

What works for offenders *and* staff: Comparing two multi-agency approaches to offender resettlement.

Jane Wood,

Cassandra Kade,

And

Mamta Sidhu.

Department of Psychology,

Keynes College,

University of Kent at Canterbury,

Canterbury,

CT2 7NP,

United Kingdom.

All correspondence to the first author. Please e-mail: j.l.wood@kent.ac.uk

This research was made possible by funding from the Kent and Medway Resettlement Programme.

Running title: Multi-agency approaches to offender resettlement

Abstract:

Between 2005 and 2007, the Kent and Medway Resettlement Programme (KMRP) piloted EXODUS (Ex-Offenders Discharged Under Supervision), a multi-agency support system for identified priority and prolific offenders (IPPO's). Unlike traditional models of multi-agency support, EXODUS agencies work from the same location to maximise support for IPPO's, and inter- and intra-agency support for staff. This study assessed the perceived effectiveness of EXODUS. EXODUS staff and IPPO's were interviewed and their responses compared to those of traditional multi-agency support staff and IPPO's. Analysis showed that EXODUS IPPO's had committed fewer offences since receiving support than did control IPPO's. Neither group was more likely to be employed, but of those who were, EXODUS IPPO's were more likely to *remain* employed than control IPPO's. Most, regardless of type of support structure, recommended their programme and staff, although EXODUS IPPO's were more satisfied with the support they received. Staff believed that an expansion of the multi-agency approach was needed and that agency roles should be more clearly defined. EXODUS staff expressed higher efficacy in their own and colleagues' ability to provide effective support and improved inter-agency relations and support from co-workers. However, EXODUS and control staff did not differ in levels of job satisfaction.

Key words: multi-agency, rehabilitation, prolific offenders.

Acknowledgements:

This study could not have been completed without the efforts of many people. We would like to thank the Kent and Medway Resettlement steering group who supported this work financially and without hesitation. Without their enduring support this study would have been impossible. Special thanks go to EXODUS and control programme staff who, despite time starvation, facilitated our data collection. We also owe a great deal to the ex-offenders who agreed to participate, for giving our questions careful consideration and thus providing us with valuable insight into the experience of resettlement.

Introduction:

The goals of rehabilitation programmes are two-fold: to reduce the risk of offender recidivism, and to improve public protection by encouraging offenders to adopt a pro-social lifestyle (Gendreau & Cullen, 1994). A number of such programmes now exist, and a multitude of strategies developed to achieve these goals. The purpose of the current study is to examine an innovative and recently-piloted programme, EXODUS (Ex-Offender Discharged Under Supervision), to determine whether it is any more effective than a traditionally delivered programme. Crucially, satisfaction with the EXODUS and traditional programmes was measured for both enrolled offenders *and* programme staff.

Andrews and Bonta (2003) suggest five principles of effective rehabilitation. The *Risk* principle refers to the requirement that intervention be targeted to the offender's level of risk of re-offending. The *Need* principle states that intervention must be able to address the specific criminogenic needs of the individual. The *Responsivity* principle ensures that the programme type is matched to the offender's learning style, thereby improving intervention effectiveness at a processing level. The principle of *Professional Discretion* requires that practitioners and clinicians providing intervention retain their professional judgment and use it responsibly. This is achieved through assisting their continued development, ensuring that all training is at an optimal level in order to offer the offender the best chances of rehabilitation (Andrews & Dowden, 2005). The final principle of *Program Integrity* ensures that a programme is conducted in practice as its theory and design had so intended (Andrews & Dowden, 2005). These principles are not mutually exclusive; all work together to ensure the offender has the opportunity to develop pro-social attitudes and challenge their criminal behaviour.

Consequently, and arguably, the most dominant approach to offender rehabilitation is the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model (Ward & Brown, 2004), which closely follows these principles. It has been argued, however, that this model over-emphasises offenders' cognitive deficits and perceived risk at the expense of consideration for their motivations and humanistic (as opposed to criminogenic) needs (e.g. employment, relationships, etc.; McMurrin & Ward, 2004). This concern formed the basis of an extension to the RNR model, the Good Lives Model (GLM) of offender rehabilitation (Ward & Brown, 2004). The GLM contends that offenders attempt to acquire goods (i.e. humanistic needs) in maladaptive ways because they lack the skills to achieve them pro-socially (McMurrin & Ward, 2004). The GLM assumes that if offenders are better equipped to manage themselves (i.e. address deficits) and reach their goals by more pro-social means (i.e. address needs) then they would be less likely to re-offend (i.e. decrease risk). As such, the GLM posits that offender rehabilitation and resettlement programmes must support offenders to overcome four main difficulties; '(1) problems with the means to secure goods, (2) a lack of scope within their plans for achieving goods, (3) a conflict between their sought goals, or an incoherence of goals, and (4) a lack of the necessary ability to form and adjust plans to changing circumstances' (McMurrin & Ward, 2004, p. 300).

Consistent with the GLM, an evaluation of a number of resettlement programmes suggests that the most effective interventions combine offenders' social resources and opportunities with attention to cognitive factors such as beliefs and motivation (Lewis et al, 2003; Home Office, 2007). To this end, these pathfinder programmes have brought about improvements in offender employment and literacy (Lewis, et al, 2003). However,

inconsistent with their aim, there has been no clear reduction in re-offending rates (Harper & Chitty, 2004). This demonstrates that rehabilitation programmes are subject to a number of conditions if the support they provide is to be effective.

