications, but they further acknowledge that such outcomes often neglect the success achieved by the participant’s increased level of employability brought about by their preparative work, otherwise referred to as ‘soft-skills’. These soft skills are often those that aid the individual as they move towards quantifiable success (hard outcomes) and can be more important in sustaining change. As noted in chapter 2, soft-outcomes refer to the quantifiable assessment of the learned skill, behaviour, or attitude, and are often those ‘skills’ sought by employers. This has been further developed by the East-Wales Objective 3 Programme (WEFO, 2006: 11) which describes soft outcomes as outcomes which are qualitative in character, that ‘...capture any changes to beneficiaries’ lives before the achievement of the actual project targets, expressed by hard, statistically based outcomes’.

Although this thesis found little empirical support to suggest that ETE alone reduces re-offending (in a community setting), there is an abundance of data drawn from the interviews and additional comments given during the assisted questionnaires which
supports the suggestion that this type of intervention can provide for a positive change in the offender. This is perhaps because of the individual (one-to-one) basis of the work undertaken, and when seen as an holistic programme of intervention, participants found ETE to be a positive and worthwhile experience, which they believed would support them in making a positive change.

This finding is similarly noted by McNeill and Weaver (2010) who have suggested that for there to be a successful change, any development in service must also include ‘a comprehensive and personalised picture…’ of the individual and the process of change that the ‘...intervention exists to support’ (McNeill and Weaver, 2010: 6). This is important, as it adds weight to the contention of Clarke, Kelly and Hutton (2005: 6) ‘...punishment and deterrence are not enough in themselves’ and propose a greater emphasis be placed upon addressing the individual needs that can lead people to commit crime. This is an argument first presented in the opening chapters of this thesis concluding that deterrence alone cannot prevent crime. To be effective there must also be context. Fagan and Meares (2008: 182) concur, stating that ‘...the ability of formal punishment alone to deter crime appears to be quite limited’, and have also concluded that it is only effective ‘...when internalized through formal and informal processes of socialization’ in order to be successful in reducing the rate of re-offending.

In this instance, ETE as an intervention provided a sense of self confidence, and recognition of achievement, which may have been the first time that many of the participants had experienced such a positive environment. Indeed, Maruna LeBel, Naples and Mitchell (2009) note that ex-offenders are often faced with scepticism owing to the high numbers in
offending and reconviction, which fuels negativity and produces fertile ground for a form of self-fulfilling prophecy. Yet, encouragement and constructive support can nurture positive experience and feelings about one’s own ability, which can have an extraordinary effect upon the perception of self.

This has been considered on a number of occasions, including discussions by Goffman (1968) and Robinson and Crow (2009). In Goffman’s (1968) analysis of stigma once the label is successfully applied the individual is pigeon-holed and categorised, and often blamed for their position. Bain and Parkinson (2010) have applied this to crime and deviance. The labels of criminal and ex-offender, amongst others, conjure images associated with a level of understanding, but in doing so also provide for barriers to preventing their successful growth, development and integration. It is from behind these barriers that the labels arise and which frequently lead to an acceptance of the expected behaviour, a Golem effect (as noted by Maruna, et al., 2009), in which low expectation about one’s behaviour (prophecy) often leads the offender to act in the same or similar, negative, manner (self-fulfilment). In this instance, it is not only the individual’s successful re-integration and resettlement which may suffer, but it can as easily perpetuate the cycle of crime (and periods of desistance), and lead inevitably, to the development of criminal careers.

More generally Maruna (2012: 74) has noted that the importance for success comes from the acceptance of personal change from the wider community; this he terms the removal of ‘the leper’s bell’. Far too quickly he says, society seeks to label the individual for past action or offence, yet that same speedy judgement is not observed in the process of (re)integration, which often applies a sense of a secondary sentence, a second punishment,
for the same act and often results in a failure to exhibit real and lasting change (Maruna, 2004). This has – to some degree – been addressed in the proposed changes to the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act (discussed below). However, there is cause for some caution, as the Prison Reform Trust (2012) has also questioned whether the changes go far enough. The exclusion which follows the application of the label also places further barriers before the offender and those barriers often result in a limited access to well-paid and sustainable employment, without which may also restrict access to suitable accommodation. In doing so the individual, is often seen to return to the same set of social circumstance, which in many instances led to the development of offending behaviour in the first place. The intervention can act only as the catalyst for change, its continued success must be found in the wider social group.

This may account for the perceived levels of mistrust exhibited by offenders when providing comment about work undertaken with organisations and agencies from outside the probation service, where they felt a lack of empathy (on the part of the staff), or where the service had not met their level of expectation, and may be a consequence of the lack of relations between the individual and the service provider (considered further later in the chapter).

Rehabilitation and Periods of Change

Conversely, Robinson and Crow (2009) have noted that when successful, rehabilitation enables the offender to shed the negative label attached to conviction and to take up their position within the social group once more. It is the premise upon which the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act (ROA) (1974) was first conceived, and yet in which it often fails. The act
recognises that the individual has worked toward a change in behaviour, that they have left
the mistakes of their past behind and made a successful change in their lives – thus
rehabilitated. Significantly, this is a period recognised by many (see for example Clarke,
2010; NACRO, 2012; Travis and Bowcott, 2012) as being problematic and often adding
another barrier to a successful change. In its original form, the ROA (1974) required a
period of five years rehabilitation for a community punishment to be considered spent,
however the reform of the ROA (1974) has seen this period reduced to one year (see Table
6.3 below).

