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PREFACE

Inmate programmes may be considered to be a form of treatment for the offending that results in imprisonment. A major and continuing question in designing the provision of any kind of treatment for offenders is the degree to which the offending behaviour reflects a predisposition for delinquency, or is the result of adverse social, economic or family circumstances. The purpose of the seminar reported here was to review the results of recent research and to consider this question and the implications of the conclusions for the organisation of inmate programmes. The seminar concentrated therefore on these linked themes; inmate programmes, activities and rehabilitation in relation to dispositional and other possible causes of delinquent behaviour, as revealed by research.

Recent research using cohorts of children followed over long periods of time has shown that criminal behaviour is associated with a variety of social or psychological problems, including drug-taking, excessive drinking, school failure, unemployment and severely impaired relationships (Session 1). The nature of these associated problems, and their persistence over time and over situations, revives the suggestion that delinquent behaviour reflects some underlying personal predisposition that either creates or aggravates these other problems. Since the research shows that these other problems in turn increase the likelihood of further offending, the difficulties or deficits they represent (particularly in the areas of education, work and relationships) are legitimate and important targets for prison treatment. In a sense they define the goals of the Directorate of Inmate Programmes.

Not surprisingly in view of the above, successful programmes have been found to be those that take account of individual features, and address a range of problems in an integrated way (Session 2). It is now generally conceded that the notion that "nothing works" in the treatment of delinquency is simply wrong.

Turning to programmes addressing specific offenses, studies of sex offenders for example have identified a number of psychological characteristics which may plausibly be seen as sustaining offending (Session 3). These include such features as unusual sexual preferences, social skills deficits, difficulty in managing negative moods, and unusual beliefs; all of which should be dealt with in treatment. The sex offender programme currently being introduced is designed as an integrated treatment package.

Anger management programmes have also been shown to be effective, notably in improving prison behaviour. But this success depends on the exclusion of certain areas of violent offending for which more complex systems of assessment and treatment may be required (Session 5).
An important aspect of treatment programmes is the fact that the impact is greater if "high-risk" groups are targeted. What the research has shown is that the risk of re-conviction following release from prison can be calculated with great accuracy from information about the person's history, (mainly the criminal history) (Session 4). This predictability extends (though less accurately) to more specific offenses, including the sexual and the violent. The ability to predict is an obvious requirement for efficient selection for offence-specific treatment programmes.

The index of risk can also be used in the evaluation of treatment programmes, and the research results give added emphasis to the fact that proper evaluation is an essential factor for the identification of "best practice". Indeed, the success of any prison initiative, and not just those that are formally referred to as "treatment", can be gauged by comparing actual rates of reconviction following release with the known reconviction risk.

Just as the research has shown that good programmes can reduce the rates of reconviction, there is also evidence to show that some regimes may have the opposite effect (Session 7). This comes primarily from studies revealing that certain regimes are associated with increased delinquency within the prison and that this effect carries over as a raised reconviction-rate after release. The converse is also the case. Regimes that are successful in improving prison behaviour have lower reconviction rates following release.

One thread in the material so far may be summarised as reviving the old fashioned notion that everything that occurs in the prison will in effect influence (however slightly) subsequent reconviction; either for better or for worse. That this became controversial is primarily due to the fact that the effects either way are much smaller than had been expected (which also explains why delinquency is predictable on the basis of behaviour prior to imprisonment). Only with well-designed research involving large samples could the true picture emerge. But once it is recognised that

— prison programmes can influence behaviour;
— such programmes have to integrate most of the elements of prison life,
— and the actual influence is reliable but comparatively small

then it is clear that the inmate responses to the integrated programmes have to be properly documented and collated to enable best practice to be identified. In the remaining sessions, the practical implications of these conclusions were considered, particularly in the light of the introduction of Sentence Planning.
If prison treatment is conceptualised as involving the integration of prison activities, prison routines and offence-specific programmes then it is clear that it is the prison regime that is being specified. In Session 6 the regime is defined as the configuration of activities and routines making up the normal prison day. Analysis of the day according to staff-inmate contact time is then shown to provide an assessment of what can be done using all of the demands of the natural custodial environment.

The system of Sentence Management designed by the Regimes Research and Development Section in DIP2 is described in Session 8. This system is an attempt to incorporate the major implications of the results of the research described so far, as well as linking with regime monitoring and other initiatives, such as prisoners pay and the policies described in The Place of Work in the Regime. The essentials of sentence management are that

— prisoners are individually observed in a variety of activities, (eg work, association, special programmes),
— their behaviour is recorded by checking against a pre-determined set of criteria, set by activity supervisors,
— profiles of attainments according to these criteria are used in interviews and contract-setting with the prisoner,
— targets are set based on actual attainments, and
— elements of problem behaviour are addressed through appropriate allocation.

Thus Sentence Planning can be individually tailored and integrated, with attainments set and monitored over the whole range of prison activities.

The collated records of attainment may serve as Performance Indicators not only for sentence planning but also for regime delivery, regime integration and balance and activity costs (Session 9). They may ultimately provide Performance Indicators for evaluating the rehabilitative impact of prison, when used in conjunction with predicted risk and subsequent reconviction rates.

Mark Williams,
Linda Blud,
Regimes Research and Development Section,
July, 1992
INTRODUCTION

THE AIMS OF THE SEMINAR

Brian Emes

Mr Emes welcomed colleagues to the DIP seminar, expressing the hope that this occasion would set a precedent for members of the Directorate to meet together once a year. The purpose of the seminar was to look at the results of recent research and to examine ways in which this information could be disseminated and ultimately influence practice. The intention was to produce a report of the meeting which could contribute in shaping the general direction for regime development over the next five years; informing the work of the two Divisions of the Directorate and aiding Area Managers in developing operational strategies.
Session 1

Basic Research into the Causes of Delinquency -

Introduction and Overview

Criminology, as an academic discipline, draws primarily from work in sociology and psychology. The latter has, in general, tried to demonstrate what psychologists refer to as *individual differences* (in personality, in up-bringing, in learning) to explain the fact that some individuals offend whereas others do not. Over the past 30 years sociologists, on the other hand, have questioned the relevance of differences of this kind. They switched attention away from the offender to questions of the nature of social control itself and thence to see the question of delinquency as the question of how people come to fall within the Criminal Justice net. This trend has only recently started to shift into reverse, but criminologists of all persuasions are now beginning to agree again that the more important question is the *nature of the delinquent* rather than that of the process that labels him delinquent.

A major plank in this development is the result of long-term studies of normal children, some of whom will become delinquent. A prime example is that undertaken by the Cambridge Institute of Criminology (sponsored by the Home Office) and now run by David Farrington. An important feature of this research is the demonstration of just how much greater are the differences *between offenders and non-offenders* than are those *between individuals within the offender population* (such as the aggressive, or white-collar or drug-taking offender).

The thrust of the remainder of the research evidence presented at the seminar was that

- offending is part of a wider, more persistent class of social or psychological problems or deficits;
- these other psychological/social problems or deficits (expressed in areas such as employment, education and social relationships) therefore have equal legitimacy as targets for prison treatment;
- it may be possible to begin to describe the nature of such treatment on the basis of the underlying features of 'anti-social conduct' in general.

Taken together, these propositions could be seen as providing a basic rationale for the Directorate of Inmate Programmes.
SESSION I

Basic Research into the Causes of Delinquency

Mark Williams

Introduction

When I joined the Prison Service in 1964, the academic discipline called Criminology was uncomplicated; being a search for those defects of character, temperament or upbringing, or those particular socio-economic conditions that led to criminality. Criminality was also relatively uncomplicated. Primarily it concerned violation of the criminal law, but extended at the margins to include those associated behavioural excesses, such as promiscuity, alcohol abuse or disorderly conduct (all of which could on occasion fall outside what was legally permissible).

For at least two decades, however, this comparatively simple situation was challenged. Sociologists, from a variety of standpoints, questioned the propriety of seeking particular differences that made some individuals 'delinquent'. They asserted instead that central to the study of delinquency was social control - the way the 'delinquents' were singled out by those responsible for social control, reflecting not the behaviour of the so-called 'delinquents' but rather the interests of the social controllers themselves.

What follows is an attempt to describe, very briefly, the arguments and the evidence that brought the majority of the academic community back to recognising the problem of delinquency as a problem of individual differences, and to consider the implications for the Directorate of Inmate Programmes.

A major element in this development is the result of long-term studies of normal children, some of whom become delinquent. The most important current example is that being undertaken by the Cambridge Institute of Criminology (sponsored originally by the Home Office) and now run by David Farrington. This is a prospective longitudinal survey of delinquency in 411 males, mostly born in 1952. The study began in 1961/62, when the sample members were aged eight or nine. The major results obtained so far can be found in four books and over 60 published articles. The subjects in the sample were interviewed and tested in their schools when they were aged about eight, ten, and 14, by male and female psychologists. They were interviewed in the research office at about 16, 18 and 21, and in their homes at about 25 and 32. In addition to this, other personal information was collected at these points in their development. The detail and extent of this work has established its importance in planning social policy.
The major quotations that follow, describing the results of the study, are drawn from a single journal article (Farrington & West 1990) that summarised the conclusions of the researchers following the most recent sampling, when the members of the sample were 32 years of age.

THE NATURE OF OFFENDING

Results from relevant research will be considered to explore the possible causes of offending. The major conclusion draws on a series of related characteristics of offenders and offending that the Cambridge study, in particular, has established with great clarity. These characteristics will be considered in turn.

1. ASSOCIATED EVENTS: THE DELINQUENT LIFESTYLE

In the long term study, Farrington was able through the interviews and self-reports, to demonstrate the differences in behaviour or conduct of the delinquents and the non-delinquents. He found that delinquents tended to

- smoke more
- drink more
- experiment with drugs more
- have earlier sexual experiences
- be more promiscuous
- fight more
- gamble more
- truant more from school
- be absent more frequently from work

than did non-delinquents. These are often thought of as bad habits, but that label tells us very little. The crucial difficulty is to provide a coherent reason for an increased frequency over such a wide range of behaviour, without invoking some general characteristic of the person, rather than some particular feature of the environment or personal experience.
The second important point of this result is that not only do the delinquents and non-delinquents differ, but that these differences are sustained over time. At 32, they differed in most aspects just as they had in adolescence and early manhood. This is part of a pattern best described as a difference in 'life-style' rather than in any particular behaviour (ie, in offending).

Nor is the difference restricted to what might be thought of as hedonistic elements. Farrington noted:

"One of our most important findings was that the worst offenders at each age differed significantly from the remainder of the sample on almost every factor we measured. In terms of statistically significant relationships, we had an embarrassment of riches. In some ways this was surprising, because to a large extent the sample was homogeneous in important factors such as age, gender, ethnicity, social class, neighbourhood, and of course culture."

2. THE CONTINUITY OF OFFENDING OVER TIME

A second aspect of offending is the continuity (or otherwise) of offending over time. One characteristic of individual differences studied by psychologists is that they are relatively constant over time; if you have a certain temperament or personality, or if you are subjected to important childhood experiences, the effects will tend to be apparent over an extended developmental period. An important issue, therefore, in looking at the causes of delinquency, is to see just how constant is the delinquent behaviour over time. In the Farrington study the evidence is summarised as follows.