The development of a therapeutic alliance between programme staff and offenders is central to the programme's ability to provide support (Ward & Brown, 2004). If a therapeutic alliance is successful then we would expect both parties (i.e. offenders and programme staff) to hold positive attitudes towards each-other and be more satisfied with the programme, and thus will be equally engaged in taking positive steps toward successful rehabilitation. Satisfaction with programme structure and staff support has been associated with a reduction in re-offending (Maruna & Farrall, 2004). Offender responsiveness is thus also likely to be high. The GLM posits that if rehabilitation programmes consider offenders' humanistic needs then responsiveness would further increase (Ward & Brown, 2004). However, rehabilitation programmes face some limitations also. A review of correctional services (Carter, 2003) revealed that the fragmentation of the criminal justice system (CJS) was counter-productive to effective offender resettlement:

“We have found an urgent need for the different parts of the criminal justice system to work closer together. At its simplest, each part of the system has little regard for the consequences of its actions on the other parts. This means that resources are not always used effectively. Further, few of the players are focused on the overall aim of crime reduction.” (p.1)

In 2004, the Home Office introduced a strategy to assist in achieving this aim through curtailing the activities of a specific group of offenders, Identified Priority and

Prolific Offenders (IPPO's). IPPO's are defined as individuals aged over 18 who have committed six or more recorded offences during the past year (Dawson, 2007). The strategy to combat IPPO behaviour comprises three 'strands' (Dawson & Cuppleditch, 2007). The first, 'Prevent and Deter', concerns using education programmes to act as early interventions to stop offending behaviour from becoming persistent. The second, 'Catch & Convict', allows the police to monitor IPPO's behaviour, and to arrest and convict them if they re-offend. The final strand, 'Resettle and Rehabilitate', involves a multi-agency approach to resettling offenders, by supporting them to address needs, such as finding employment or treating substance misuse (Dawson, 2007).

A multi-agency approach to offender rehabilitation is intuitively appealing since offenders' needs will be numerous and diverse. Seventy percent of offenders have no employment, education or other training schemes organised for them post-release (Niven and Stewart, 2005), and since employment has been related to the inhibition of offending (Niven & Olangundoye, 2002; Sampson & Laub, 2005) it seems feasible that this 70% will likely fall back into a criminal lifestyle. However, addressing an offender's lack of employment (i.e. the role of a single agency) is insufficient if, for example, their accommodation arrangements or drug treatment (i.e. the roles of separate agencies) are not taken into account (Crow, 2005). A multi-agency approach promotes collaboration in expertise, providing an intensive package of interventions and improved management of IPPO's (Robinson & Raynor, 2006; Cinamon & Hoskins, 2006). Although this style of administration has its critics (e.g. Pearson et al, 1992; Pitts, 2001), there is some evidence that the adoption of a multi-agency approach by Youth Offending Teams (YOT's) has had a positive influence on the delivery of intervention (Burnett & Appleton, 2004).

In 2005, a new multi-agency initiative was launched, designed to improve the employability of IPPO's and evaluate the delivery of pre- and post-release training and guidance. The EXODUS (Ex-Offenders Discharged Under Supervision) programme was piloted across the South East of England between 2005 and 2007, supporting IPPO's released into the community. In a novel extension to traditional multi-agency support networks, which are spread over a number of locations, EXODUS introduced core agencies (e.g. prison and probation services, Job Centre Plus, drug addiction teams, police and community support officers) working from the same location in order to improve inter-agency information sharing and support for offenders enrolled on the programme. The logic behind this innovation is that since social support networks influence offenders' rehabilitation (Hochstetler, Murphy & Simons, 2004) co-location of agencies offers a sense of united support for offenders (Millie & Erol, 2006). This is also practically beneficial, since providing 'one-stop-shop' access to support staff reduces the amount of time IPPO's spend travelling across distances to attend different meetings with support staff from different agencies.

As well as benefiting offenders enrolled on the programme, the EXODUS scheme also has some advantages over traditional programmes for its staff, a neglected consideration of offender rehabilitation research. The diverse nature of multi-agency working can lead to ambiguity in understanding of each agency's role, creating inconsistent expectations which can lead to tension, or 'turfism' (Crawford, 1998). Lack of collegial support for rehabilitative service staff is the biggest risk factor for staff burnout (Corrigan, McCracken, Kommana & Edwards, 1996). Not only does staff burnout have a negative effect on the individual sufferer in terms of their physical and

psychological health, but it is also likely to negatively affect programme delivery. This in turn will affect programme integrity (Andrews & Bonta, 2003). If a rehabilitation programme is to achieve a satisfactory therapeutic alliance between staff and offenders, it is essential that programme staff are able to function efficiently. This is not to say that all multi-agency approaches are susceptible to inefficiency; close and successful working relationships between the police and probation services have been observed (Kemshall & Maguire, 2001). Clearly more needs to be understood about the working practices of multi-agency teams, to determine the conditions under which their services may be more or less productive.

The present study has two main aims: to examine staff perceptions of the EXODUS programmes effectiveness, and to examine IPPO's satisfaction with the support they receive. Programme effectiveness can be measured simply by comparison of clients' (e.g.) employment histories and offending behaviour post-treatment, but such an analysis can describe only surface details. The concept of self-efficacy, the belief in one's ability to influence events to attain a desired goal (Bandura, 1982), offers the potential for greater insight into the mechanisms that underlie offender rehabilitation. By assessing IPPO's self-efficacy for rehabilitation we can achieve a deeper examination of the relationship between treatment programmes and IPPO's belief that they can achieve long-term behavioural change. EXODUS offenders' and staff (experimental group) responses to a series of questionnaire items were compared with those of offenders and staff using a traditional framework of programme delivery (i.e. across multiple locations; control group). To the authors' knowledge this is the first study to examine both offender and

staff perceptions of programme effectiveness across two different approaches to programme delivery.

Regarding offenders, we hypothesised that since EXODUS and control IPPO's have similar offending backgrounds (as demonstrated by their IPPO status) there is no reason to expect that they would differ in their belief (self-efficacy) that they could re-offend should they want to. However, since EXODUS provides easy access to support from multiple agencies, EXODUS IPPO's were expected to have a greater belief (self-efficacy) in their ability to rehabilitate. We also expected that more EXODUS than control IPPO's would be in employment, since easier communication between support agencies should increase such opportunities (Cocker, 2005; Cinamon & Hoskins, 2006). Since EXODUS IPPO's have easier access to different agencies, we expected them to express greater satisfaction with the support they receive from programme staff than control IPPO's would. Lastly, since EXODUS IPPO's were expected to be more satisfied with support and have higher levels of self-efficacy for rehabilitation, we expected that they would also report lower rates of re-offending when compared to control IPPO's (consistent with Maruna & Farrall, 2004).