Table 6.3 sets out the current and proposed changes to the ROA (1974). Travis and Bowcott
(2012) state that such change recognises that sentences have increased in recent years and
that where historically a sentence of thirty months (2½ years) was considered a long
sentence it has become far more common in the last decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Sentence</th>
<th>Current Rehabilitation Period</th>
<th>Proposed Sentence</th>
<th>Proposed Rehabilitation Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caution</td>
<td>Immediately Spent</td>
<td>Caution</td>
<td>Immediately Spent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Order</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Community Order</td>
<td>Sentence +1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody &gt; 6 months</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Custody &gt; 6 months</td>
<td>Sentence +2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody &gt; 2½ yrs</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Custody &gt; 2½ yrs</td>
<td>Sentence +4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custody 2½ yrs +</td>
<td>Never Spent</td>
<td>Custody &gt; 4 yrs</td>
<td>Sentence + 7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Custody 4 yrs +</td>
<td>Never Spent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from MOJ: Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Bill (2012)

The success of the individual is often dependent upon their self-concept – long before any
concern for rehabilitation periods – and whether they are able to attribute their new found
position to a positive change (Wigboldus, Spears and Semin, 1999). Similarly, although
note-worthy, this study did not find the rehabilitative periods to be of great concern, participants believing other things to be of far greater importance. The major anxiety for this cohort was the continued substance misuse of illicit drugs and alcohol (see chapter 5: pp. 167-71).

To this can be added the importance of association, and whether the attribution is seen to be an internal or external event. For example, was the positive change made due to the hard work and effort that the individual undertook, such as the positive statements made regarding their success in gaining qualifications in literacy and numeracy or gaining a CSCS card enabling them to get employment working on building sites, or the acquisition of a skill (such a Fork-Lift Truck Licence); or was it something that was done by somebody else and they – the offender – were lucky enough to benefit from. This is double-edged, for whilst it may be reflective of the positivity with which the participants regarded the ETE service, it is important that the individual believes that they had some responsibility for the success.

Maruna and Copes (2005) note that it is important that the offender believe they are responsible for a successful outcome, in order for them to gain in confidence. This positivity can support further change and enables the individual to move forward in their lives. Again, this may be noted in the important value that can be attached to the assessment of soft-skills, through the observation of personal change over a sustained period and where the individual may not achieve (or maintain the hard-outcome), they may move significantly towards that end (distance travelled). Positive statements were not made in isolation, but were evident in many of the interviews and comments made throughout the study, and seem reflective of work conducted by others (see for instance, Farrall, 2002; McEvoy, 2008;
Flynn, 2010). This is important, because although there is recognition of the essential part that soft skills play, as Dewson et al. (2000) have noted, they still remain on the periphery, with no target and no relationship to funding.

In much the same manner as Ward and Maruna stated ‘they all come back’ (2007: 3), McNeill (2012: 95) has more recently reminded the reader that almost all offenders eventually desist from crime, and adds that for many desistance researchers the question remains ‘what can be done to assist them in this process’. Similarly, in this study many participants were able to identify things in their lives that needed to change if they were to make a successful move away from crime. Although ETE was seen to be an important factor for many, others identified good relationships and (with) families as important in making and sustaining a change.

**Important Relationships**

For many in this study it was the positivity and honesty of the ETE officer that supported their own positive feelings of gaining a successful outcome: learning to use a computer, literacy and numeracy, understanding the application process and confidence in interviews, identifying current skills and setting targets to update them or achieve new skills. Offenders reported the ETE officers as being someone of trust and someone they could trust. However, during the interviews, participants were clear that what they really valued in the service was the clarity and consistency of the one-to-one service provided by the ETE officer. They did not want, nor like, to be passed back and forth between one ‘professional’ and another, which often resulted in repetition and frustration (especially if little was resolved). Although they rarely used those words, the participants built trust and
confidence in the ETE officer; they believed (in) them, when they said that they would or had done something; they had an expectation (for the most part), that things would get better, that they would be able to move away from crime. This is important because it speaks of the importance associated with the relationship built between staff and offender.

Yet, even in the enthusiasm of learning a new skill or trade, at some point reality takes over and past events can catch up with the individual. Self-perception is frequently understood through interactions with others, negotiated and shaped in the actions and reactions experienced. As Maruna and LeBel (2010) quite rightly point out, if there is little engagement, then it is unlikely that the intervention will succeed in its pursuit of rehabilitation. This is an observation similarly made by Flynn (2010) in which he suggests that unless social relations are stable and supportive, then they can have the opposite effect and lead to persistence rather than periods of desistance.