"In general, the best independent predictor of offending at any age was the measure of offending at the immediately preceding age, showing the considerable continuity in offending over time. For example, the best predictor of offending at age 21 - 24 was offending at 17 - 20, closely followed by offending at age 14 - 16. The best predictor of offending at the earliest age (ten to 13) was troublesome behaviour at age eight to ten. These results suggest that child troublesomeness escalated to juvenile delinquency and then to adult crime. This may mean that the same theoretical construct (eg anti-social tendency) has different behavioural manifestations at different ages. Alternatively, there may be developmental sequences, such that an early stage had to be reached before a later stage could develop."

This continuity reflects a very general finding in criminology, familiar to those of us in the Prison Service in that the best predictor of re-conviction following imprisonment is invariably the number of convictions prior to that imprisonment.
A by-product of delinquent behaviour extending over periods of time is that some people will commit many more offences than others; ie in terms of offending, the difference between offenders and non-offenders will become more marked as time passes. An analogy may be found in the concept of the 'accident prone'. Although accidents are supposed to happen at random, when long periods of time are considered, it is found that a small proportion of people account for a larger than expected proportion of accidents; hence the notion of an underlying cause ('accident proneness') is invoked. This was precisely the kind of statistical aspect that Farrington found in his sample.

A vivid example was the fact that at the age of 25, there were 23 offenders (of the 411) who accounted for half of the offences in the whole sample. Thus 6% of the sample had accounted for half of the offences. All of these 6% had convictions prior to the age of 15. In addition, at age 32, those designated as 'chronic offenders' constituted 22 men who had each committed at least nine officially recorded offences. The men convicted at the earliest age (from ten to 13) tended to become the most persistent offenders.

3. DISTRIBUTION OF OFFENDING OVER TIME

Obviously this evidence of the continuity of offending over time, has to be tempered by the knowledge that for the majority of delinquents, the offending behaviour rises to a peak in late adolescence and then declines. So offending per se is not an inevitable and continuous activity over time. On the other hand, although for most people the delinquent behaviour will be a comparatively short episode in their lives, some of the associated 'life-style' behaviours may be much more sustained.

This is the general problem of the distribution of offending over time. The significance of the pattern of offending over time has taken some time to be appreciated. It is well established that:

- crime reaches a peak at about the age of 17 years,
- the number of newcomers to crime declines rapidly from age 20 onwards (or thereabouts), and
- offenders tend to drop out of the criminal statistics (to cease offending) equally rapidly following adolescence into early manhood.

Over a long period of historical data collection, despite great changes in social custom and conditions, the shape of the curve of involvement in delinquency (breaking the law) has been remarkably similar. From early Victorian convicts through to contemporary inner city populations; from places as disparate as England, New Zealand, Brazil, Canada and New York State; indeed, whenever properly collected statistics have been made available and maintained, the result is the same: that officially recorded offending rises to a peak during late adolescence and declines systematically thereafter.
This has in the past lead to two conclusions:

- criminality is essentially an adolescent phenomenon (apart from a tiny minority of disturbed individuals),
- offenders 'grow out' of it and become like non-offenders (apart from a tiny minority of professional criminals).

But the decline in offending may instead be a characteristic of offending and not of offenders. Instead of delinquents becoming more like non-delinquents as they grow older, it could equally well be that the differences other than offending were maintained.

This may be more dramatically demonstrated by considering criminality within a particular setting. Consider adjudications in the English dispersal system. These are essentially equivalent to delinquent acts, and yet, when collected over eight prisons sharing very similar characteristics, and over a population that is assessed to be too dangerous to be anywhere other than within the maximum security stock, nevertheless the same shape is apparent. In Figure 1, below, 39,000 adjudications are tabulated according to the age of the offender and here again there is a dramatic decline from a peak around late adolescence through to 60 year olds. Note here that this comparison is entirely within a single group of delinquents (they are all active criminals) in the same social setting (they are all in a maximum security prison) and during the same life-experience (the data is from current sentence alone).

![Figure 1 - Delinquency inside Prison by Age](image-url)
What may be inferred, therefore, from the combination of evidence concerning

- the correlates of offending, (being those long-term differences between offenders and non-offenders other than offending itself),
- the continuity of offending over time, and
- the distribution of offending over time,

is that the ‘problem’ represented by delinquency is constant although the form it takes will change over the course of time.

Obviously, the long term study illuminates this feature. As an example, in Farrington's work, he was able to identify a group of what he called ‘desisters’. These were people who had committed delinquent acts up to the age of 21, but at 32 had a crime-free period of over ten years. When these people were seen as part of the research, as 32 year olds,

"Desisters - those last convicted before the 21st birthday - also did not differ so much from unconvicted men [as did those still offending in their 20s]. They tended to be heavy drinkers, as well as divorced or separated, with children living elsewhere, disagreed with their wife or cohabitee about how to control the children, were involved in fights, heavy smokers, drunk drivers, drug takers, and they admitted many offences (especially theft from work). However, they had satisfactory accommodation and a satisfactory employment history."

In other words, these ‘desisters’, when given a self-report questionnaire to describe their own behaviour, admitted a wide range of offending and offending-type behaviour, despite the absence of an official criminal record. Essentially the ‘desisters’ fell between those who were still being convicted and those who had not been convicted at all. They were not as extreme a group and therefore their offending behaviour was not as extreme. In terms of officially recorded offending, they actually started later as well as desisting earlier than did the chronic delinquents. The crucial point is that throughout the period they remained a distinctive delinquent group.
4. VERSATILITY OF OFFENDING

Much effort has been expended in past research looking for the differences between what were seen as different types of offender; the white collar offender for example, or the sex offender, or the aggressive offender. The results have been disappointing.

If a simple summary of a widely ranging literature were to be called for, it would state that differences between delinquent ‘types’ were generally much smaller than the differences between delinquents and non-delinquents. Even those differences that have been found are open to an alternative explanation. If ‘delinquency’ is a more general feature of a particular kind of person, then the white collar offender, for example, may simply be the conventional offender in a different setting, or from a different social background. This implies that any differences found between offenders such as the ‘white collar offender’ or the ‘fraudster’ or the ‘gangster’ are simply the effects of delinquents ‘working’ in particular but very different environments. Evidence for this view would be that however these offenders were classified, they would, in the end, always have more in common with other delinquents than with the non-delinquent (including the increased likelihood of offending in other ways than those supposed to characterise them). This is essentially the case.

A slightly different argument obtains for aggressive or sexual offences. These are, by their very nature, rare events. If offending is a general characteristic of some people, then given time, all persistent offenders will commit every kind of offence. Obviously this means that the rarer offences such as extremely violent sexual offending will be committed by the most persistent offender. This is in fact what the research has generally shown. Persistent offenders have very varied lists of offences and the more persistent they are then the more likely it is that they will commit almost every offence that is possible. In Farrington’s study, he makes the following point:

"... there was significant continuity between childhood aggression and adult violence. Boys who were aggressive in childhood or adolescence tended to be more deviant in adulthood: living in worse home circumstances, more in conflict with and violent towards their wife or cohabitee, more unemployed, heavier smokers and drinkers, more drunk drivers and drug takers, and committing more offences (including violence). This continuity, however, was probably not specific to aggression and violence but was part of the general continuity in anti-social and deviant behaviour from childhood to adulthood. This was why aggressive children had deviant lifestyles 20 years later as adults. Violent offenders were essentially the most extreme offenders in frequency and seriousness."
Two conclusions regarding sexual and violent offending may be drawn from the research findings:

- if you take very large numbers of delinquents, you can identify small sub-groups of individuals who seem to have committed more than the expected number of sexual or violent offences, but
- in general, most sexual and violent offences are committed by people who are simply the more persistently delinquent.

This is part of the general picture of the versatility of offending. One of the best indicators from the Farrington study to demonstrate this, is to show that those things that best predicted delinquency in general also tended to predict any particular delinquency (such as violent offending). For example, predicting anybody who was convicted (which amounted, in the end, to about one third of the sample Farrington followed up) versus those who were not convicted, or predicting the chronic (those 6% of the people that committed over half the offences) versus the non chronic, produced the same result. The best indicators at \textit{age eight to ten} of these outcomes were the following:

- indications of child anti-social behaviour
- hyperactivity/impulsivity/attention deficit
- family criminality
- school failure
- economic deprivation.

The equivalent list of predictors at \textit{age eight to ten} for predicting violence were identical but with the addition of:

- poor child rearing.

Evidence of the versatility of offending points to the generic nature of law-breaking, extending beyond the boundaries of particular offences. Coupled with the features of offending set out in the three previous sections, the conclusion is that the research has established that those who offend during adolescence are exhibiting one aspect only of a more widely disturbed pattern of behaviour. Furthermore, although not immutable, evidence of this disturbed pattern of behaviour is apparent at as early an age as eight.
SEEKING AN EXPLANATION

The Nature of Offending

In nineteenth century classical theory, the object of crime was seen to be an effort to achieve what all would recognise as desirable: money, sex, goods, revenge, freedom from pain, freedom from jealousy, and so on. The current picture is no different. Most contemporary thinking is concerned not with why people/offenders want the things they seem to want, but why they cannot control the illegal means of obtaining them. This approach is given added impetus by the evidence that very few delinquents specialise in one particular offence. Given that versatility is the norm, the first step in the search for an explanation is to describe the characteristics underlying the major areas of offending.

Two prominent sociologists, (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990) invoke the notion of self-control. They offer a theory of offending as follows: the likelihood of committing offences is in proportion to the lack of self control - an individual difference in the true sense of being a quality that distinguishes people along a single dimension. A precis of how they have characterised offending gives a flavour of their argument.

Criminal acts provide immediate gratification of desires. A major characteristic of delinquents is therefore a tendency to respond to the immediate environment in a concrete ‘here and now’ orientation.

Criminal acts provide easy or simple gratification of desires - they provide money without work, sex without courtship, revenge without court delays. Delinquents tend to lack diligence, tenacity, or persistence in the course of action.

Criminal acts are exciting, risky or thrilling. They involve stealth, danger, speed, agility, deception, or power. Delinquents therefore tend to be adventurous, active and physical.

Crimes provide few or meagre long term benefits. They are not equivalent to a job or a career. On the contrary, crime interferes with long term commitments to jobs, marriages, family or friends. Delinquents thus tend to have unstable marriages, friendships and job profiles. They tend to be little interested in (or are unprepared for) long term occupational pursuits.

Crime requires little skill or planning. The cognitive requirement for most crimes are minimal. It follows that delinquents need not possess or value cognitive or academic skills. The manual skills required for most crimes are minimal. It follows that delinquents need not possess manual skills that require training or apprenticeship.

Crimes often result in pain or discomfort for the victim. Property is lost, bodies are injured, privacy is violated, etc. It follows that delinquents tend to be self-centred, indifferent or insensitive to the sufferings and needs of others. It does not follow that delinquents are routinely unkind or anti-social. On the
contrary, they may discover the immediate and easy rewards of charm and generosity.

A major benefit of many crimes is not pleasure but relief from momentary irritation. The irritation caused by a crying child is often the stimulus for physical abuse; that caused by a taunting stranger in a bar is often the stimulus for aggravated assault. It follows that delinquents tend to have minimal tolerance for frustration and little ability to respond to conflict through verbal rather than physical means.