Regarding programme staff, we hypothesised that the co-location of EXODUS staff would provide greater inter-agency support than available to traditional programme staff, and thus EXODUS staff would express higher levels of job satisfaction than control staff. EXODUS staff were expected to report higher levels of self- and other- (colleagues') efficacy in supporting IPPO's than control staff due to their having better access to other agencies and superior mutual inter-agency support. Lastly, EXODUS staff were expected to hold more positive attitudes towards IPPO's than control staff. If

EXODUS staff have higher self-efficacy in the effectiveness of the support they provide, they are also more likely to believe IPPO's are capable of rehabilitation.

Method:

Participants;

Offenders;

Thirty-five IPPO's participated in this study: 22 EXODUS offenders (20 males and two females, mean age = 24.72 years, SD = 6.63) and 13 control offenders (12 males and one female, mean age = 27.85, SD = 10.60). All participants were receiving treatment under the supervision of the Kent and Medway Resettlement Programme, one of the initiatives piloting the EXODUS programme. Probation officers approached potential participants enrolled on the two programmes; all 22 IPPO's from EXODUS (100%) agreed to participate but of the 17 control IPPO's approached four (23.5%) refused. The mean total number of offences committed by EXODUS offenders was 78.4, compared to the control offenders' mean of 60.8. As of the time of data collection, EXODUS IPPO's had been free from prison for a mean of 14.9 months, compared to 9.3 months for the control group.

Staff;

Fourteen programme staff participated in this study: seven from the EXODUS group (three males and four females, mean age = 48.1, SD = 9.46) and seven from the control group (five males and two females, mean age = 46.6, SD=12.34). All were recruited by the researchers. EXODUS staff included members of Kent Police, HM Prison Service, Kent Council on Addiction, Employment Training & Education providers, and the Probation Service. The control group consisted of six probation officers (including one

trainee) and one Prolific & Priority Offender co-coordinator. The mean length of time EXODUS staff had been employed by their respective agencies was 19.9 years (SD = 12.62), compared to a mean of 8.4 years (SD = 9.54) for the control staff.

Design;

This study used a between-participants design, with one independent variable (rehabilitation and resettlement programme type; EXODUS vs. control group). There were four dependent variables for offenders (satisfaction with support services, attitudes towards crime, self-efficacy for rehabilitation, and self-efficacy for re-offending) and four for the programme staff (self-efficacy in programme delivery, other-efficacy in programme delivery, job satisfaction, and attitudes towards IPPO's). DV's were measured using the scales described below.

Materials;

A pilot study of all test materials, involving 20 university students was conducted to see if there were any comprehension problems with either of the interview schedules; none were revealed.

Demographics;

IPPO's were asked to report their age, gender, and ethnicity. Their most recent prison release date was recorded and used to calculate a mean follow-up period. IPPO's self-reported current offending rates and offending history (i.e. their response to items such as "how many offences have you committed to date", "have you re-offended while receiving support and if so how many", and "do you think that you are likely to commit further offences in the near future"), and their employment status (e.g. "have you been interviewed for a job", "have been offered a job", "have you turned down a job" and

“*have you entered into education or training programmes*”) were used as direct tests of programme effectiveness. Self-report data were used since reconviction rates allow for biases between actual behaviour and the data (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). Data regarding relationship status, and family and/or friend support was also collected, since social support has been linked to a reduction in recidivism (Cullen, Wright & Chamlin, 1999).

Staff were asked to report their age, gender and length of service with their respective agencies.

Interview schedule for IPPO's;

Satisfaction with support services; A satisfaction in support services questionnaire, devised specifically for use in this study, assessed IPPO's' satisfaction with the availability of staff, the support they receive from staff and perceptions of staff attitudes to them. Participants were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = 'strongly disagree' to 5 = 'strongly agree') their agreement with 25 statements, including e.g. “*I get as much support as I need from staff*” and “*The support I am receiving from staff is helping me to overcome my personal problems*”. Five further items were open-ended and required qualitative responses. The scale had high internal consistency ($\alpha = .82$).

CRIME-PICS II (Frude, Honess & Maguire, 1994); IPPO's' attitudes to crime were assessed using CRIME-PICS II (Frude, Honess & Maguire, 1994). This measurement has been widely used in Pathfinder evaluations, as part of the standard test 'battery' for probation programmes (Home Office, 2004b), and is relatively simple and quick to administer (Raynor, Kynch, Roberts & Merrington, 2000). Further, it has been related to

reconviction rates (Raynor, 1998) and as a measure of change in criminal attitudes (Hatcher & McGuire, 2001). Participants were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = 'strongly agree' to 5 = 'strongly disagree') their agreement with 20 statements, including e.g. "*In the end, crime does pay*" and "*I don't see myself as a real criminal*". The scale had moderate internal consistency ($\alpha = .60$).

Self-efficacy for rehabilitation and re-offending; The General Self-Efficacy Scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1993) was adapted specifically for this study (based on guidelines provided by Schwarzer & Fuchs, 1996) to assess IPPO's' perceived self-efficacy for rehabilitation and re-offending separately. Two questionnaires were developed, on both of which participants were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = 'not at all true', 2 = 'hardly true', 3 = 'uncertain', 4 = 'moderately true', 5 = 'exactly true') their agreement with a number of statements (14 items on the rehabilitation scale and 19 items on the re-offending scale), including e.g. "*I am confident that I could commit further offences and avoid detection*", and "*I can always manage to solve difficult problems without resorting to crime*". Both scales had high internal consistency (re-offending, $\alpha = .89$; rehabilitation, $\alpha = .91$).