Discussing the role of the Offender Manager, Durrance, Hosking and Thorburn (2010) note the importance and re-emergence of a traditional case work ethos from within the probation service, which guides and supports a change in offending behaviour. Here they highlight the usefulness of Attachment Theory, and reflect upon the discussion presented by Ansbro (2008) regarding the importance of attachment and the offender – case manager (OM/ETEO) relationship to the success of any intervention. Ansbro provides for a discussion based in the application of Attachment Theory to CBT, yet here the same discussion provides for a guiding principle for all interventions, when working with offenders. She notes, that the time taken to understand, engage and establish ‘...a well-pitched dialogue, ...is time well spent’ (Ansbro, 2008: 239), a message which is perhaps critical to learning
about and understanding motivation to change. Ansbro concludes that this is achieved in providing for a framework of attachment, ‘...the relationship in itself is a tool that can effect change, ...the rapport is in itself an instrument of intervention’ (2008: 241). Indeed, Canton (2011) has noted that the relationship between the offender and officer (in this instance ETEO) is crucial to motivation.

**Offender Motivation**

There are a number of ideas about offender motivation from the work undertaken to the decision to stop offending, and offenders in this study were no different. Offenders often reported positive changes in family relationships as being a catalyst for change: birth of a child, marriage, providing for a positive role-model for their own children. Others said that they were ready to make the change. In any sense there was a recognition that they needed to make changes in order to avoid further engagement with the criminal justice system.

In building upon an argument originally proposed by Laub and Sampson (2001, 2003), Flynn (2010) notes that it is virtually impossible to disentangle the self from the social and states that desistance is often associated with such life-changing events as were reported here: such as marriage, employment, and/or appropriate peer groups.

Robinson and Crow (2009) discuss motivation to change as a guiding principle for interventions and reflect upon the ‘Good Lives Model’, suggesting that models such as the ‘...dominant risk/needs model... tend toward ‘negative’ treatment goals’ where in contrast a Good Lives Model ‘...adopts a more positive perspective’ (Robinson and Crow, 2009: 102).
As previously noted in chapter three, this type of model enables the individual to work towards goals associated with socially acceptable behaviour and can support positive change. Crime is seen as being a combination of both social and psychological factors and when targeted and treated, offending behaviour is likely to reduce (Maruna, 2001). However, the argument could be made that the Good Lives Model holds a rather negative view in itself, which does not empower the individual to take action to change, but rather highlights the dysfunction and sets an agenda based upon socially accepted norms and values.

Conversely, an attribution (theory) of emotion and motivation suggests at least some link between behaviour and motivation (Kronger and Mills, 2004). By presenting opportunity based upon the goals set by the individual it is possible to observe the identity transformation, which Maruna et al. (2009: 30), suggest criminologists are so wary of. In understanding what it is that the individual holds important and how they seek to make that a reality, there is an opportunity to guide and support that motivation and activate a change in behaviour.

This is perhaps best understood through a process of motivational interviewing and pro-social modelling, employed to support a successful change. Raynor, Ugwudike and Vanstone (2010) have noted that by showing respect for, and incorporating the views of, the individual with open-ended and reflective questions they (the offender) are encouraged to (re)evaluate their position. However, although a technique regularly employed by the ETE officers, it was an area which was not mentioned by any of them in interview, when asked about the training they had received. Each was able to produce a list of training events
attended or workshops completed, but they were either very general (Diversity – Training Day) or very specific (Rehabilitation of Offenders and the Disclosure of Offences – Half Day) to the role. This would seem to be a missed opportunity, because the greater the development of a skill the more successfully (and skilfully) the member of staff would be able to: reflect, affirm, reinforce (self-motivation), monitor (readiness) and, frame the work undertaken and its development over the coming period of supervision, a point similarly considered by Canton (2011).

This is suggestive of a learned behaviour, and sits well within the social learning theory developed throughout the mid-late twentieth century and argues that cues are learned about particular behaviours, depending upon whether they are reinforced or punished. This learning theory also proposes that such behaviour – and the cues – could be learned through the observation of others, as a form of modelling behaviour, akin to that of pro-social modelling. For instance, Canton (2011), has noted that for change to take place value needs to be placed upon trust and mutual respect. Thus, for (pro-social) learning to be effective, change needs to be enacted not only by the individual, but in their relationships (personal and professional) and social environment: where they live, their peer-group, as well as their access to employment. To this, Maruna, et al. (2009: 51), argue that while under-researched, the maintenance of successful desistance ‘...might involve the negotiation of a reformed identity through a process of pro-social labeling (sic)’.

The application of a label is thus followed by the formation (or transformation) of identity, as either pro-social or otherwise. For instance, Maruna et al. (2009), argue that although one single act may lead to indefinite stigmatising, a hundred (or more) non-deviant acts may
not be enough to remove the label. Which is to say, that regardless of the work put in or the period of time which has passed without the acceptance of their peers and community, the label (and stigma) remains in place (Bain and Parkinson, 2010).

Interestingly, Farrall (2002) has noted the importance of a shared understanding of the obstacles to successful desistance, and states that such an understanding is ‘...essential for a productive working relationship’ (2002: 73). Indeed, McNeill and Weaver (2010: 30) further develop this argument and state that

*Little can be achieved within any method of intervention unless practitioners can establish the right kinds of relationships with offenders*

Similarly here, there was a clear understanding and shared belief (between the ETE officer and offender), which was transmitted in the positive statements from participants and from the ability of staff to recognise those that were likely to attend the appointments, and work towards future goals.