Gottfredson and Hirschi sum up by saying that delinquents will tend to be impulsive, insensitive, physical (as opposed to mental), risk-taking, short-sighted and non-verbal, and they will tend, therefore, to engage in criminal and analogous acts. Since these traits

- can be identified prior to the age of responsibility for crime,
- tend to come together in the same people, and
- tend to persist through life,

it is reasonable to consider them as comprising a stable construct useful in the explanation of crime. The ‘analogous acts’ proposed by these authors is the anti-social but not necessarily illegal, behaviour listed earlier, and considered in what follows.

The Nature of the Related Behaviour

Some behaviour associated with delinquency is obviously hedonistic; drinking, smoking, taking drugs, gambling, early sex and promiscuous sex are all in some senses enjoyable. Other behaviour is better characterised as providing relief; absenteeism from work or truancy from school are examples of behaviour giving relief from difficult or demanding tasks. Fighting may often be characterised as a way of getting relief from personal slights or feelings of discomfort and threats to one’s self-esteem. Clearly the notion of poor self-control could provide some explanation for the joint occurrence of this kind of behaviour and delinquent behaviour.

Critics have argued that essentially the notion of low self-control is tautological: the observed behaviours (the delinquency, the alcohol and substance abuse, the promiscuous relationships, and the disordered work and living patterns) are described and the supposed cause (lack of self-control) is simply a phrase for not being able or willing to resist them. What is required is an index of self-control that can be measured independently of the behaviour to be explained. This will be considered in the sections describing basic and future research. There are other correlates of delinquency, however, besides personal habits.
Other Factors Correlated with Delinquency

Due to the detailed nature of the data and the extended period of time over which it was collected, the Cambridge study enabled in-depth analysis of the potential causal elements external to the person in the development of criminality. Farrington wrote

"over and above this behavioural continuity, [ie the fact that the best predictor of current criminality was always previous criminality] four factors were independently important predictors of offending

- economic deprivation, including low income and poor housing,
- family criminality, including convicted parents and delinquent siblings,
- parental mishandling, including poor supervision and poor child rearing behaviour and
- school failure, including low intelligence and attainment.

These results suggest that superimposed on the general continuity and developmental sequence are causal sequences, for example where parental mishandling leads to truancy, which in turn leads to an unstable job record, which in turn leads to adult crime."

Causal Sequences

Farrington describes the progress of his delinquents over time as a series of stepping stones; but at almost every stage, the interactions are complex. For example,

"results show that boys did commit more offences whilst unemployed than whilst employed... the difference restricted to offences involving gain... theft, robbery, and fraud. No effect of unemployment on other offences such as violence, vandalism, and drug use... effect greatest on those with highest prediction scores for crime..."

Remember that delinquents have poor employment records and indeed their inability to maintain a proper work record equivalent to their non-delinquent peers was very nicely demonstrated when America entered the Second World War. A famous sample of 500 delinquent and non-delinquent matched pairs of adolescents, when they became adults, were then called up for military service. Their subsequent Army Record (primarily describing civilian-type occupations) represented a standardised work experience. Follow-up revealed that the delinquent group had a much worse record than their non-delinquent peers.
The effect of marriage was also of interest in the Farrington study. Those who married convicted women continued to offend at the same rate after marriage as matched unmarried offenders. Only marriage to unconvicted women led to a decrease in offending.

"Numerous factors measured at age eight to ten significantly predicted convicted as opposed to unconvicted men and chronic as opposed to non-chronic offenders, notably indicators of child anti-social behaviour, hyperactivity - impulsivity - attention deficit, family criminality, school failure, and economic deprivation. Poor parental child rearing behaviour and early separation from parents predicted convictions but not chronic offending."

One particularly interesting group were those who did not offend despite coming from backgrounds that were diagnostically poor. Sixty-three boys were identified as vulnerable to delinquency when they were in the age group of from eight to ten. These were those who had at least three of the following five adverse factors:

- low family income
- large family size
- convicted parents
- poor parental child rearing
- low non-verbal IQ.

Three quarters of these were convicted up to the age of 32. The significant point about this was that those who did not offend, nevertheless at age 32 still demonstrated considerable similarity to the delinquent.

"Surprisingly, the unconvicted vulnerable men were often the most unsuccessful, for example in not being home owners, in living in dirty home conditions, in having large debts and in having low status, lowly paid jobs. They were also the most likely to have never married, to have no wife or cohabitee, and to be living alone... however, they were generally well behaved, for example in not taking drugs other than marijuana and in being less likely to commit offences. Their good behaviour may be connected with the fact that they were the most likely to stay in every night."

Farrington suggested that the ‘protecting’ factors in these cases of high risk boys growing up into non-delinquent although unsuccessful adults, was being rated as more nervous and withdrawn, and less hyperactive or impulsive when they were aged eight to ten.
Basic Research

Clearly the longitudinal research suggests that delinquency is a long term phenomenon, tied primarily to specific individuals but extending far beyond difficulties with the law to a whole range of associated behaviours. What is required now is a more definitive account of the individual differences that are relevant so that high risk children may be identified, and intervention designed and implemented at a much earlier stage. The nature of the intervention should also be informed by the nature of the individual differences found to underlie the problem.

There has been considerable speculation and some empirical evidence implicating the level of psychophysiological arousal in the genesis of delinquent behaviour. Unfortunately, few studies have used non-institutionalised delinquents, and up to 1989 there had been no prospective studies. I want very briefly to report the results of the first prospective study that measured arousal levels at the age of 15 and subsequent criminality at the age of 24.

I was involved in this work with Adrian Raine, who was also a prison psychologist but has subsequently gone to America (Raine, Venables and Williams, 1990). Three measures of arousal, using basic physiological measures, were made on 101 York school children. The sample of schoolboys selected from four schools in York were given a set of standard tasks in a laboratory setting, whilst measures were taken of simultaneous heart rate, skin conductance and EEG (brainwave) activity. Nine years later the criminal records showed that 17 of the 101 subjects had been subsequently convicted of at least one criminal offence (the almost identical rate to that found within the Cambridge Study).

Two results may be briefly mentioned to illustrate the kind of differences that were revealed. The first showed that heart-rate levels in beats per minute at the start and the finish of a two-minute rest period, were significantly lower at both measurement points for the offenders. The second showed that the frequency of non-specific fluctuations in skin-conductance, showed significantly fewer responses in the delinquents than in the non-delinquents. Both of these simple measures (essentially aspects of heart-rate and palmar sweating) index individual arousal levels. In fact, on virtually all measures, reflecting both central and autonomic nervous systems, the delinquents scored in the low-arousal direction. Furthermore, in the measures taken of the orienting response, delinquents displayed significantly poorer attention.

Overall, therefore, the psychophysical measures showed delinquents to be chronically under-aroused and also to display attention deficits. These would go some way to explain the sensation-seeking, impulsivity and attentional problems characteristic of so many delinquents (and apparent at a very young age).
Three persistent problems in general criminology may be explained by these findings.

First, the finding of an approximately eight IQ points average difference in scores between delinquents and non-delinquents. This is a shift of the whole range of IQ downwards; it is not simply a distortion introduced by an over-representation of very low scoring delinquents. This shift could well be explained as a systematic decrement in test-performance due to problems of impulsivity, frustration from reduced sensation-levels and attentional deficits.

Second, the problem of delinquent under-achievement at school. Teaching methods have presumably evolved to meet the modal demand in terms of span of attention, sensation levels and motor self-control (or impulsivity). Again, poor performance in the classroom could well be the result of the delinquent’s relative deficits in these areas.

And finally, is the problem of the non-specific nature of offending. The measures of attention and arousal used in the research are believed to underpin important personal characteristics; in particular of

- impulsivity
- sensation seeking / boredom threshold
- attention span / concentration problems
- hyperactivity.

These are characteristics which have been shown to be predictive of delinquency (particularly in the Cambridge Study). The psychophysiological measures therefore may be independent indices of the basic dimension of self-control, allowing early identification of ‘at-risk’ groups and a more profound understanding of the nature of that risk.

The implications for treatment are obvious, but difficult to resolve without experimentation. What the results suggest is that any training regime, behaviour modification programme, or behaviour contracting must take account of the fact that the delinquents will tend to fall outside the normal range of sensation-seeking, impulsivity or ability to maintain attention. The chronic under-arousal cannot be addressed directly, but has to be taken as a given in the design of programmes intended to amend delinquent behaviour.
Future Research

In early 1988 a programme of research on human development and criminal behaviour began in America. Three working groups were created initially to focus on pathways to the onset of conduct disorder, the onset of delinquency and criminality, and the continuation of criminality and desistance from it. The chosen research method was a mix of studies using different cohorts (that is groups of people who will be followed from a particular point in time for a prolonged period), but also by contemporary groups differing in composition along conventional lines associated with criminality (eg socio-economic status, intelligence, environmental situation). The programme was essentially an attempt to put together the full range of hypotheses as to the causes of conduct disorder, and these hypotheses include

- The behavioural characteristics of impulsivity, easy boredom, irritability, low empathy, and impatience increase the risk for conduct disorder.

- These behavioural characteristics are not all present at birth. However, they are reliably detected by age three and remain relatively stable until adulthood.

- These behavioural characteristics are more frequently identified in males than in females.

- Low heart rate variability, low circulating levels of cortisol and high levels of androgens represent physiological markers for these behavioural characteristics in males.

- Criminal parents produce children with these characteristics more often than non-criminal parents.

- The quality of the early relationship between infant and primary care giver as well as the type and consistency of discipline parents use are important factors in the development of conduct disorder.

- The probability of high risk behavioural characteristics resulting in conduct disorder can be reduced by a combination of good health practices, early language and social skills development, and competent child rearing practices. However, it is unlikely that any one of these measures will produce a significant effect alone.

I hope to have quoted sufficient to give you a flavour of what the current academic community see as the crucial elements to research in the causes of crime. David Farrington is a prominent leader of this group of workers and of course draws extensively on his own experience of longitudinal research.
Conclusions and Implications

David Farrington wrote the following:

"Our most important conclusion is that the types of acts that lead to court appearances are only one aspect of a larger syndrome or anti-social or deviant behaviour. It seems likely that there are individual differences between people in some underlying theoretical construct which might be termed "anti-social tendency", which are relatively stable from childhood to adulthood. The behavioural manifestation of this construct changes with age of course; for example, adults cannot truant from school, just as juveniles cannot hit their spouses. While the relative position of individuals on this underlying dimension is sufficiently stable to allow significant prediction from age eight to age 32, the stability should not be exaggerated. Significant predictability does not mean that outcomes are inevitable or that people cannot and do not change."

Delinquents are demonstrating during adolescence and early manhood, evidence of a wider, more persistent behavioural problem or deficit than simple dishonesty or poor self-control.

School behaviour, work behaviour, behaviour related to drink and/or drugs, gambling, sexual and parental relationships will all, to varying degrees, reflect this more persistent problem, and each may in its own way exacerbate the problem. For example, school truancy obviously makes job prospects much worse, and poor job prospects or achievements makes relationship problems much worse, and so on.