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960); Since this study relied on self-report data, a social desirability scale was included to identify participants who attempted to project favorable images of themselves. The scale contains 33 true/false items that describe socially acceptable but improbable behaviors and items deemed unacceptable but probable, such as "*I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake*". These items had moderate internal consistency ($\alpha = .68$)

Interview schedule for staff;

Perceptions of self-efficacy in programme delivery; Due to the absence of a suitable established scale, the self-efficacy in programme delivery questionnaire was devised (following a review of literature relating to self-efficacy) specifically for this study. Participants were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = 'strongly agree' to 5 = 'strongly disagree') their agreement with 13 statements, including e.g. "*My communication with other agencies is effective in helping the client*". Eight further items were open-ended and required qualitative responses. The scale had good internal consistency ($\alpha = .74$).

Perceptions of colleagues' effective programme delivery; As with the self-efficacy scale, the perceived effectiveness of colleagues programme delivery questionnaire was devised specifically for this study. Participants were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = 'strongly agree' to 5 = 'strongly disagree') their agreement with 14 statements, including e.g. "*My colleagues have played a pivotal role in helping ex-offenders achieve their goals*". Three further items were open-ended and required qualitative responses. The scale had good internal consistency ($\alpha = .73$).

Job satisfaction; The job satisfaction scale was based on the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; Balzer, 1997). Participants were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = 'strongly agree' to 5 = 'strongly disagree') their agreement with 15 statements assessing how stimulating, interesting and challenging staff found their work. Items included e.g. "*The work in my present job gives me a sense of accomplishment*". The scale had fairly low internal consistency ($\alpha = .40$).

Attitudes toward IPPO's; The attitudes towards IPPO's scale was developed from the Attitudes towards Prisoners Scale (Melvin, Grammling & Gardner, 1985). Participants

were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1 = 'strongly agree' to 5 = 'strongly disagree') their agreement with 30 statements, including e.g. "*Most IPPO's can be rehabilitated*". Internal consistency was good ($\alpha = .75$).

Procedure (all participants);

Before the main data collection began, ethical approval was sought and granted. A pilot study of all test materials was then conducted. At data collection, questionnaires were administered by the researchers in the form of an interview, to offset any literacy difficulties IPPO's might have, and to ensure privacy and confidentiality for all participants. Before being interviewed each participant was fully informed of the aims of the study and of their rights as participants to withdraw at any time without penalty, in accordance with the ethical principles of the British Psychological Society (BPS) and H.M. Prison Service. They were then asked to sign a consent form agreeing to participate. Questionnaires were randomly administered to prevent order effects (see Krosnick & Alwin, 1987). Following completion of the interview each participant was fully debriefed verbally and a written copy of the debrief sheet was given to them to keep. To maintain confidentiality and anonymity questionnaires were numbered and kept separate from consent forms.

Results:

Results were screened for outliers and violations of assumptions: none were found. All statistical analyses were conducted using a .05 alpha level. The results are presented in two parts, first outlining findings from IPPO's, and then from programme staff.

Offenders' Results;

We expected that EXODUS IPPO's would have similar levels of self-efficacy for re-offending but higher levels of self-efficacy for rehabilitation compared to control IPPO's. An independent samples t-test showed that EXODUS ($M = 42.45$, $SD = 16.18$) and control IPPO's ($M = 41.31$, $SD = 14.63$) had similar self-efficacy for re-offending, $t_{(33)} = .21$, $p = .84$. However, contrary to our prediction, there was no difference between EXODUS ($M = 52.27$, $SD = 10.91$) and controls ($M = 51.15$, $SD = 11.57$) in self-efficacy for rehabilitation, $t_{(33)} = .29$, $p = .78$.

Our second prediction was that more EXODUS IPPO's than control IPPO's would be employed. A series of chi-square analyses were used to compare EXODUS and control IPPO's on whether they were employed, involved in education or training programmes, had accepted a job, had rejected a job, had left a job and believed they are likely to get a job (see Table 1).

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

No differences were found between the two groups on all items except leaving a job: more EXODUS IPPO's ($n = 15$) than controls ($n = 4$) had remained in employment, $\chi^2_{(1, n=35)} = 0.03$, $p < 0.05$.

We also predicted that EXODUS IPPO's, compared to control IPPO's, would express greater satisfaction with support from programme staff. An independent samples t-test showed that EXODUS IPPO's were more satisfied ($M = 91.32$, $SD = 7.02$) than controls ($M = 77.38$, $SD = 18.71$), $t_{(33)} = 2.58$, $p < .05$.

Nearly half of the control IPPO's (46.15%, $n = 6$) reported having re-offended while receiving support compared to 27.3% ($n = 6$) of EXODUS IPPO's although this was not significantly different, $\chi^2_{(1, n=35)} = 1.29, p = 0.22$. To examine the rates of IPPO's re-offending while controlling for the effects of other variables a multiple regression was used. The dependent variable was the number of offences committed since programme involvement. Results produced a significant model that explained 72% of the variance (see Table 2).

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

The most important predictors of number of offences committed were group membership, self-efficacy for re-offending and rehabilitation, and number of offences ever committed. Group membership ($sr^2 = .04$) explained 4% of the variance and shows that EXODUS IPPO's reported committing fewer offences than control IPPO's. Self-efficacy for re-offending ($sr^2 = .15$) explained 15% of the variance and shows that if IPPO's have high belief in their ability to re-offend they commit fewer offences. Self-efficacy for rehabilitation ($sr^2 = .19$) explained 19% of the variance and shows that if IPPO's have high belief in their ability to rehabilitate they commit fewer offences. Number of offences ever committed ($sr^2 = .36$) explained 36% of the variance and shows that the more offences that IPPO's have ever committed the higher the number of offences they have committed since being part of the programme. Since this variable accounts for a large amount of the variance we conducted a t-test to see if IPPO's differed

on their levels of offences ever committed since such a difference may have implications for the findings overall. Results showed no difference between EXODUS IPPO's ($M = 78.41$, $SD = 110$) and control IPPO's ($M = 60.85$, $SD = 132$), $t_{(33)} = .42$, $p = .68$. Social desirability was not an important predictor, which shows that EXODUS and control IPPO's did not differ in their socially desirable responses.

Qualitative responses;

We asked a number of open-ended questions to expand the picture of rehabilitation programmes from the offender's perspective and to further clarify the results. Examples of typical responses when asked how they would describe the current support staff involved in rehabilitation were;

"Staff are helpful... they can help you with things like housing problems"

(EXODUS Participant A6).