**Driving Motivation**

It is worth mentioning that the value placed upon ETE, by staff and offenders is far from trivial. As was noted previously (see chapters one and two), advice regarding ETE was often provided on an *ad hoc* basis, and was often subject to the knowledge and experience of the individual supervising officer, and/or the importance that they placed upon such things to help reduce crime. A significant amount of the Offender Management (previously probation officers) training seeks to identify and recognise risk and harm, rather than to identify and support change in those areas which may lead the majority of people to offend. This would
suggest an inconsistency deeply dependent upon the knowledge, understanding and motivation of the supervising officer, and a concern identified in the government’s most recent consultation paper – *Transforming Rehabilitation* (MoJ, 2013). Thus the positivity shown by the participants toward the (ETE) service provided in this instance suggest that where this service (ETE) is not available by a dedicated team, there would be little surprise in seeing a rise in reconviction rates. Conversely, ETE officers regularly felt pressurised to find a hard outcome, where there was little of value, which could have a detrimental effect upon the service provided and the relationships built between staff and offender.

As a consequence staff members frequently found themselves balancing a number of differing requirements and expectations. Members of the team commented that the requirements of the probation service were too rigid, where the supervising officer may have had a completely different agenda to that of the ETE officer, or the offender. The requirement may have simply been to provide the offender with an outlet to investigate all options available, providing a spark of interest. Conversely the OM may have been seeking some relief from their own expanding caseload, and a plan of action with the ETE team (over three or four visits), may provide just such relief. However, ETE officers also noted a third management style which consisted of those OMs that truly valued the work and believed it useful or helpful to the offender and (where successful) could be used to support the case returning to court in order to seek an early revocation, or at least improved the offenders position and led to a successful completion of the order. This was noted in the previous chapter when discussing the Outcomes Analysis, which provided evidence that 62.6% of all cases in the study (whether they completed an ETE action plan or not)
successfully completed their order, or achieved an outcome of education, training or employment.

Crucially, offenders often came with a totally different expectation, and may have held unrealistic goals and hopes for the intervention, which were often unachievable owing to their previous criminal convictions, a point similarly highlighted by Flynn (2010). ETE officers often overcame this by offering alternatives, or (as was noted in the previous chapter) where an alternative was not viable, they were honest and (as previously noted above) it was their honesty that paid off, earning them the confidence and respect of the offender.

However, this was tempered by members of the ETE team variously noting morale and/or motivation as lacking and further added unrealistic or changeable targets (a point further noted by Canton, 2011) as being a cause of some frustration. Changes in paperwork and data gathering requirements produced further agitation, when little guidance or explanation was provided, or time was limited and was only added to by the frustrations of limited resources available to the officers. Canton (2011) has noted that people are drawn to the probation service because of the opportunity to work with people, and the challenge associated with this type of client group, yet he is also quick to point to the negativity related to the ‘...amount of paperwork, bureaucracy and time at the computer’ inherent in the modern role.

Resourcing however, is often bound up in the wider discussions of funding allocation and the requirements of the probation service to reach specified objectives in order to unlock additional money, or at least remain within budgetary targets. This point has been similarly
argued by Raynor and Robinson (2009), in which they state that resource allocation is often expressed through a treatment (or at least an observable) outcome. However, they also note that there is an expectation that where an activity is ‘...complex, expensive, difficult and unsure of success’ a justification is provided for the use of such resource (Raynor and Robinson, 2009: 4).

A final point to be raised by staff in relation to the role was a perceived, general lack of support from the management, and was seen as being a major cause of stress within the team. Burnett and McNeill (2005) suggest that this relationship is often overlooked even though it is imperative to the success of the work (intervention) undertaken, and during the course of this study ETE officers voiced major concerns regarding the lack of supportive (or poor) management.

Although the targets for ETE seemed to be achievable over the course of the year, there was no recognition of the additional work done in order to get the person ‘employment ready’, which may have been the cause of much of the frustration. This was later confirmed in an interview with a member of the Senior Management Team, when asked about outcomes and the importance attached to hard outcomes of education, training and employment, when so much else was done to support the offender. His response (see chapter 5: pp. 180-81), that ETE dealt with specific issues, and his conclusion that these targets could be achieved even if the team did not exist only highlighted the differences between the role undertaken by staff and the expectations managers had of the associated importance of other areas, thus enabling targets to be met. This is an important point to recognise,
considered later in the chapter, which has identified the differences that exist between expectation and experience.

The importance of such work can be drawn from the supporting evidence and the work undertaken by Morash (2009: 138). Morash has noted that the success for women came from their ability/willingness ‘...to reveal their feelings and shift away from partners who continued to break the law,’ and to alter their perceptions of self, something which takes great skill and support on the part of others, so often missed from the target driven outcomes associated with ETE.