Two distinct deficits keep intruding as possible sources of the originating basis of primary delinquency. Under-arousal as reflected in impulsiveness, sensation seeking, attention problems, and hyperactivity, and lack of empathy as reflected in cruelty or lack of concern for others. These are the possible elements that might properly be considered central to the way the prison regime is to be organised. Above all, the regime development inside prison should aim to break down the conceptual barrier between ‘treatment’ and normal activities.
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Points Raised in Discussion

It was generally recognised that the research pointed to a need to address a whole range of problems in the context of life within prison, and not simply to focus on offending behaviour alone. As an example of the differing emphasis on activities in general as opposed to offence-related behaviour, it was pointed out that work records are rarely examined with the same eye for detail as are records of offending; the fact that an inmate had been sacked from a job might well be recorded, but the reason(s) why would not.

The question was raised as to what the nature of work within prison should be, if the research implied that throughout the daily routines of work and education the focus could be on ‘offending behaviour’ in the wider sense. Was there a message to be given to DSP3 in this respect, regarding the type of work that prisoners should be engaged in?

Mr Williams responded by pointing out that at present there was no proper account of working-behaviour as such (ie integrated records of absenteeism, effort, emotional stability, etc) within prison, and there was a need properly to describe what is currently happening in the workshop as a first step. This might come about either through innovatory sentence planning or through improvements in regime monitoring, but until then one could only speculate on which type of work was most beneficial.

It was suggested that although the widespread belief that prisoners could learn to tolerate boredom was implausible, nevertheless increasing prisoners’ pay might enable them better to get accustomed to sustained work. It was also feasible to suggest that prisoners could be given incentives, such as better pay, to behave better generally. However, this kind of argument was focussing on strategies for control of the prison population; the aim of the seminar was to go further, and examine ways in which rehabilitation could be effected.

It was suggested that any real transfer of learning to the world of work outside is unlikely under present circumstances, with, for example, prisoners working in a metal shop for 3.50 per week. As the main thrust of Mr Williams’ paper was that there should be more fundamental benefits than the acquisition of work skills from prison work, the question of transfer was a real one.

Interest was expressed in exploring further some of the results from the Cambridge study. For example, those in the sample with early convictions who later desisted from crime apparently differed from the persistent criminals in having more satisfactory accommodation and employment. It would be interesting to know how they had achieved this, and why these ‘desisters’ had given up crime. Mr Williams pointed out that in fact this group were shown (from their self-reports) still to be engaged in other deviant activities (eg stealing from work). The crucial point about the research was that the group of desisters shared more in common with the persistent offenders in the sample than they did with the non-offenders and that their intermediate status was sustained over time. This
was part of the evidence that the characteristics of offenders were related to a wide range of cognitive, behavioural, and lifestyle problems, beyond the simple fact that they had offended. On the other hand, the result cited must encourage efforts to incorporate work and life skills in the rehabilitative programme.

In relation to work, this did not necessarily imply setting up different industries, but rather adopting a different approach to the running of that industry. It was asked whether this kind of strategy was already employed, in the way that education in prisons operated differently to education outside. Mrs Stiling pointed out that education in prison did not use different teaching methods to those employed outside. It was likely, however, that prisoners received more encouragement. Mr Williams felt this to be crucial since the notion of extending treatment beyond the offence presupposed that specific techniques in work, education and relationships probably had to be developed.

It was generally agreed that the period working in prison should be used as preparation for work outside, and this could well involve looking for analogies to the problems inmates were likely to encounter outside (such as anger control in the workplace). This appeared to have fewer implications for DSP3 than it did for DIP, since the responsibility for planning sentences would fall to the latter. There was some disagreement on this point, and it was pointed out that there might indeed be implications for DSP3 which needed to be considered. The question was raised as to how this new approach related to the notion of the primacy of the work ethic, and the view that prison industry needed to be self-sufficient.

Mr Emes referred to two apparently distinct deficits reported in relation to prisoners; namely, problems with empathy and with sustained attention. He questioned whether SWIP schemes, which Mr Williams suggested might address the first of these deficits (empathy) had been originally intended to deal with this problem. Mr Williams replied that an important facet of the SWIP and Personal Officer schemes was the possible development of closer relationships between officers and prisoners. Although not originally intended, greater empathy might well be the result - an example of the way that addressing the wider problem of delinquency might be reflected in prison activities with very different functions.

In relation to the other deficit (attentional problems), it was suggested that the wider realisation of the problem could influence the design of work and education programmes within the daily regime. The essential idea was that work and education should not be seen as simple add-ons to other, more specific, programmes addressing offending behaviour. They were potential treatments in their own right and their design should be informed by the attentional deficits now identified as part of the delinquent problem.
Session 2

What Works: the Distinctive Features of Successful Programmes -

Introduction and Overview

In the 1970s, the influence of the analysis of Martinson (Martinson 1974) was reflected in the widespread belief that, as far as programmes designed specifically to counter offending were concerned, 'nothing works'. Clearly this had major implications for the organisation of the Criminal Justice System in general, and for imprisonment in particular. It was obviously especially relevant in the context of this seminar. If, as the research suggested, the notion of 'delinquency' in effect embraced associated problems of work, education and other life skills, then clearly something had to work if any impact was to be made.

Ample evidence is now available, however, to refute the notion that 'nothing works'. First, there were flaws in the original analysis that were quickly revealed by later commentators. More important was the fact that subsequent rigorous studies effectively demonstrated the potential impact of well-designed and well-implemented programmes. Work in the treatment of sex offenders and in anger management are cases in point. In addition, examples exist of programmes (in areas such as employment and education) which have made an impact on re-conviction despite addressing problems apparently indirectly related to offending.

Evaluative research suggests the following are critical for successful programmes.

- Programmes must be intensive.
- They must be based on sound theory.
- Staff must be well-trained and motivated.
- Matching inmates to programmes requires sound classification strategies.
- Programmes should address a range of problems in an integrated way.
- Programmes should incorporate and maintain strong links with the community.
- Programmes should incorporate an evaluative component.
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SESSION II

What Works - the Distinctive Features of Successful Programmes

Chris Nuttall

Chris Nuttall began by describing the history of penal thinking and practice in relation to treatment, rehabilitation and the influence of the ‘nothing works’ doctrine. He referred to two influential papers (by Cormier, Gendreau and Ross), which signalled the resurrection of the notion of rehabilitation, (a summary of these two papers follows, pages 27 - 32).

Although it became respectable from the mid 80s onwards to allow that some things worked, for some people, it remains the case that a number of strategies previously given credence are ineffective. One of these is deterrence. The evidence indicates that giving long sentences does not have a deterrent effect on the individual concerned (although there is evidence of some general deterrent effect; for example in influencing drunken driving behaviour). Other things which have proved to be ineffective as treatment strategies include some very general programme initiatives, such as Community Service Orders.

It has also emerged that in introducing any programme, the amount of effort entailed does not necessarily equate with success. Often a change will occur with minimal input. But Programmes fail if they lack integrity; if they are under-staffed or under-funded, and if staff are not trained adequately or have low motivation.

In the light of this, the question of what is necessary for success becomes crucial. The research by Palmer and Lewis (1980), indicated the main features of successful programmes to be the following:

- High-risk clients
- Increased contact with counsellors
- Higher service provision
- Using problem-solving approaches
- Maintaining a community link/network
- Where work done is seen as helpful/useful
- Where programmes are well-run/have integrity

22
Andrews et al (1990) conducted a meta-analysis which examined a whole range of studies in an attempt to identify whether correctional treatment worked. Their review of 80 programmes indicated that reconviction could be reduced by up to 50%, if the following elements were characteristics of the programme:

- Delivery to high-risk individuals
- Targeting of criminogenic needs
- Using cognitive-behavioural methods
- Matching styles and modes of treatment to client needs

The importance of matching treatment and client cannot be over-emphasised. The implication is that treatment programmes may need to be individually tailored.

The importance of including a cognitive component in any treatment programme was given credence in a Canadian study by Ross and Fabiano, which indicated that offenders’ thinking styles showed a unique pattern. The way that offenders reason, solve problems, and view their world differs in several respects from non-offenders. Elements of the pattern identified include poor self-control and impulsivity (two characteristics referred to earlier by Mark Williams). Studies done in two probation areas in Canada showed that reconviction rates of a group given cognitive skills training were half that of a control group. Less dramatic, but still encouraging, results have been obtained in a prison context. These studies again indicate that such programmes are particularly successful with higher-risk offenders.

In Britain a study reported by Colin Roberts identified four major components which could be addressed in any treatment programme. These components can be seen as a hierarchy of problems, or a pyramid of four levels. These are:

- Specific offending behaviours
- Associated behaviours (eg alcohol abuse, anger management)
- Aspects of social functioning (eg literacy, money management)
- Community re-integration (employment training, housing associations etc.)

This approach points to the relationship between different problem areas and highlights the importance of extending programmes into the community.

In this country, the cognitive skills approach has been adopted in the mid-Glamorgan Probation area, and this has been set up with the aim of ensuring programme integrity. Probationers experience four hours per week on the course. Another Canadian innovation, Life Skills programmes, has also shown encouraging results, especially in relation to literacy modules. There has been a major push in encouraging adult basic education during the last five years, and
it has been shown that re-offending figures can be improved by up to a quarter. Again, such programmes are more successful with high risk groups, especially those offenders who have previously served sentences, and those with longer sentences. They were less successful with young offenders.

In conclusion, the evidence from research was that however difficult rehabilitation was in practice it was nevertheless certainly possible.
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Points Raised in Discussion

There was considerable discussion on the question of why high-risk individuals should be more amenable to treatment programmes. Mr Nuttall provided further figures. In the last study referred to (the literacy study) the drop in reconviction rates for the high-risk group was 10% compared to 3% for the low-risk group. Reconviction rates had dropped from 39% to 24% in the long-sentence group, and from 49% to 37% in the young offender group. There was, therefore, a considerable improvement in the young offender group even though it was less dramatic than in the longer-sentence group of prisoners. He confirmed that all the offenders referred to in the programmes reported above were volunteers.

The problem of matching some prisoners, especially rapists, to suitable programmes was raised by Mr Guy, and it was agreed that this was not an easy task. Rapists were particularly resistant to treatment strategies. However, this did not contradict the evidence that high-risk offenders were more amenable to treatment. 'High risk' was not used in the sense of danger to the public, but instead in the sense of likelihood of re-offending. This point needed to be emphasised.
Mr Emes raised several issues. First was the question of picking the right people. This was more complicated than simply saying that programmes should be aimed at high-risk individuals. To plan sentences, we needed to know what information should be collected in order to select out the right individuals for the right programmes. Clarification was needed on whether this information was currently available and accessible.

The second issue was how to ensure that programmes, once initiated, actually succeed.

And the third point was whether there were any sequences of intervention which were known to work and how to address the hierarchy of problems described in addition to specific offending problems.

Mr Williams replied that, to a large extent, much work was already being done; we simply needed to improve the way we did it. The work on literacy was a good illustration of how this kind of approach fitted into the wider context of daily routines. Dr Thornton agreed that literacy was a good example, having such a wide application as to be almost certainly useful in the outside world, in contrast to any specific job skill learnt in prison. Mrs Stiling pointed out that illiteracy was a huge disadvantage and clearly this was an important area of concern which could be dealt with in prison.

Mr Bone cautioned against too much optimism, since he felt that there was a lot more work to be done, and Mr Nuttall agreed that this was the case. The most important thing to be initiated was an evaluation programme, in order that developments could be monitored and assessed. The Parole Index, for example, coded information on a whole range of social/economic/criminal variables which should be collected as a matter of course. It was necessary to have a good predictive instrument in order to properly evaluate the effectiveness of any programme. At present, we did not have adequate information.