"Staff are helpful. I haven't offended again [since] they are always there when I need them" (Control Participant B7).

Typical descriptions of the best and worst aspects of the programme included:

"Helping me find a job and putting me through forklift driver's license"

(EXODUS Participant A8).

"Getting things off your chest and talking about your problems" (Control Participant B5).

"The length- it's too long... I have completed everything and I still have a year left" (EXODUS Participant A3).

"Inexperienced staff" (Control Participant B11).

“Still no structure of finding people like myself the help of getting a job” (Control Participant B9).

“The prison staff - 90% think they are a waste of money. Staff get you down by calling you junkies... they think these programmes are a waste” (Control Participant B5).

When asked about useful aspects of the programme, typical responses included:

“The one-on-one session with [my] worker” (EXODUS Participant A6).

“People [are] there to talk to about personal problems” (EXODUS Participant A1).

“[I’m] quite happy with [my] probation officer, he comes across as listening and he knows what I’m talking about” (Control Participant B10).

“Talking one-on-one... Building a relationship where there is a bit of trust”
(Control Participant B4).

When asked why they have continued to offend, typical responses included:

“Being drunk and silly” (EXODUS Participant A7).

“Drinking and depression” (EXODUS Participant A21).

“Anger problems” (Control Participant B2).

“Lack of help from probation” (Control Participant B5).

Those who had not committed an offence explained:

“I have a family now” (EXODUS Participant A14).

“I don’t want to go back to prison” (EXODUS Participant A5).

“Grown-up more and settled down with girlfriend” (Control Participant B8).

“I’ve learned from my mistakes” (Control Participant B7).

Considering future involvement in offending, typical responses included:

“I want to be normal and start living my life. I don’t want to waste my life in jail”

(Control Participant B3).

“If I have got a job then I won’t, but if I can’t get a job then I will” (Control

Participant B12).

“I’m a changed man. I have a family and I’m working on my prospects. EXODUS gives me good advice and other options” (EXODUS Participant A4).

“Because I’m an ex-offender, not a re-offender” (EXODUS Participant A16).

Staff results;

An independent samples t-test was used to see if, as expected, EXODUS staff expressed higher levels of job satisfaction than did control staff. Results showed that job satisfaction, although near to significance, did not differ between EXODUS ($M = 63.71$, $SD = 7.97$) and control ($M = 54.29$, $SD = 10.77$) staff, $t_{(12)} = 1.86$, $p = 0.08$.

Our second prediction was that EXODUS staff, when compared to control staff, would report higher self- and other- (colleagues’) efficacy in supporting IPPO’s. Independent t-tests showed that EXODUS staff ($M = 55.57$, $SD = 1.99$) did have higher self-efficacy in supporting IPPO’s than did controls ($M = 48.29$, $SD = 10.77$), $t_{(12)} = 4.22$, $p < .005$. EXODUS staff ($M = 60.00$, $SD = 2.89$) also reported higher levels of other- (colleagues’) efficacy than did control staff ($M = 52.57$, $SD = 4.43$), $t_{(12)} = 3.72$, $p < .005$.

Finally, EXODUS staff were expected to hold more positive attitudes to IPPO’s than control staff. An independent t-test showed that there was no difference between EXODUS ($M = 112.57$, $SD = 12.29$) and control ($M = 110.43$, $SD = 8.85$) staff perceptions of IPPO’s, $t_{(12)} = .37$, $p = .72$.

Qualitative responses;

We also asked staff a number of open-ended questions to add clarity to the results. Examples of typical responses when asked for their perceptions of the advantages of current working practices were:

“Regular contact with agencies is good because sometimes we have to help with other issues like immediate crisis intervention so when you have had the communication for a long time it makes it easier to do this” (EXODUS Participant 1).

“We tie in the community to resettlement which is good as it is a community problem” (Control Participant 6).

“Because we are a small unit and all work closely we have constant communication. We all know what’s going on with each offender so if something goes wrong we have support from other staff” (EXODUS Participant 5).

“High risk offenders are given more intense supervision, and more agencies means more intense support” (Control Participant 6).

When asked what the disadvantages of their current working practices were, responses included:

“Agencies are not close enough, we need more interactions and we need to be less formal and more focused” (Control Participant 1).

“With all these new strategies we are at a point of change, but some of the older Probation officers are still in the old autonomous style of work and this makes it difficult sometimes” (Control Participant 6).

“The job-centre is no longer allowed to share information with EXODUS which is like taking 3 steps back” (EXODUS Participant 4).

When asked what improvements they would like to see to current working practices responses included:

“Open up communication effectively and even greater multi-agency working” (EXODUS Participant 5).

“Getting agencies to be interested in what they do, motivate them to be interested in the individual outcome for the IPPO” (Control Participant 3).

“Those agencies who don't really know what their role is don't communicate with the rest of us; this is why we need to have even better communication” (EXODUS Participant 1).

“Sometimes people get muddled about what their role is. So when we start to become dependant on other agencies for their information it can become a bit difficult” (Control Participant 3).

Discussion:

Our study aimed to determine whether a multi-agency, integrated services programme Ex-Offenders Discharged Under Supervision (EXODUS) provided more effective support to Identified Prolific and Priority Offenders (IPPO's) than conventional, fragmented services.

Our first hypothesis was that EXODUS and control IPPO's would have similar self-efficacy for re-offending, but that EXODUS IPPO's would have higher self-efficacy for rehabilitation than controls. This hypothesis was upheld in part: EXODUS and control IPPO's did not differ in self-efficacy for re-offending or rehabilitation. Such similar self-

efficacy for re-offending is unsurprising since IPPO's are identified using a specific set of criteria, i.e. they are all offenders over 18 with six or more recorded offences during the past year (Dawson, 2007). Consequently, at least in offending terms, IPPO's are a homogenous group who could be expected to share similar beliefs about their ability to commit crime. This also shows us that the experience of being caught and convicted has not diminished IPPO's belief in their ability to commit crime effectively. The finding that both groups shared similar levels of self-efficacy for rehabilitation is contrary to our prediction. This shows that whether support services are integrated or fragmented makes little difference to IPPO's self-efficacy for rehabilitation. It is possible that this is not a reflection on the intervention programmes but rather reveals a lack of faith on the part of IPPO's in their own ability to rehabilitate that transcends their faith in treatment; as one stated "*If I have got a job then I won't [re-offend], but if I can't get a job then I will*" (Control Participant B12). Given the homogenous nature of the IPPO group and their past offending behaviour, this belief may be common to all IPPO's.