In summary then, as this chapter noted in its introduction, soft outcomes are neither target nor funding related and thus are seldom recorded, even though these are key indicators of change. ETE officers noted that such outcomes or changes would be seen as superfluous, wasting valuable time and resources, and would only serve to bring them into conflict with their manager(s). There seems some argument over what sort of service should be provided. Should ETE concentrate upon the hard-outcomes of education, training and employment – acting as a sign-posting service for other agencies and organisations, or should the provision of ETE be more aligned with the tasks of its fore-runner (Community Links), providing a more holistic service – tackling presentation (of self), motivation, self belief (and confidence) and inevitably individual morale – understood in terms of mentoring (first considered in chapter 3, but which will be returned to below) – in order to prepare the individual for life post supervision?
Key Conclusions in the Work of ETE

As this chapter has suggested, offending behaviour is complex and can be subject to the influence of a number of personal, social and environmental factors, which shape individual knowledge and understanding as much as they are driven by developments in policy and practice. This has most recently been recognised in the MOJ (2013: 7-8) consultation paper – first considered in chapters two and three – in which it has been noted that there exists ‘...a raft of reasons why offenders commit crimes... such as homelessness, drug and alcohol dependency, mental health illness and unemployment’ concluding that more needs to be done to get offenders back on track. This is a commendable statement which would seem to address many of the tangible difficulties which face vulnerable groups (such as offenders). However, it does not speak of the need to address other, equally important areas. This study has highlighted the importance of the journey toward change, and the individuals understanding of that change, as well as achieving the desired outcome (of ETE). Participants often reported confidence, motivation and positivity about the work undertaken, which led to heightened feelings of self-awareness, levels of self-esteem, and an overall sense of well-being.

Although a hypothetical illustration, figure 6.1 (below) depicts the inter-play of the self, the social, and the ETE service as catalysts for change. Each cog has a different role to play, their importance and/or influence determined by events in life, but each dependent upon that which precedes and that which follows. The social and the (ETE) service then are seen to act as regulating forces, controlling and advising, guiding, supporting and manipulating the self in everyday life, in order to provide for an environment in which change can take place.
This chapter pursues the argument that if there is to be a significant change in individual rehabilitation, then there must also be recognition that (as was suggested in chapters two and three) the offender can be a victim of situation (society), and that choice is often a reflection of social circumstance. It is an argument that suggests the need for a greater emphasis to be placed upon efforts to support holistic change; to provide for a stake in society, a bond or attachment to the community, and a reason to change. However, this is something which requires support. These same individuals are often those that have fallen by the wayside, or slipped through the net in earlier life and therefore need the support of someone to guide them to take the first steps, as was noted by ETEOS in the findings of this study (chapter 5: pp.141-42). This provides further evidence in support of a mentoring service (first considered in chapter 3) as the offender is provided someone of knowledge and understanding to act as a guardian, guiding them in change (Newburn and Shiner, 2005). The chapter argues that without such support it is difficult for change to take place, and therefore punishment will hold little meaning or value.
Nurturing Desistance Focussed (ETE) Services

What then does this mean for the probation service, community orders and for interventions such as ETE? Although this section of the chapter discusses the ‘service’ rather more holistically, it is important to note that it is centred upon the role of (ETE) intervention within the Community Order. In so doing, it questions the opportunity/appropriateness of such a sentence to provide for deterrence and/or rehabilitation and presents the focus for the implications for future practice, and more generally the conclusion of the thesis as a whole.

Of greatest importance is an holistic service, one which would seem more akin to that provided for under the title of Community Links during the 1990s (discussed in chapter 2). The specialised service of ETE has provided for a sign-posting of (other) services and agencies which leads the offender in a number of directions, resulting in duplication, repetition and (although it provided for a funding related outcome, for each of the service providers) it often led to a lack of communication, frustration and apathetic feelings on the part of the offender. In the previous chapter comments were highlighted which suggest a lack of confidence in the services provided by outside agencies (on the part of the offender), and feelings of resentment on the part of ETE officers. However, such comments have far greater implications for staff morale and may explain the high turn over of staff (considered by Newburn and Shiner (2005) in relation to schemes such as mentoring plus) identified in chapter 5, and ultimately for the success of the intervention.

At the very start of this thesis the focus was placed upon the use of deterrent and rehabilitative models of criminal justice and the associated success of enacting a change in
behaviour. To be effective there must be a reason for the individual to avoid certain behaviours (as noted in the introduction to the thesis). This is an argument taken up by Gough (2005: 100), who has noted that deterrence is only likely to be ‘...effective for those individuals who have a great deal to lose by the criminal sanction’. It is therefore important to realise that the individual must recognise that a change is needed, this has already been noted on a number of occasions in this chapter, and is usually represented/associated in their family circumstance, professional relationships and friendships, health and/or welfare, as well as a change in focus or ETE.

Where this is not the case the offender may follow the path of least resistance, the course which is likely to support achieving their goals in the fastest and simplest manner, which Flynn suggests is evident in the development of criminal careers (Flynn, 2010). In this study, similar evidence was found when asked how they sustained a living when they were not employed (see chapter 5: 150-51). In each of these cases it was the inability to make a sustainable living which led them to offend further in order to achieve their goals.

Ramsbotham (2005) argues that any successful punishment will reduce crime and the costs of crime – to the criminal justice system and its associated agencies – and although he is quite correct, Ramsbotham’s argument is centred upon the spiralling costs of court cases, incarceration and punishment more generally, he is not necessarily referring to the cost reduction achieved through the success of rehabilitation or desistance programmes. Change cannot always be measured in monetary terms however, or at least not in the short-term, but is often predicated by three separate, but entirely related events: the decision, the intervention and integration. An example of this in action is the cycle of change,
developed by Prochaska and Di Clemente’s (1992) and was briefly considered in chapter five.