Mr Bone felt wary of accepting the evidence so far, for example, that high-risk individuals should be the main focus of programming, without further confirming evidence. Mr Nuttall agreed that we needed much more evidence, but that which was available was consistent and provided guidance for future developments. Mr Wheatley endorsed the view that more evaluative work needed to be done. He felt that a lot of work was already in progress and needed to be recognised. The proper way to do this was through initiating evaluative programmes.

Dr Thornton pointed out that proper evaluation, whilst it was recognised as essential, was difficult to implement in practice. Evaluation required that control groups, receiving no treatment, should be set up for comparison with treatment groups. This raised many ethical and practical problems, and he had experienced some resistance in relation to the setting up of comparison control groups for the sex offender programme. An alternative strategy might be to have a phased introduction of programmes.
Mr Nuttall accepted that setting up control groups was problematic, and suggested that an alternative might be to use a predictive tool, such as the reconviction prediction scale (which is described in a later paper by Mr Williams).

It was generally agreed that implementing programmes may be relatively easy, but setting up a good evaluative strategy was more problematic. It was, however, recognised that evaluation was essential. The discussion widened to include the issue of management information systems, which it was generally agreed were not adequate.

Mr Williams pointed out that the Offenders Index will be available in the near future and may be a useful predictive instrument. Mr Nuttall agreed that this could facilitate the calculations of reconviction, although this was not done routinely. It was pointed out that evaluation entailed more than improving Management Information Systems. Another aspect which needed to be considered was how to pass on this information to officers, who would be the ones delivering any services decided upon.

The seminar went on to discuss the issue of resources. Mr Nuttall suggested that it was possible to set up an ESRC (Economic and Social Research Council) Institute to run evaluation programmes for as long as ten years. There was competition for such funds, but, for such an important area of research, he felt there would be a good case. Concern was expressed at the adjustments necessary over such a long time period, and it was decided that evaluation programmes running over two to three years would be preferable. These could be run in-house.

It was generally agreed that the time was ripe to initiate the development of programmes, as discussed so far. This strategy was entirely compatible with the Woolf Report, and the Criminal Justice Act provided a good blueprint, for example, in the setting up of sentence plans. Mr Guy cautioned that the first step was for the Prisons Board to accept the idea of a programme-driven Service. There was also a need for the Board to recognise the resource implications. Programmes only worked if resourced and implemented properly. Mr Wheatley suggested that there was some flexibility in relation to resources, since people in establishments were keen to initiate programmes and were in fact already working on many. What they needed was guidance as to what the best programmes were. He argued that changes could be effected without requiring much extra in the way of resources. Whatton was a good illustration of this, having changed from a Detention Centre to a Centre for Sex Offenders using the same basic facilities and relatively little additional resources.
Summary of paper by R B Cormier (1987) "Offender Rehabilitation"

The paper gives a brief history of the rise and fall of the notion of rehabilitation, and the development of contrasting views, such as punishment, deterrence and 'justice as fairness', which have directed penal policy. The review mainly concentrates on the North American experience. Cormier describes the major influence of Martinson's paper, 'What works? Questions and Answers about Prison Reform' (1974), which led to the general view that 'nothing works'.

Cormier describes how Martinson later reassessed his earlier views, and publicly recanted his conclusions that rehabilitation efforts had no effect on recidivism; although little attention was paid to this change of heart at the time. It is now clear that most of the treatment programmes reviewed by Martinson lacked 'programme integrity'; that is, they were methodologically flawed and not based on sound theory. Many were understaffed and underfunded. Cormier suggests that successful programmes need to be implemented intensively, seriously, and for a reasonable length of time, and with offenders who are suited to them. He also sees links with community resources (family, schools, and employers) as important.

Cormier goes on to describe the 'quiet resurgence of interest in rehabilitation' in the US, but says it has yet to exert a major influence on the American criminal justice system. (However, this paper was written in 1987, and clearly progress has been made in this respect during the last five years).

He then goes on to describe the Canadian experience, and the development of an 'active motivation model', which he sees as essentially a modern statement of rehabilitation. The fundamental idea is that offenders should be actively encouraged to participate in programmes intended to increase the likelihood of their becoming law-abiding citizens on release. In summary, Cormier brings out the major facets of a successful rehabilitation approach:

- Programmes must be intensive.
- They must be based on sound theory.
- Staff must be well-trained and motivated.
- The selection/matching of inmates to programmes requires proper classification strategies.
- Research and evaluation of programmes is important.
- Programmes should be multi-faceted, i.e. address a range of problems in an integrated way.
- Programmes should attempt to maintain/incorporate strong links with the community.
Cormier points out that virtually all effective programmes have included a component designed to change an offender's thinking, and mentions briefly cognitive training programmes being used by Probation Officers in Canada. Since Cormier's paper was written, more recent Canadian evaluations have indicated that cognitive skills training is effective in reducing recidivism rates.

**Summary of paper by P Gendreau and R R Ross (1987) "Revisification of Rehabilitation Evidence from the 1980s"**

This literature review was published in the same year as the Cormier paper, and espouses much the same viewpoint. The authors start with a critique of Martinson's 'nothing works' doctrine, and go on to assess the current (ie 1987) status of programmes that do 'work'. Their review of the treatment literature is in three parts. The first reviews rehabilitation topics defined by programme structure; the second refers to therapies as applied to distinct classes of offenders, and the third describes meta-analyses of the treatment literature. Their review is very comprehensive, and some studies are described in considerable detail.

In the first part (Part A), the authors describe research under the headings of biomedical, diversion, early/family intervention, education, getting tough, individual differences, parole/probation, restitution, and work. Since this section is very detailed, only the major points will be referred to here.

In relation to studies using *biomedical methods*, the Grendon psychiatric prison programme follow-up study is described (Gunn and Robertson 1982). The authors describe the Grendon psychiatric programme as representative of a traditional style of medical-model 'service' delivery. In the study, 20 neurotic inmates performed significantly better on a General Health Questionnaire than a comparison group imprisoned elsewhere. However, two years later, the treated group had a 70% recidivism rate, similar to the comparison group. The authors conclude that overall, there is little compelling empirical evidence to support biomedical methods.

*Diversion methods* are described and several studies apparently indicating the failure of this approach are listed. However, the authors feel that if the evaluations are scrutinised, it becomes clear that the quality of diversion programmes was generally very poor, and hence doomed to failure. They argue that diversion can succeed if something of substance and integrity is provided for the young offender. Treatments must be well grounded theoretically, and focus on positive rather than punishment processes. One finding they report is that para-professionals, contrary to some opinions, can be very effective in delivering programmes, if they are well-trained. In view of recent developments here relating to the involvement of prison officers in running treatment programme, this is encouraging.
The literature on *early/family interventions* covers three areas: training approaches to cognitive problem-solving skills, early prevention, and family intervention. The authors feel that the family intervention literature offers the most convincing demonstration that early intervention programmes can be effective, but findings in relation to the cognitive skills literature may be of greater interest to us. Kazdin et al (1987) found that training programmes based on problem solving skills were much more successful than programmes based on relationship therapy (ie focusing on empathy, enhancing self-esteem, etc). The latter type of therapy is often used with young offenders, but without much success. A focus on problem-solving skills would appear to be much more effective.

Whilst the literature on diversion and early/family intervention focuses on strategies mainly employed in the community, the section on *Education* focuses on prison programmes, and reports promising results. The well-known University of Victoria programme, which used a Humanities Course to teach social cognitive skills, is reported in some detail. The authors suggest that in order to be successful, educational programmes should be intensive, provide an alternative community within the prison, and have peer support. Support services should be provided upon release to enable inmates to continue their education or find jobs.

The section on *Getting Tough* describes the results of 'boot camp' prison regimes in the States, and also details the results of our Young Offender Psychology Unit (now incorporated in DIP2) study (Thornton et al 1984) evaluating the regime in Detention Centres.

The section on *Individual Differences* covers a wide range of studies, but the most important point made in this section is that *what may prove to be the most potent individual difference factor has emerged from one of criminal justice's most venerable topics, the literature on risk variables which are predictive of recidivism.* The authors point out that risk assessment tools that stress the measurement of static variable (such as age, previous convictions) are not especially helpful in designing treatment programmes. The targeting of dynamic variables, as represented by personal needs, which themselves can be predictive of risk (eg degree of substance abuse or criminal thinking) is more productive in dealing constructively with the offender's current situation. These ideas seem consistent with work currently being undertaken in relation to risk assessment, eg by the Psychology Department at Wakefield.

The sections on *Parole/Probation* and *Restitution* cover work done in the community rather than within a prison setting, and evaluations of these programmes are sparse, suggesting only modest results.
However, the final section of Part A, on Work, is more relevant. The authors suggest this is one of the few avenues for reform capable of providing broad-based political support for rehabilitation. To be successful, work programmes should:

- be targeted on higher-risk offenders without job skills, rather than relatively stable offenders with adequate employment histories;
- concentrate on enhancing practical skills and developing personal skills;
- minimise prisonisation;
- ensure work is not simply punishment.

Most of the evaluations reported relate to community-based programmes, but these principles seem to apply just as well to work within a prison setting.

The second part of the review (Part B) is divided into three sections covering sex offending, violent offending and substance abuse. In all three areas, the authors lament the lack of evaluative evidence to support claims for the efficacy of programmes. As this paper was written five years ago, the most recent developments in these areas are not discussed. The research which is quoted is already well-known within DIP2, where current work on programme development is focused specifically on sex offenders and violence.

The final section (Part C) details results of meta-analyses of treatment programmes. Meta-analysis is a statistical technique, developed at the beginning of the 80s, which enables a reviewer to analyse the findings of a great number of studies, whereby each study is treated as a unit of analysis. The aggregated data can then be analysed in a quantitative manner using statistical tests. Thus Garrett (1985) reviewed 111 studies (relating to juveniles) and concluded that, on the whole, treatment worked. Behavioural approaches (as opposed to psychodynamic and life skills approaches) were the most potent overall. For specific treatments, family therapy, contingency management and cognitive-behavioural approaches worked best. Other meta-analysis studies have produced similar results. Davidson et al (1984, 1986, 1987) found that the professional groups who were most effective in delivering successful treatment programmes were psychologists and educators. More recent meta-analyses have indicated that whilst the most successful studies are behavioural in nature, they also include a cognitive component (Hollin, 1991).
Conclusion

In the same year that the two papers summarised above were published (1987), David Thornton, then of the Prison Service's Young Offender Psychology Unit (now DIP2) also published a critique of Martinson's work ("Treatment effects on recidivism: a reappraisal of the 'nothing works' doctrine.") Thornton argued that the evidence on which the doctrine of 'nothing works' was based was misinterpreted, and claimed that if scrutinised, the same evidence suggests that well-implemented programmes can lead to lower recidivism. This view is very similar to that expressed in the Cormier and Gendreau and Ross papers. During the last five years, many of the points made by Cormier and by Gendreau and Ross in relation to the essential ingredients of successful programmes have been incorporated into strategies used here.

One obvious example is the current initiative on sex offender treatment programmes, designed by David Thornton. It was recognised that the treatment of sex offenders in prison was piecemeal, and needed a co-ordinated strategy. The programme now being implemented has drawn on the Canadian experience of cognitive behavioural programmes, advocated by the two papers reviewed above. Similar plans are underway for programmes to deal with aggression and violence (again under the direction of Dr Thornton).