Our second hypothesis was that more EXODUS than control IPPO's would be employed. The results did not support this. Both groups had similar employment rates, suggesting that both forms of programme delivery have similar success in helping IPPO's find employment. Since IPPO's tend to have higher levels of need than non-persistent offenders (Home Office, 1999) it is unlikely that finding a job alone will suffice to reduce the risk of re-offending if they have other problems (e.g. drug dependence, housing issues, etc.). Consequently, IPPO's will likely need continued support to deal with these other issues (Crow, 2005). However, our finding that EXODUS IPPO's were less likely than controls to leave a job is particularly important as it suggests that integrated support

helps offenders *sustain* rehabilitative goals such as finding and keeping a job. It is purely speculative but if EXODUS IPPO's have other problems such as drug or housing issues then this finding implies that the support they receive enables them to deal with these other problems rather than give up work and return to offending. Working IPPO's are likely to have less time to spend accessing support for their additional problems, so co-locating services is likely to make access easier for them. Put simply, IPPO's who have to travel to different locations for various support services will have to take more time off work, potentially putting their jobs at risk. The co-location of support will encourage IPPO's to continue addressing problems at the same time as holding down a job, putting EXODUS participants at a definite advantage over control participants. In this respect, EXODUS' core aim of improving IPPO employability was a success.

Our third hypothesis that EXODUS IPPO's, when compared to control IPPO's, would report more satisfaction with support from programme staff was upheld. This supports and expands earlier findings that multi-agency approaches involving collaborative efforts and joint management of staff increases offender satisfaction (Millie & Erol, 2006), because it is easier to manage appointments and offers greater access to resources and agencies (Lewis et al, 2007). Considering that a multi-agency approach is intensive (Robinson & Raynor, 2006; Cinamon & Hoskins, 2006), and that some EXODUS IPPO's complained that the programme was *too* intensive, it is impressive that they still expressed more satisfaction than control IPPO's did. This shows that even if IPPO's dislike some aspects of the programme, if access to it is easy then they are more satisfied than when access is more difficult. Since satisfaction with treatment is indicative of a healthy therapeutic alliance (and thus improved rehabilitation), this finding suggests

that multi-agency co-location has a firm theoretical basis as a means of effective treatment. This also supports our assertion that the lack of difference between EXODUS and control IPPO's in efficacy to rehabilitate is the result of lack of faith in the self rather than in the programme.

Finally, our expectation that EXODUS, compared to control IPPO's, would report lower levels of re-offending since involvement in the programme was upheld. Although the strongest predictor of offending levels for both groups was previous offending levels, results also showed that since involvement in the programme, EXODUS IPPO's had committed fewer offences than had control IPPO's. It was interesting to see that self-efficacy for rehabilitation and re-offending were important predictors of offending levels. If IPPO's had high belief in their ability to rehabilitate they committed fewer offences. However, IPPO's who had high belief in their ability to re-offend also committed fewer offences. This is an odd result but it could simply reflect the IPPO population as a whole (i.e. they have high offending rates so would be expected to have high levels of self-efficacy for offending regardless of whether they continue to offend or not). The difference between EXODUS and control IPPO offending rates could be explained by the intensity of supervision IPPO's receive from EXODUS; the increased presence of the police, prison, probation, and partnership services may act as a deterrent from re-offending, particularly if there is easy and adequate support (i.e. an effective therapeutic alliance) readily available. The fact that EXODUS IPPO's also had a greater likelihood of sustained employment may also have been influential in this regard (e.g. Niven & Olangundoye, 2002; Sampson & Laub, 2002). These explanations are purely speculative but could be tested in future work.

The first of our hypotheses regarding programme staff, that EXODUS staff would express greater job satisfaction than would control staff, was not upheld (although, the result neared significance and would likely have achieved it with a larger sample). This finding may speak more about the type of people who embark on careers involved in offender resettlement than of the programmes themselves. Certainly it is likely that people who choose careers in offender resettlement will be dedicated to their roles and that even if working practices are not always ideal, staff will still express satisfaction because they are working in their chosen profession. Again, this is speculative and could be addressed by future work (e.g. by asking for information about how staff came to be employed in their jobs). Also, both staff samples worked in the East Kent area under the supervision of the KMRP, so the similarity in job satisfaction may actually reflect the work ethos of the KMRP as a whole, rather than of the co-located or dispersed services specifically.

Our second hypothesis, that EXODUS staff would express higher levels of self- and other- (colleagues') efficacy in resettling IPPO's, was upheld. This provides persuasive strength to the argument that co-location is beneficial for self-efficacy and belief in colleagues' ability to provide rehabilitative interventions for IPPO's. These differences, combined with the differences in IPPO employment sustainability, suggest that co-location of key personnel from separate agencies could positively affect programme integrity (Andrews & Dowden, 2005). In order for programme integrity to be high, firm management decisions are required (Andrews & Dowden, 2005); this is more likely to be achievable if communication between agencies is strong. Once a programme has substantial integrity it is likely to be more effective in meeting the needs of IPPO's.

As the five principles of effective intervention (Andrews & Bonta, 2003) are not exclusive, heightened programme integrity is likely to positively influence the other principles of risk, responsivity and professional discretion. In turn this should result in the development of a premium service which is required for IPPO's.