Here it is possible to borrow from Prochaska and Di Clemente’s model (in a similar way to that proposed by Canton, 2011) in order to highlight the changes needing to be made to support the success of that change. Robinson and Crow (2009) suggest that an accurate assessment of motivation to change is vital to the decisions about appropriate interventions. This is no less the case for ETE and allows for a greater success in targeting and planning the work to be undertaken.

Although Prochaska and Di Clemente begin with Pre-contemplation, the discussion here (as shown in Figure 6.2 below) begins from the motivation to change, or the decision to change (Contemplation). Guidance must be sought before any change will take place (Preparation); working towards a new skill, qualification or employment programme, or a positive family life (Action); the maintenance of positive outcomes and change, which builds upon and sustains the current familiar and positive environment (Maintenance) and desistance providing for what Prochaska and Di Clemente suggest to be the Termination.

Importantly, the decision must come from the individual and no amount of cajoling or coercion on the part of ‘another’ will make that decision a reality (Maruna, 2012). Similarly, an intervention will only be successful when it offers something to the individual that they perceive to support their own wants, desires or needs. Although the intervention might support the change taking place, unless the offender is ready to change, or at least consider the change, no transformation in behaviour will take place.
Important in both models however, is the need to recognise that relapse and reconviction, can happen and, as has been recognised by the MoJ (2010: 24), is often associated with the barriers to change that exist. The key is in identification of the processes and supporting a change on the basis of that lapse in order to support further periods of desistance and eventual rehabilitation. An example may come from the letter of recommendation, personal statement, or reference given in support of the offender’s application for employment and is often provided for by a supervising officer, as proof that change has taken place (Flynn, 2010).

This point is considered by Maruna (2001), and consequently he states that desistance is not an event, but a process. Further to this, Laub and Sampson (2001) state that desistance is a move away from crime and not an end result. Thus, the argument can be made that many offenders are in a continual process of change which needs further guidance and support in a familiar environment and which provides a consistent service. Farrall and Maruna (2004) concur and have defined both the process and the act as being to stop (desist) and
desistance (the process through which the cessation occurs), a point initially identified in the definitions provided in the introductory chapter.

The argument returns to the discussion of Flynn (2010) noted earlier in the chapter and his suggestion that it is almost impossible to disentangle the individual from social factors when examining change. Offenders need the opportunity to further develop their social (as well as human) capital. Skills, qualifications and employment are key indicators of change, but it is often a change which is not sustainable. As Flynn (2010) has noted, in many cases, the only jobs that are open to (ex)offenders are low-paid, low-skilled and have little in the way of security or prospects.

Recent history has seen the emphasis on control of risk and the protection from harm. This was identified by Nash (1999) in the emergence of the Polibation Officer, armed with standards, objectives, and assessment tools, which depersonalise, dehumanise and categorise, regardless of motive, motivation and (social) experience. It is an arena of management that clearly outweighs the need to support individual growth and development which often lead to periods of desistance and rehabilitation. This is not to say that these are not important considerations, only that when the balance is thrown out, it only perpetuates the cyclical nature of offending. In placing what is in danger of becoming innumerable barriers and checkpoints along the path to change, the offender is effectively hemmed in and guided toward only singular opportunities – specified activities and change at all cost. It becomes a road marred with pot-holes and barriers, potential dangers seen at every turn, a single slip ending in fault, or worse, tragedy. Yet, if opportunities are
presented, then successes – however small they are – can begin the process and support the longevity of desistance.

In nurturing ‘soft’ outcomes, offenders are offered the opportunity to build upon a solid base, to enjoy the benefits that come from greater confidence and sociability. It can raise their self-esteem, self-worth and identity, all of which are imperative to change and thus desistance and rehabilitation. In this instance the argument then turns to the suggestion that in order to support a successful change in behaviour the service of probation, needs to adopt a person centred, holistic, focus, a return – if you will – to its role as a critical voice, an organisation which challenges sentencers ‘...to deal with offenders in respectful, just and social inclusionary ways in the community’ (Gough, 2005: 91).

The evidence drawn from the interviews and assisted questionnaires would seem to suggest that the supervision provision provided for in a community setting (whether through the probation service, or a partnership organisation) needs to move more toward an individual and holistic approach, if it is to successfully adapt to the needs of the individual as well as the continually changing needs of the criminal justice system. To this Canton (2011) has added that a desistance model returns control to the offender, thereby making them an active participant. This is contrasted by the traditional RNR model, which does not pay sufficient attention to the strengths of the individual, being offence led rather than offender led, and concentrates upon the past behaviour as a predictor of risk – rather than focussing on change as a way out of crime (Duffy, 2008; Ward and Maruna, 2007). In the first place, the assessment of risk provides for a prediction of further offending, and hence the intervention begins from the belief that there will be further future offending. Second, as
Canton (2011: 77) notes, greater need can be – incorrectly – associated with greater risk, thus ‘...redefining the most needy as the most risky and subjecting them to weightier and more intrusive punishments’. Finally, responsivity raises serious questions regarding the appropriateness of assessment and placement on a programme of intervention. Every person differs, has individual needs, wants and desires and programmes are often generic and lack positivity. In contrast a desistance focussed model would consider the need first in order to support a reduction, and cessation from offending in the future.