Such specialised programmes go hand-in-hand with a broader strategy embodied in DIP1's work on sentence planning. Whilst sex offenders need to focus primarily on their offending behaviour, it is recognised that they may have wider problems which also need to be addressed, such as education, social skills and alcohol and substance abuse.

The current work on sentence planning is an attempt to manage an inmate's total time in custody, using the natural demands of all the daily activities and routines in which he may engage. Attainment areas and criteria can be generated during daily work or recreation. This involves the negotiation and contracting of personal targets. In this process, all prison staff may be involved in actively motivating inmates to achieve in a variety of ways. Education and work are especially important areas where treatment can be incorporated into the daily activities of inmates. In all these areas of intervention, it is recognised that evaluation and training are of paramount importance.

Assessment of risk is also an area which is currently being pursued. DIP2 are currently looking into the efficacy of the new Reconviction Prediction Scale, and developments on risk assessment underway at Wakefield are being monitored.
The need to match inmates to programmes and develop tools which can identify those amenable for treatment is an important part of the development of the sex and violent offender programmes. In addition, recently completed work on vulnerable prisoners (Rushton and Blud, 1992) looked at the problems experienced by this group of prisoners and involved the evaluation of assessment tools to identify those most at risk, or those most likely to experience problems or be resistant to seeking help.

Other research recently initiated and being undertaken currently by DIP2 involves evaluations which focus on the importance of maintaining community links, which is one of the areas which Cormier sees as important. This includes looking at the regimes at Blantyre House and Latchmere House (with especial reference to the strong emphasis in those regimes on community links and provision of work experience); and evaluating the feasibility of a scheme to return long-term prisoners to their local area towards the end of their sentence, to facilitate re-integration into their home community.

All these research projects incorporate the main points made in the two papers reviewed above. For example, it is recognised that to be successful, any treatment programme must be intensive, last for a reasonable time period, be based on sound theory, emphasise the importance of training professional and paraprofessional staff, involve community links, be concerned with a proper classification of inmates (enabling the matching of inmates to programmes), and be multi-faceted, ie employ a range of strategies to address a variety of problem areas.
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Session 3
Sex Offenders: Prospects for Treatment -
Introduction and Overview

Although the research reported so far suggests the broad nature of the delinquency problem, nevertheless specific offences are generally regarded as being so serious as to merit particular attention. One of the most significant developments in the Directorate of Inmate Programmes was the introduction of a nationally co-ordinated programme to address sex offending. The structure of the treatment programme being put into practice at present, includes:

A Core Programme (currently running at 14 establishments)
A Detailed Assessment Programme (beginning in October 1992 at six centres)
An Extended Programme (planned for six centres in 1993)

The programme design draws on the research suggesting the effectiveness of the cognitive-behavioural approach.

The major points made in David Thornton’s presentation were:

☐ Sexual offending seems to be sufficiently damaging to constitute a serious social problem.

☐ Although some sex offenders commit comparatively few offences, others seem to offend in a persistent and repetitive way.

☐ Treatment should be focused on individuals identified as persistent (‘high risk’) offenders.

☐ Studies of sex offenders have identified a number of psychological characteristics which may plausibly be seen as sustaining offending and which should therefore be addressed through treatment.

☐ These include
  — unusual, offence-related sexual preferences;
  — social skills deficits, including difficulties in forming close relationships with adults;
  — difficulty in managing negative mood states (anger, depression);
  — unusual beliefs or ways of perceiving their potential victims which serve to minimise or justify their offences.

☐ The most promising treatment technology for addressing these targets is provided by the cognitive-behavioural approach to treatment.
SESSION III

Sex Offenders: Prospects For Treatment

David Thornton

Introduction

This note seeks to summarise some of the research findings which are relevant to the treatment of sex offenders. Six issues are addressed:

- the frequency and nature of sexual offences
- the repetitive nature of sexual offending
- the number of sexual offenders the prison system has to deal with
- the characteristics of different types of sexual offender
- the main approaches to treating sexual offenders
- the long term effects of different kinds of treatment

The Frequency and Nature of Sexual Offences

If sexual offences were very rare or only took a rather trivial form it would be hard to justify allocating scarce treatment resources to the treatment of sex offenders. Accordingly this section examines research into the frequency and nature of sexual offences.

Sexual behaviour may infringe the law in a variety of ways. In the present context, however, the phrase 'sexual offences' refers to sexual assaults such as rape and to the sexual abuse of children. It does not include prostitution or for example the kinds of 'lavatory offences' for which gay men have sometimes been prosecuted.

Many sexual offences are not reported to the police. Consequently official crime statistics grossly underestimate the frequency with which sexual offences occur. The most useful guide to the frequency of these (and other kinds of offence) is to be derived from surveys in which potential victims are asked about their experience of various kinds of crime. Crime rates for England and Wales are regularly estimated on this basis through the British Crime Survey. Unfortunately there are particular difficulties in carrying out victim surveys in relation to sexual offences. Victims may well feel embarrassed to admit to having been the victim of some kind of sexual offence. In addition, it is not normally thought appropriate to carry out victim surveys with children so the prevalence of sexual offences against children has to be estimated on the basis of the
recollections of adults. These difficulties mean that the rate of sexual offences are better estimated through specially designed surveys than through large scale general-purpose victim surveys. The results of such research are described below, first in relation to sexual assaults on females and then in relation to the sexual abuse of children.

Sexual Assaults

Probably the best study of the prevalence of rape was that reported by Russell (1984). This involved a large (N=930) random sample of adult women in San Francisco. Carefully trained interviewers carried out a detailed interview about these women’s experience of different kinds of sexual victimisation. The interview typically lasted over an hour. About a quarter of Russell’s sample reported having experienced a completed rape. Just under a half reported having experienced a completed or attempted rape. Only 8% of these incidents had been reported to the police. Repeat victimisation was quite common. About half of those who experienced one rape went on to later be raped again on another occasion. Just over 3% of the women reported that they had been raped in the previous 12 months.

Just under 1% of the women in Russell’s survey reported having been the victim of a completed rape before they were twelve years old. The risk of being raped appeared to be greatest when women were between the ages of 16 and 34. Only 12% of these completed rapes were carried out by men who were unknown to the victim. Those offences were, however, particularly likely to be reported to the police. Nearly a quarter of the rapes involved the woman’s husband or ex-husband. Altogether about half the rapes involved men with whom the women had had some kind of voluntary sexual contact prior to the rape. This category includes lovers or ex-lovers, boyfriends, and more casual dates. About one in ten of the rapes were carried out by friends with whom the woman did not have a previous sexual relationship, nearly a fifth of the rapes were carried out by acquaintances and about one in 20 rapes involved a relative other than the woman’s husband. A little over one in 20 rapes were carried out by authority figures, for example teachers or employers. The large number of rapes in Russell’s survey partly reflects her inclusion of incidents which arise in the context of some previously established sexual relationship. In some times and places these kinds of rape have not been prohibited by law. For example, rape within marriage has not always been illegal. This is not just a legal issue, however, sometimes neither the man nor the woman involved recognise such incidents as ‘rape’ at the time they are occurring. Nash and West (1985) give an example from their victim survey in which a woman reported having been raped on three occasions by the man she was dating. The victim remarked that although she now saw these occasions in which she had been forced to have sex as rapes, at the time, neither of those involved had seen it in that way.
Rapes by acquaintances or intimates should not be dismissed as unimportant because of these difficulties about how particular incidents are interpreted. A substantial proportion of these incidents do not arise out of some prior social interaction in which the man might have 'misunderstood' the woman's feelings. Rather many involve attacks which are committed without significant social prelude by men who have chosen this victim, perhaps, because they know her (Smith, 1989). In addition, research into the long term consequences of rape suggest that being raped by an intimate is, if anything, more damaging than being raped by a stranger (Russell, 1982).

Clearly the prevalence of rape in San Francisco may be different from that in England and Wales. Rates of most kinds of crime do seem to be higher in the United States. The British Crime Survey suggested that there were about 60,000 offences of rape or indecent assault in 1987. The BCS figures relate to women aged at least 16 which only covers adults so this corresponds to an annual risk of being sexually assaulted for this group of just under a third of one percent. This is much lower than the kind of figures obtained by Russell but the BCS is recognised as considerably underestimating these offences. The true figure probably lies somewhere between Russell's estimate of a 3% annual risk and the BCS estimate of an annual risk of 0.3%.

British Crime Survey data suggest that about one in five sexual assaults on adult women (rape or indecent assault) are recorded by the police. Even when these offences are recorded however there is still an enormous gap between this and an identified offender being convicted or cautioned for the offence. Thus, for example, official statistics show that some 3,305 rapes were recorded by the police in 1989. In that same year, however, only 613 men were convicted or cautioned for rape. Thus less than one in five recorded rapes result in someone 'being caught'. Further, if allowance is made for under-recording this suggests that less than one in twenty of the rapes that actually occur result in the offender being caught. Consequently those rapists who are caught are a somewhat selected group. Nevertheless there is normally fuller information available about those rapes which have involved someone being convicted so that analysis of such cases can be informative and it is, in any case, only those offenders who have been convicted who can be considered for prison treatment programmes. The characteristics of the rapes involved in this selected set of cases is therefore of interest.

Something of the nature of these offences can be garnered from statistics gathered by Lloyd and Walmsley (1989). They examined all rape convictions in England and Wales for 1985 (there were 448 in that year). They found that almost all the victims were aged between 13 and 40 with around 70% of victims being between 16 and 29. In something like a fifth of cases victims were raped by more than one offender. Less than half the rapes were by strangers, in fact nearly a third were by acquaintances and a similar proportion by intimates (friends, ex-lovers, or relatives). More than half the offences took place indoors, commonly in either the victim's or the offender's house. Outdoor offences tended to be in a street, a car, or perhaps a field or park. The threat or use of violence
was present in nearly all cases (90%) and the victim was physically injured (eg vaginal cuts and bruises) in about three-quarters of the cases. In more than half the cases rape was reported as having been accompanied by additional sexual acts, commonly some form of oral sex, anal sex, or the insertion of something other than the penis (finger or perhaps objects such as a milk bottle) into either the vagina or anus. The offences also not uncommonly extended over some considerable time. Thus about 40% of victims were under coercion for over 30 minutes and in some 5% of cases coercion lasted for over five hours.

**Sexual Abuse of Children**

Surveys of adults asking whether they have been sexually abused as children have given quite variable results. Peters et al (1986) summarise the results of American surveys up to that point in time, concentrating on result for girls. Finkelhore (1984) contains a review of the results for boys. Estimates of the percentage of males sexually abused at some point in their childhood have varied from 3% to 31% while estimates of the percentage of females sexually abused during their childhood have varied from 6% to 62%. Rather similar results have been reported for English data when survey methods similar to those used in the USA have been employed (Nash and West, 1985). All of these studies point to relatively high rates of sexual abuse of children. The variability of the results is striking though making it difficult to give any precise figure.

Many of the studies have used definitions of sexual abuse which includes both contact abuse (ie fondling of breasts and genitals, and oral, anal or vaginal sex) and non-contact abuse (mainly indecent exposure, or suggestions to the child that they take part in a sexual activity).