Our final hypothesis, that EXODUS staff would hold more positive attitudes to IPPO's than would control staff, was not upheld. This finding was slightly surprising. Since efficacy in programme delivery differed, then attitudes towards IPPO's could be expected to have a corresponding difference; with a superior belief in their ability to provide effective support, it was not unreasonable to assume that they would therefore be more positive about their clients. It could be argued that the lack of difference between the attitudes of both groups of staff is due to similarities in their line of work, despite the differences in the structure of their work. Both groups work within the KMRP, helping offenders back into the community. Just as it did with regards to job satisfaction, this seems to speak more of the quality of the people involved in offender rehabilitation than it does of difference in service delivery techniques.

The qualitative data gathered from staff helped clarify perceptions of co-location and multi-agency working. Both groups felt that although multi-agency working was successful, there was a sense that IPPO programmes would benefit from the incorporation of more agencies (e.g. mental health representatives, Benefits Agency), as this would address a broader range of criminogenic needs. In addition there were feelings, particularly amongst control staff, that agencies outside of the CJS were working outside of their realm and had difficulty understanding the complexities of court and probation service procedures. Control staff felt they spent a lot of time explaining procedures and

clarifying roles rather than actively helping IPPO's. Here co-location obviously helps since queries can be dealt with more promptly. Employees unfamiliar with the CJS have more direct access to practical knowledge of the system and are better able to establish their niche within rehabilitative services. One control member of staff highlighted a need to start looking beyond rehabilitation 'office hours', citing a real deficit in providing services outside of the IPPO programme. A definite exit strategy is required, not only for out-of-hours support and services, but to give IPPO's some sense of direction even after they have completed their license.

Although the results of our study show promise for future research, and for ex-offender rehabilitation programmes, they are not immune to certain methodological problems that are common to this line of research. Foremost, ex-offenders are a population widely known to be difficult in recruiting for research studies (Merrington & Stanley, 2004; Raynor, 2004); our study is no exception to this rule and would have benefited from a larger sample size of IPPO's and staff. This would also have allowed for improved matching of IPPO's and staff across programme groups. The EXODUS programme was piloted across the South East of England, although the present findings are based only on IPPO's under the jurisdiction of the KMRP; an evaluation of findings from other jurisdictions using co-location within IPPO programmes would provide larger samples, and may also dilute the effects of a local area work ethos and any part this played in our results. This would improve the generalisability of the findings greatly. If the EXODUS pilot is deemed successful and the programme launched on a permanent basis, a follow-up investigation should examine the re-offending and attrition rates in the EXODUS programme across time. Reconviction of IPPO's should also be considered, as

opposed simply to self-reported re-offending; in this instance the Offender Group Reconviction Scale-2 (OGRS-2; Taylor, 1999) may be used, allowing for further assessment of programme effectiveness through a control of predicted reconviction pre-treatment. With regards to offender rehabilitation programmes in general, further investigations should explore the specific attributes of the staff that come into contact with offenders since the majority of IPPO's identified staff as "*the most helpful part of the programme*". More studies are needed to explore the effectiveness of social support in becoming rehabilitated and resettled.

The potential for integrating multiple agencies for ex-offender rehabilitation and resettlement offers a new initiative for future research. In conclusion, our study contributes to the 'What Works' literature through assessing a novel development in the field, and may help researchers further identify factors contributing to resettlement. It provides a unique insight into both IPPO's and staff perspectives on rehabilitation. We have shown that integrated programmes such as EXODUS are associated with lower rates of re-offending, higher levels of IPPO satisfaction and higher levels of staff belief in their own and colleagues' ability to deliver interventions effectively. Our small sample is not enough to make generalisations or any representative claims, however they do provide at least some hope that interventions are working and provide insight into alternative forms of intervention delivery.

References:

- Andrews, D.A. & Bonta, J. (2003). *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*, 3rd Edition. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Andrews, D.A. & Dowden, C. (2005). Managing correctional treatment for reduced recidivism: A meta-analytic review of programme integrity. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 10, 173-87.
- Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy mechanism in human agency. *American Psychologist*, 37 (2), 122-47.
- Balzer, W.K., Kihm, J.A., Smith, P.C., Irwin, J.L., Bachiochi, P.D., Robie, C., Sinar, E.F. & Parra, L.F. (1997). *Users' manual for the Job Descriptive Index (JDI; 1997 Revision) and the Job In General scales*. Bowling Green, OH: Bowling Green State University.
- Burnett, R. & Appleton, C. (2004). Joined-up services to tackle youth crime: A case-study in England. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44, 34-54.
- Carter, P. (2003). *Managing Offenders, Reducing Crime*. London: Strategy Unit.
- Cinamon, K. & Hoskins, J. (2006). The prolific and other priority offender initiative in practice. *The Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 53 (2), 154-66.
- Cocker, S. (2005). Re-integrating the Bradford rioters: Lessons for NOMS and the future of resettlement. *The Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 52 (3), 259-76.
- Corrigan, P.W., McCracken, S.G., Kommana, S. & Edwards, M. (1996). Staff perceptions about barriers to innovative behavioural rehabilitation programs.

Cognitive Therapy and Research, 20 (5), 541-51.

Crawford, A. (1998). *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: Politics, policies and practices*. Harlow, UK: Longman.

Crow, I. (2005). Does Work Do The Job? *Safer Society*, 26, 11-3.

Crowne, D.P. & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 24 (4), 349-54.

Cullen, F.T., Wright, J.P. & Chamlin, M.B. (1999). Social support and social reform: A progressive crime control agenda. *Crime and Delinquency*, 45 (2), 188-207.

Dawson, P. (2007). *The National PPO Evaluation - Research to Inform and Guide Practice*. London: Home Office.

Dawson, P. & Cuppleditch, L. (2007). *An Impact Assessment of the Prolific and Other Priority Offender Programme*. London: Home Office.

Frude, N., Honess, T. & Maguire, M. (1994). *CRIME-PICS II Manual*. Cardiff: Michael and Associates.

Gendreau, P. & Cullen, F. (1994). Intensive rehabilitation supervision: The next generation in community corrections? *Federal Probation*, 58 (1), 72.

Harper, G. & Chitty, C. (2004). *The Impact of Corrections on Re-offending: A review of 'what works'*. Home Office Research Study 291. London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.