Maruna (2012) finds a similar example in the work of McNeill (2006), and using the analogy of ‘signs’ and ‘signals’ has concluded that there exists a reliance upon the static, previous criminal behaviour, requiring proof of change (signs); where investigations framed in the dynamic require something to take place, a something which is not always immediately observable (but which signal the change to come).

In recent years the political mantra has variously changed tack from one of tough policies, coupled with the expansion of the prison system, to one offering a revolution in the way in which offenders are seen, dealt with and supported towards a life after crime. In concluding the need for a desistance-focus within the probation service, Maruna states that

‘...the rehabilitation movement should return to the origins of the word ‘rehabilitation’ and focus at least as much on efforts to remove and relieve ex-prisoner stigma as on treatment and reform efforts. There will be no ‘rehabilitation revolution’ without this. Second, these efforts should involve active, not passive redemption. Rehabilitation processes that require almost a decade or more of ‘crime-free’ behaviour before forgiving an individual for his or her crimes are just and fair, but they miss the point of rehabilitation.’

Maruna, 2011: 97
As is to be expected, both positives and negatives can be drawn from the findings of this study, yet what is perhaps most significant is that in speaking to the individual offenders and staff, there is a sense of understanding, positivity and hope for the future. One of the most important and fundamental comments that came from the interviews, was given by T2 who said:

“...it’s good to have someone there to talk to, someone who’s got an idea of what’s going on.”

It would seem that for the greater part, what ETE offers the individual is a quality of service, providing advice and guidance to those that have to this point, fared less well and often start from a playing field that is anything but level with others in society. This is important, because the lack of knowledge, understanding, access and even the opportunity to engage, is often further restricted by difficulties and barriers that can be addressed and/or supported, but which do not provide the instant gratification of a hard-outcome. The argument then is perhaps best made by Ansbro (2008: 241) when she states that ‘...we should measure the effects of our work, but we should remember that sometimes things that matter are difficult to measure’.

**Implications for Practice: The Road Ahead as the Path Behind**

The research began from the argument that if there is to be a successful change in behaviour then it is also important to appreciate individual knowledge, understanding and experience. When the data collection began in September 2008, the probation service had a target to reduce re-offending by 5 percent, and there existed an expectation that this figure would continue to fall year-on-year, to a figure of 10 percent, by 2010 (Barbary,
In the year ending September 2010, the point at which the outcomes analysis was performed, there was a new government and some 182,778 offenders had been made subject to a community order/supervision by the probation service in England and Wales (MOJ, 2012). However, as the process of measurement changed, it is difficult to evaluate success of these figures over time with a degree of accuracy.

In order to achieve the required reduction to crime figures it was noted in chapter three that the probation service make use of a number of interventions, which seek to protect the public through an effective punishment – perhaps using a combination of methods which are: punitive (Unpaid Work); support victim empathy (through Cognitive Skills Programmes); and reduce re-offending by tackling core issues – such as illicit drug use, improving the opportunity for a legitimate, sustainable income, or secure housing. These are factors which many authors, government agencies and NGOs have suggested are key to the success of policies that seek to reduce crime, the fear of crime and recidivistic behaviours (see for instance, Bain and Parkinson, 2010; Crow, 2001; Crow and Robinson, 2009; Farrall, 2002, 2004; Maruna, 2001, 2004; MoJ, 2010; SEU, 2002).

There is little doubt that interventions play a key role in the development of the individual and evidence suggests that when implemented with the individual in mind, they can support a change in behaviour. However, the individual is central to this process and there has to be a reason for the change to take place. There has to be something of value, something worth holding on to, and something they do not wish to lose (Farrall, 2002; Flynn, 2010; Gough, 2005), in effect the offender has to ‘buy-in’ to the system to effect change (McNeill and Weaver, 2010: 39). This process was identified in figure 6.1 above, in which there is an
interplay between the self (personal wants, needs and desires – or readiness to change), the social (providing access to services and opportunity in recognition of that change), and the other directed by the service provided (guiding and supporting, and sometimes enforcing, the change to take place).

In 2010, following the election of the coalition government, Kenneth Clarke (as Minster of Justice) stated that the fundamental failing of the criminal justice system has been a ‘lack of focus on reform and rehabilitation...’ (Ministerial Foreword, 2010: 1). In this statement he also highlighted the fact that an analysis of reoffending statistics by the Ministry of Justice had noted that 37% of prisoners needed help finding somewhere to live when released, almost half (47%) had no qualifications and 13% had never worked. Each of these areas (amongst others) required greater focus in order to rehabilitate offenders and support a life without crime, a role identified as that of a Community Links officer in the local probation trust area (in the 1990s).

What is apparent from the literature and findings is that for the service (ETE as well as the probation service as a whole) to develop and grow there must be recognition of the individual whose care they have been entrusted with, accounting for their own wants and needs. This can be expressed through professional knowledge, judgement and discretion of the Offender Manager (probation officer) and/or ETE (Interventions) officer to re-establish the relationship between staff and offender so important in arguments of desistance (McNeill and Weaver, 2010; MoJ, 2010). To affect a duty of care (to the community, the victim and the offender) there must be focus placed upon a desistance-centred service (McNeill and Weaver, 2010); one which looks at the person in a holistic sense; enabling the
self, the social and probation service (if not a social service) to work together to support the individual and guide personal change.