If non-contact abuse is excluded then rates fall noticeably, by about 15 percentage points in most cases, and much of the variability of the results is eliminated. Thus abuse involving actual physical contact appears to be reported by most surveys to occur for between one in six and one in four women. Most of this abuse consists of some form of genital fondling.

Most studies show that children are most at risk of sexual abuse between the ages of 8 and 12 though a significant amount of abuse does occur with both younger and older children (Finkelhore and Baron, 1986). Girls are more often abused than boys but probability of being abused appears to be unrelated to either social class or ethnic background. Children with step-fathers appear to be at particular risk.

For about half of the child victims their abuse involves a single event (eg Brown and Finkelhore, 1986) but for some abuse can be repeated regularly over a period of years. Substantial amounts of sexual abuse is carried out by people who are previously unknown to the child, surveys suggest that somewhere between a half and a third of incidents arise in this way. Much of the rest is carried out by acquaintances or by relatives other than the child’s parents. Parents, including step-parents appear to be responsible for only a small proportion of abuse, probably less than 10% of it (eg Nash and West, 1985; Finkelhore, 1984). Nevertheless most surveys suggests that about one in a hundred women
experienced some kind of contact abuse from their parents. Given the wide range of different kinds of sexual act that is covered under the heading of Sexual Abuse of Children it is important to consider both how these events are experienced by the children concerned and the kinds of long term effects these experiences may have.

The apparently least serious form of sexual abuse is "non-contact abuse". A large part of this consists of strangers indecently exposing themselves. From Nash and West's survey it appears that children's reaction to this depends critically on whether they are alone with the offender. If a man exposes himself to a group of children the predominant reaction seems to be for them to find it funny. On the other hand if the child is alone the experience can be very frightening. Being sexually propositioned on the other hand seemed to be more uniformly unpleasant.

More generally there appears to be considerable variation in children's response to sexual encounters with adults. Most girls report finding the experience predominantly negative even though some of the physical sensations or the attention involved may be recognised as pleasant. Somewhere between one-fifth and two-fifths of girls appear to manifest noticeable disturbance, for example having nightmares, becoming anxious or depressed, becoming withdrawn or naughty and aggressive with other children. They may also start to make sexual approaches to both adults and other children. Thus for a proportion of children the experience is clearly traumatic and, at least in the short term, damaging. On the other hand, although most girls appear to find the experience unpleasant many claim not to have had any serious short-term reaction to it.

The situation for boys appears to be more complicated. Boys experience of abuse has been less researched but it seems that many do not regard sexual contacts with adults in quite such a negative way. A small proportion of the boys involved appear to have initiated sexual contact or to have found the experience interesting or attractive. Many more report a more neutral or mixed reaction while a substantial number find the experience as negative as do girls (Finkelhore, 1979). Moreover, amongst those cases which come to official attention whilst they are still children, boys are if anything more likely than girls to manifest negative reactions such as emotional disorder, conduct disorder or over-sexualised behaviour (The Research Team, 1990). Thus even though the proportion may be less, some boys clearly do find sexual contact with adults traumatic and, in the short term, damaging.

Studies of the long term effects of sexual abuse on children involve comparing the psychological adjustment of adults who were abused as children to the adjustment of those who were not abused. There are obvious pitfalls here. Abuse does not happen at random and any differences observed amongst the adults may reflect those characteristics which made the child more vulnerable to victimisation. Good studies try to contrast adults who were abused to adults who were not abused but who otherwise came from similar backgrounds. Much of the relevant research has been reviewed by Browne and Finkelhore (1986). They
conclude that about a fifth of abused girls manifest serious psychopathology as adults and that this is apparent specifically in terms of depression, self-injury, anxiety, feelings of isolation and stigma, substance abuse, and vulnerability to further victimisation. This review identified some studies which suggested an effect specific to sexual relationships with men. That has subsequently been confirmed in two studies. Nash and West found results suggesting that abuse was associated with more sexual activity in adolescence but a withdrawal from sexual relations with men in adulthood. Similarly, Finkelhore et al (1989) found that a history of abuse was associated with subsequent difficulty sustaining a marriage. Unfortunately little data is available regarding the long term effect of sexual abuse on boys. Nevertheless there is some evidence for effects on their sexual adjustment. Males who had been abused in childhood reported finding sexual relationships less satisfying as adults in Finkelhore’s (1979) survey of college students and in Finkelhore et al’s (1989) study of abused males were also less able to sustain a marriage successfully.

Browne and Finkelhore’s review examined factors which appeared to make abuse more or less traumatic. They concluded that damage was made more likely by each of the following factors: longer lasting experiences; more incidents; the perpetrator being a father figure; use of force by the perpetrator; the perpetrator being male; and the perpetrator being much older than the child (e.g. an adult as opposed to a child). They found inconsistent evidence that the degree of intrusion of the sexual act made a difference. However, subsequent studies (Nash and West, 1985; and Finkelhore, 1989) have supported the suggestion that damage is greater where the sexual acts were more intrusive.

The Repetitive Nature of Sexual Offending

The material reviewed in the previous section indicates that both sexual assaults and the sexual abuse of children occur with sufficient frequency and cause sufficient damage that it is worth allocating resources to try to control them. If however offending was widely scattered throughout the population, with each offender contributing only a few offences, then there would be little merit in approaching the problem through the treatment of known offenders. Under that scenario sexual offending would, as it were, be a self-limiting disorder. There would be little point in treating known offenders as by the time they were caught they would already have committed most of the offences for which they were going to be responsible and the great bulk of offending would meanwhile be being committed by people who never came to official attention. That is of course an extreme scenario. The other extreme would be to postulate that all sex offences were committed by a limited number of offenders, each offender being responsible for a large number of offences. If this second scenario were correct then treating individual offenders might be a highly efficient means of controlling sex offending.
In fact the evidence rather consistently indicates that the truth lies someway between these two extremes. Many sex offenders commit only a small number of offences. On the other hand some individuals appear to offend much more often. There are three lines of evidence: victim surveys, surveys of self-reported offending and studies of convictions. Victim surveys indicate that for many children who are sexually abused the abuse consists of a single unrepeated incident. Since much of the abuse occurs in a context where the victim is repeatedly exposed to the offender after the initial incident (for example, where the offender is a member of the child’s family) this strongly suggests that the commission of a first offence does not automatically lead to the commission of further offences. On the other hand some people report having been repeatedly victimised by the same individual. Self-report studies involve asking people about the offences they have committed under either confidential or anonymous conditions. Probably the most comprehensive study of this kind was reported by Abel et al (1987). In this study 561 sex offenders attending an out patient clinic were interviewed about the number of sexual offences of different kinds that they had committed. The offenders admitted to over a quarter of a million sex offences, about a quarter of which were contact offences. The 126 men who admitted to rape reported having carried out some 900 rapes while the 371 child-molesters admitted to just under 39,000 acts involving the contact abuse of children.

In describing Abel et al’s study most commentators place great emphasis on the very large number of offences committed by this small number of men. However, a more subtle aspect of the results is of interest here. The typical number of offences committed by each offender is reported both as the average (the arithmetic mean) and as the point which has half the offenders reporting more offences and half reporting fewer (the median). For rapists, the average number of rapes reported per offender was about seven but half of the rapists reported only having committed one rape. The average of seven rapes per rapist can thus have only arisen if whilst many offenders did not repeat their rape, a small number committed many rapes. A similar pattern was apparent for most kinds of child-molesting. Thus in each case there appeared to be a relatively large number of offenders who had each committed very few offences and other offenders who were each responsible for a large number of offences.

Abel’s study is based on offenders referred to a clinic and might be expected therefore to be drawing on a somewhat extreme population. However two studies have examined self-reports of child-molesting amongst (unconvicted) members of the general population. Finkelhore and Lewis (1988) using telephone survey techniques found that 10% of adult men admitted having sexually abused a child. Fromath et al (1991) studying male college students found that 3% of them reported having sexually abused a child. In the latter study the 16 students who admitted sexually abusing a child reported 58 incidents of abuse against 21 children. Just four of the students however had abused more than one victim and these four offenders accounted for 62% of the incidents. Thus again there is a
pattern of many offenders each accounting for relatively few offences whilst others offend much more frequently.

Finally conviction data paints a somewhat similar picture. Following a first conviction for a sexual offence the probability of being reconvicted for any sexual offence is very low even with a lengthy follow-up period. Phillpotts and Lancucki (1979) reported a sexual reconviction rate over six years for those without sexual previous convictions of 1.5%. Similarly, Thornton and Travers (1991) found a sexual reconviction rate of 5% over ten years for their low risk group. On the other hand both groups of researchers were able to identify categories of sexual offender with a much higher reconviction rate. Phillpotts and Lancucki (1979) report that offenders with a current sexual offence and two previous convictions for sexual offences had a six year sexual reconviction rate of 22.3%. Similarly Thornton and Travers found a ten year sexual reconviction rate of 41% for their high risk group. Thus conviction data too indicates that some sex offenders are much more inclined to repeat their offence than others.

Taken together the three sources of data examined here indicate that a large amount of sexual offending is committed by offenders with a relatively low probability of repetition. Post-conviction treatment is of little relevance to the control of the sexual offending of this group. On the other hand there is also clear evidence of a number of sexual offenders whose offending appears to be quite repetitive even after being convicted or (in the Thornton and Travers sample) having served a long prison sentence. Clearly effective treatment aimed at these repetitive offenders would be beneficial.

**Sex Offenders in Prison**

Each year about 2000 adult males begin prison sentences following conviction for a sex offence. The figures for male young offenders and women are much smaller (about 230 male young offenders a year, and about a dozen female offenders). A large part of the adult male sex offender intake, about 70%, receives sentences of less than four years.

Although they are a minority of receptions, longer sentence sex offenders actually dominate the sex offender population in prison. At any one time there are about 3000 adult male sex offenders in prison and roughly two-thirds of these are serving over four years with about 400 serving very long sentences.

For treatment planning purposes then the population of imprisoned sex offenders can be notionally divided into three groups. First there is a large group with relatively short sentences. These offenders are scattered over a large number of prisons. Then there is a group serving medium to long term sentences. They tend to spend in excess of two years in prison and to be concentrated in a more limited number of prisons. Finally there is a smaller but still significant number of sex offenders who are serving very long sentences. This group tends to be concentrated in an even more limited number of establishments.
There are particular difficulties in organising treatment for both the short term and the very long term groups. For many short term offenders it would take too long to get them into a treatment centre and for treatment to be completed. For very long term prisoners in contrast there is a problem about the timing of treatment. Ideally treatment would take place at both the beginning and the end of sentence; at the beginning because the memory of what was involved in the offence is still reasonably accessible at that stage and at the end of sentence because then there will be less chance for the effects of treatment to decay before the offender is released. For medium term prisoners the beginning and end of treatment are relatively close to each other so that timing does not present a great problem. For a life sentence prisoner on the other hand the gap between the two is so large that it is not possible to specify a single point in sentence which will represent a satisfactory time for treatment.

Unfortunately prison statistics do not lend themselves to distinguishing the kinds of offence for which sex offenders may have been convicted. The categories used in official statistics for example do not consistently distinguish child-molesting from offences against adults. A survey by Rhys Matthews of prisoners in the South-West part of England suggested that three-quarters had been convicted for offences against children and that about 40% had been convicted for offences against members of their own family.