Hatcher, R. & McGuire, J. (2001). Offence-focused problem-solving: Preliminary evaluation of a cognitive skills program. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 28, 564-87.

Hochstetler, A., Murphy, D.S. & Simons, R.L. (2004). Damaged goods: Exploring

predictors of distress in prison inmates. *Crime and Delinquency*, 50 (3), 436-57.

Hollin, C.R. (1999). Treatment programs for offenders meta-analysis; "What works" and beyond. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 22 (3), 361-72.

Home Office (1999). *The Government's Crime Reduction Strategy*. London: Home Office.

Home Office (2004a). *Prolific and Other Priority Offender Strategy - Supplementary Guidance: Rehabilitation and resettle framework, September 2004*. London: Home Office.

Home Office (2004b). *Prolific and Other Priority Offender Strategy - Guidance Paper 3: Prevent and deter, September 2004*. London: Home Office.

Home Office (2007). *An Impact Assessment of the Prolific and Other Priority Offender Programme*. London: Home Office.

Kemshall, H. & Maguire, M. (2001). Public Protection, Partnership and Risk Penalty: The multi-agency risk management of sexual and violent offenders. *Punishment and Society*, 3 (2), 237-64.

Krosnick, J.A. & Alwin, D.F. (1987). An evaluation of a cognitive theory of response-order effects in survey measurement. *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 51 (2), 201-19.

Lewis, S., Vennard, J., Maguire, M., Raynor, P., Vanstone, M., Raybould, S. & Rix, J. (2003). *The Resettlement of Short-term Prisoners: An evaluation of seven pathfinders*. Research, Development and Statistics Directorate Occasional Paper 83. London: Home Office.

- Lewis, S., Maguire, M., Raynor, P., Vanstone, M. & Vennard, J. (2007). What works in resettlement? Findings from seven pathfinders for short-term prisoners in England and Wales. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 7 (1), 33-53.
- Maruna, S. & Farrall, S. (2004). Desistance from crime: A theoretical reformulation. *Kölnner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 43, 171-94.
- McMurrin, M. & Ward, T. (2004). Motivating offenders to change in therapy: An organising framework. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 9, 295-311.
- Melvin, K.B., Grammling, L.K. & Gardner, W.M. (1985). A scale to measure attitudes towards prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 12, 241-52.
- Merrington, S. & Stanley, S. (2004). 'What works?': Revisiting the evidence in England and Wales. *The Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 51 (1), 7-20.
- Millie, A. & Erol, R. (2006). Rehabilitation and resettlement: A study of prolific offender case management in Birmingham, United Kingdom. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 50 (6), 691-710.
- Niven, S. & Olagundoye, J. (2002). *Jobs and Homes: A survey of prisoners nearing release*. Home Office Research Findings No. 173. London: Home Office.
- Niven, S. & Stewart, D. (2005). *Resettlement Outcomes on Release from Prison in 2003*. London: Home Office.
- Pearson, G., Blagg, H., Smith, D., Sampson, A. & Strubbs, P. (1992). Crime, community and conflict: The multi-agency approach. In D. Downes (ed.), *Unravelling Criminal Justice*. Basingstoke; Macmillan.
- Pitts, J. (2001). Korrectional karaoke: New Labour and the zombification of youth justice. *Youth Justice*, 1 (2), 3-16.

- Raynor, P. (1998). Attitudes, social problems, and reconvictions in the 'STOP' probation experiment. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37 (1), 1-15.
- Raynor, P., Kynch, J., Roberts, C. & Merrington, M. (2000). *Risk and Need Assessment in Probation Services: An evaluation*. Research Study 211, London: Home Office.
- Raynor, P. (2004). The Probation Service "Pathfinders": Finding the path and losing the way? *Criminal Justice*, 4 (3), 309-25.
- Robinson, G. & Raynor, P. (2006). The future of rehabilitation: What role for the probation service? *Probation Journal*, 53 (4), 334-46.
- Sampson, R.J. & Laub, J.H. (2005). A life-course view of the development of crime. *American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 602 (1), 12-45.
- Schwarzer, R. & Fuchs, R. (1996). Self-efficacy and health behaviours. In: M. Conner & P. Norman (Eds.), *Predicting Health Behaviour*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Schwarzer, R. & Jerusalem, M. (1993). *The General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE); English version*. Retrieved June 10, 2007 from:
<http://userpage.fu-berlin.de/~health/engscal.htm>
- Taylor, R. (1999). Predicting reconvictions for sexual and violent offences using the revised offender group reconviction scale. *Home Office Research Findings 104*. London: Home Office.
- Thornberry, T.P. & Krohn, M.D. (2000). The self-report method for measuring delinquency and crime. In Duffee, D. (ed.), *Measurement and Analysis of Crime and Justice* (pp. 33-83). (*Criminal Justice 2000, vol 4*). Washington D.C.: U.S. National Institute of Justice.

Ward, T. & Brown, M. (2004). The Good Lives Model and conceptual issues in offender rehabilitation. *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 10 (3), 243–57.

Table 1: Employment demographics

	EXODUS		Control	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Employed	5	22.7	3	23.1
Enrolled in education/trade programme	5	22.7	4	30.8
Accepted a job	4	18.2	3	23.1
Rejected a job	11	50.0	4	30.8
Left a job	7	31.8	9	69.2
Likely to find a job	18	81.8	12	92.3

Table 2: Variables predicting levels of re-offending for control and EXODUS IPPO's.

Variable	β	t	p
EXODUS vs. Control group	.27	2.22	.037
Age	-.21	-1.85	.078
In a relationship	.01	.12	.906
Support from friends/family	.13	1.27	.216
Employed	.10	.87	.391
Self-efficacy for re-offending	-.62	-4.32	.000
Self-efficacy for rehabilitation	-.79	-4.79	.000
Pro-criminal attitudes	.08	.69	.497
Satisfaction with support from programme staff	.09	.65	.525
Number of offences ever committed	.63	6.59	.000
Social Desirability	.05	.41	.683
Adj. $R^2 = .72$, df, 11, 34	F = 8.95, p < 0.001		