Nevertheless, this study found that offenders were happy with the service provided, often stating that they valued consistency from the service provider (in this instance a local ETE team), the relationship that had been built between offender and ETE officer seeing this as a great support to developing and sustaining motivation. What should be the greatest consideration for the service provider in the future is that the evidence presented here would seemingly suggest that what the individual has identified in the ETE officer is an advocate or mentor, someone who can guide and support them as they make changes to leave a life of crime behind.

Indeed, regardless of the work and effort that has gone in to enforcing change within the probation service, what has been recognised even in the most recent consultation document is the need to provide a service which supports the offender in every aspect of their daily lives including work, health and welfare (including addictions), housing and benefits, literacy and educational deficits (MoJ, 2013). It should come as no surprise then that what is proposed is a return to much of the role undertaken by the probation officer between 1907 and 1997, in befriending, advising and guiding a change in behaviour, and yet a service which will be provided by external partners (through the voluntary and private sectors. What this has highlighted beyond any doubt is the very cyclical nature of punishment and intervention within the criminal justice system of England and Wales (Bain, 2011).
Limitations and Future Research

Although the findings of this study remain positive, they should be treated with caution. Offenders’ statements were, on the whole, positive about the service provided and many expected to succeed in achieving their personal goals through the support offered. However, this was a local case-study, examining personal experiences and understanding of one intervention, and can only be considered as such.

This study took place within a fixed time-period, and as levels of service differ – as do those responsible for providing the service – it would be both challenging and exciting to evaluate on a wider scale. For example, a number of staff members were seconded to an outside organisation that had secured funding to work (specifically) with PPOs and MAPPA cases, but with a lack of infra-structure, a high turnover of inexperienced staff and poor resourcing, the company had ceased to trade before the end of the project. This meant that both staff and offenders returned to an under-funded, under-staffed, probation service prematurely, their very specialised and specific service cut short.

It is recognised that a number of other methodologies could have been used, and could be considered in the future. For example, the study lends itself to an examination by way of focus groups and could have provided for results/findings just as valid as those reported here. It is also recognised that there is not a large enough sample to give the study the power to conduct a more stringent statistical analysis, or to undertake regression analysis (to any meaningful degree). However, the methodology chosen sought to give the participants a voice, which it succeeded in doing, and which is something which has been lacking in this area in the past.
A level of caution is required however when making a claim to have provided for a representative voice in the study. Although all offenders that attended their appointment with the ETE officer were offered the opportunity to take part in the study, this can be said to be a self-selecting group as they had already made the decision to attend the ‘supervision’ appointment. What is missing from this study, and should be considered in the future, is an attempt to hear the voice of those who do not wish to take advantage of the services provided.

Any future research would benefit from the addition of a Well-being study, returning to the participants over a sustained period to examine how they felt at the end of their supervision and whether the intervention really had made a substantial difference in supporting change. A longitudinal element could also be added, examining those that had successfully completed a period of intervention as part of the supervision programme, in comparison to those that had not. This would also provide an opportunity to examine the outcomes – success and/or re-conviction – of a self-selecting control group, i.e. those offered the support of ETE but who refuse or decline the service.

To this end, any future evaluative research could include a number of comparatives, three of which have been identified below:

1) A comparative analysis should be made of those who have chosen to work with an ETE officer and those made subject to a specified activity. This will evaluate self-identification and motivation verses those that are made subject to an order of the court
2) An analysis of services provided in adjoining probation trust areas may hold some value. Experience can often differ between local areas, even in close proximity, and has been noted in differences that exist between rural and urban settings, even in this study.

3) Finally as the services are further refined and redistributed between the probation service and private, not for profit, and voluntary organisations, a well-being study could be undertaken to examine individual knowledge, understanding and experience through a range of services. This could identify the most supportive and successful services for supporting change and desistance from crime.

Contribution to Original Knowledge

The thesis set out with the intention of listening to and reporting the knowledge and experience of individuals that took part in, or were employed as part of, a programme of intervention through the service of ETE. This is the basis for the contribution to wider research knowledge and has identified ETE as a positive intervention, and an important source of guidance and support for the individual, where they are seen more clearly as a mentor and advocate; a person that understands them, guiding them and supporting them, speaking up for them, and on behalf of them (Newburn and Shiner, 2005). In this sense, ETE services provide for both an inclusionary and positive environment which Gough (2005) and others suggest is so important in enabling the individual.

This is interesting because it speaks of support for the government’s consultation paper: Transforming Rehabilitation (MoJ, 2013), first identified in chapter 2, in which a strong emphasis has been placed upon the positive support that can be offered by a mentor.
meeting the offender at the prison gate and as ‘...someone they [offenders] can turn to as a wise friend as they turn their lives around’ (MoJ, 2013: 5).

In summary, key to the findings and the outcome of this study is that although a service of ETE provides for support and guidance which supports the individual’s employability, employment is very often not the outcome. For the individuals that participated in this study, the value of the work undertaken came from the individual, one-to-one guidance they were provided.
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