Data on the proportions of imprisoned sex offenders who can sensibly be categorised as high risk is not available for the current sex offender population but Thornton and Travers found that about a quarter of sex offenders discharged in 1980 could be categorised as low risk.

Profiles of Different Kinds of Sexual Offender

Considerable research has been carried out into the characteristics of sex offenders with the intention of identifying aspects of their psychological functioning which might be addressed in treatment. The underlying assumption here is that if some psychological characteristic makes offending more likely then this characteristic should be more common in those who have committed sex offences. It has become clear in this research that sex offenders cannot sensibly be treated as a single homogeneous group.

The psychological factor which seems to most clearly differentiate sex offenders is the direction of their sexual interest. This has been investigated through penile plethysmography (PPG). The procedure involves exposing the subject to stimuli representing a range of possible sexual interests while monitoring fluctuations in penis circumference. The results are clearest for men who sexually molest other people’s children. A substantial proportion of these men show stronger PPG responses to images of children than to images of adults (eg Marshall et al, 1988). In addition, those offenders who show this unusual pattern of sexual interest are more likely to re-offend if untreated (Barbaree and Marshall, 1988).
A somewhat similar picture has recently emerged for sexual offences involving physical violence (rapes etc) where the associated pattern of deviant arousal involves responses to images of non-sexual assaults on women (Fedora et al, 1992). And again those offenders who manifest this pattern of sexual interest have a higher rate of reconviction (Rice et al, 1990).

Offence-related sexual interest is, however, not the only psychological feature associated with sexual offending. Paedophiles as a group tend to be much more introverted than other offenders (Wilson and Cox, 1983) and to produce MMPI personality profiles indicative of dependence and passivity (Walters, 1987). Their offences are often committed whilst feeling depressed or inadequate (Pithiers et al). Rapists tend to a hyper-masculine style, and claim a wider range of sexual experience and sexual activity (Kozma and Zuckerman, 1983; McDonald and Paitich, 1983) despite reporting a higher degree of dissatisfaction with their sexual relationships (Kanin, 1983). Rapes are very commonly committed while the offender is feeling angry (Pithiers et al, 1988).

In addition, child-molesters often manifest beliefs about their victims which either underplay the victim's distress or which diminish the degree to which the offender is responsible for the offence (Stemac and Siegal, 1989). Similarly, there is some evidence that subscribing to so-called 'rape myths' is associated at least with date-rape but not with predatory stranger rape (Grubin, 1990).

On the basis of this research then it is possible to suggest that treatment should address the following areas: offence related sexual preferences; social skills or social confidence; the management of negative emotions (anger, depression etc) and beliefs which can be used to excuse offending. Since none of these features are present in all sex offenders it is clear that careful assessment will be needed to tailor treatment to the needs of the particular individual.

Approaches to the Treatment of Sexual Offenders

A variety of approaches have been adopted in the treatment of sexual offences. They can only be sketched in a rather broad brush way here. Broadly they fall into three categories: biological approaches; psychotherapeutic approaches; and cognitive-behavioural approaches.

**Biological Treatment**

The approach here is to find some direct method of altering some of the physical parameters which sustain sexual interest, for example to reduce levels of the sex hormone testosterone. The most extreme approach to this is through castration but there are drugs which achieve something of the same effect, at least while the offender continues to take the drug (for example Androcur).
Psychotherapeutic Treatment

Here the usual techniques of either group or individual psychotherapy are applied to sex offenders. Therapeutic communities such as Grendon would also fall in this category. The basic principle here is that a person’s psychological functioning is altered through a combination of gaining insight and by working through the interpersonal conflicts as they are manifest in the offenders relationships with therapists or other offenders in treatment.

Cognitive-Behavioural Treatment

This approach involves the marriage of three families of technique. The first is behavioural skills training which uses demonstrations and role-playing practice with feedback to inculcate new skills. The second is the application of conditioning techniques to modify the attractiveness of ideas or activities. The third is cognitive restructuring, that is the identification of ways of thinking or interpreting the situation which make undesirable behaviour more likely, followed by the challenging of this and rehearsal of more productive ways of thinking. One of the distinguishing features of this approach is that it addresses treatment targets in a very focused and direct way.

Long Term Effects of Different Kinds of Treatment

There have been virtually no methodological rigorous evaluations of sex offender treatment. This means that it is necessary to fall back on studies which have used weak methodologies and which can accordingly only give suggestive results. Such studies have been recently identified by two reviews (Furby et al, 1989 and Marshall et al, 1991). Between them these reviews located eight studies in which it was possible to examine re-offending for treated and untreated sex offenders over a comparable follow-up period. Four of these studies examined programmes which adopted a cognitive-behavioural approach whilst four examined programmes which adopted some form of psychotherapeutic approach. It is thus possible to obtain some indication of the relative effect of these two approaches.

The four studies of the psychotherapeutic treatment of sex offenders gave rather discouraging results. Treated offenders had higher reconviction rates in three of the four studies, the average effect of treatment being to apparently raise reconviction rates by about 50%. In contrast studies of cognitive-behavioural treatment gave encouraging results. Here, treated offenders had lower reconviction rates in three of four studies, the average effect of treatment being to about halve reconviction rates.
Summary of Conclusions

☐ Sexual offending, whether against adults or children, seems to be sufficiently damaging to constitute a serious social problem.

☐ Although some sex offenders commit comparatively few offences, others seem to offend in a repetitive way. Treatment should therefore be focused on individuals identified as repetitive offenders.

☐ Studies of sex offenders have identified a number of psychological characteristics which may plausibly be seen as sustaining offending. These include: unusual, offence-related sexual preferences; social skills deficits, including particularly difficulties in forming close relationships with adults; difficulty in managing negative mood states (anger, depression); and unusual beliefs or ways of perceiving their potential victims which serve to minimise or justify their offences. When sex offenders show these characteristics they should be addressed through treatment.

☐ The most promising treatment technology for addressing these targets is provided by the cognitive-behavioural approach to treatment.
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Points Raised in Discussion

Dr Thornton invited questions throughout his presentation. He was asked to comment on whether there was any concern about the validity of confessions to multiple sex offences, and he replied that he felt the bias was probably more towards concealment rather than confessing to more offences than had actually been committed. Mr Bone asked whether there was any work on the features distinguishing between low and high recollection rates, and Dr Thornton replied that the PPG measure was the best predictive instrument available. Dr McDougall asked whether sex offenders welcomed treatment, and Dr Thornton replied that because the Criminal Justice system had recently clamped down on such offenders, this had had an influence on offenders’ motivations to seek treatment. Once treatment, in the form of challenging the cognitive distortions characteristic of such offenders’ thinking, had begun, so tolerance of changing this thinking increased.

Several questions arose in response to Dr Thornton’s description of the various treatment models available. Mr Papps queried whether the cognitive-behavioural model, at present being put into practice in selected prisons here, was dependent to any extent on the offender’s intellectual ability. Dr Thornton replied that whilst those who were very educationally subnormal were not being included in the programme, most offenders did not experience any difficulty in terms of the cognitive demands made of them. In fact, the intellectually sophisticated individuals were more problematic, since they had devised the most elaborate justifications for their behaviour.

Mr Emes asked whether Grendon was run entirely on a psychotherapeutic basis, and Dr Thornton replied that there was one wing at Grendon which was now using the cognitive-behavioural approach.

There was some discussion in relation to the outcome studies described by Dr Thornton, since the results were not very encouraging, even with respect to the cognitive-behavioural studies. However in all cases where there was a reduction in recollection rates following treatment, the treatment approach had been cognitive-behavioural. This still amounted to only three studies, and in a further cognitive-behavioural evaluation there had been no improvement in recollection rates. Dr Thornton pointed out that the cognitive-behavioural model had nevertheless indicated better results than any other approach; the main problem was in the paucity of good evaluative studies.

Mr Wheatley asked whether the sex offender treatment programme currently being run involved an evaluative element. Dr Thornton replied that originally a rigorous evaluation component had been built into the programme structure. However, this required a ‘no treatment’ comparison group and it had proved difficult to put into effect because of the resistance of staff in establishments, who expressed anxiety at withholding treatment from the control group. Another option would be to have a historical comparison group, but this was problematic since changes in economic/social factors over time would contaminate the
results. It was generally agreed that it was important to include evaluation in the sex offender treatment programme because the available evidence in support of the cognitive-behavioural approach was inadequate.

Mr Emes proposed that offenders with too little time before discharge to allow for treatment might be put through the assessment, so that their progress on release could be compared to the performance of treated offenders. Dr Thornton said this might lead to difficulties since the assessment centres for the programme were all located in Category B establishments, and it might be problematic if eligible inmates were currently in Category C or D establishments. Mr Emes then suggested a ‘roadshow’ approach, i.e. teams visiting establishments to put the programmes into practice. Dr Thornton felt this was a possibility but the resource implications needed to be examined. Staff could be diverted from the planned programme centres to a roadshow team for six months in order to get a discharge sample.

Mr Wheatley pointed out that it was important to evaluate individual establishments since any programme might be working well in one but poorly in another. Dr Thornton reported that this was not a problem since the data could be broken down into individual establishments.

Mr Guy said that there was a current probation research project underway looking at programmes for sex offenders in the community, for example, the Gracewell Clinic. This project could be used to evaluate prison programmes also. Dr Thornton added that measures from this project were deliberately being built into our procedures so that comparisons with community projects could be made automatically, to obtain a constant source of feedback.

Mr Papps raised the question of how to proceed if it was found that the cognitive-behavioural programme was unsuccessful. Dr Thornton said that if the results did prove to be disappointing, then changes would have to be made. We could only assess the courses properly once we have a standard approach to measuring clinical impact. There were several ways to develop this, and one key area of measurement would be the observations of staff.
Session 4

Identifying High Risk Cases -

Introduction and Overview

Emerging from research into the characteristics of successful programmes is the finding that success is greater if 'high risk' groups are targeted. The assessment of risk is required in areas other than treatment, of course, and a wide range of specifically penal decisions require that individuals are assessed (for classification and allocation and in consideration for temporary release, home leave and lifer release, for example). In this context, 'risk' is used as a shorthand for the probability of committing further offences, usually specific offences such as sexual or violent offences.

In general, although the diagnosis of high risk is seen as a difficult task it is also regarded as the proper province of the expert (in the widest sense). Extensive research has been carried out on both of these aspects, on the predictability of future offending in general, and on how successful the exercise of human judgement is in making such predictions.

The major conclusions are as follows:

- the risk of a reconviction of any kind following a prison sentence can be predicted with great accuracy and precision over normal follow-up periods (i.e. two to three years),

- human judgement is fallible in this area, being particularly prone to exaggerate the effect of prison experience,

- predicting the commission of specific offences is more problematic, although evidence shows that this also is possible but less precisely and requiring a longer time-at-risk period,

- predicting future offending and evaluating the impact of treatment are two sides of the same coin:
  
  - first, the probability of re-offending (the risk) is assessed at the point of imprisonment, and
  
  - second, the success of the treatment in prison is gauged by the actual reduction in risk following release.
SESSION IV

Identifying High Risk Cases
Mark Williams

Introduction
Before considering the problem of identifying high risk cases it is instructive, since this is essentially a prediction task, to consider the predictability of offending in general.

Reconviction Prediction Scales
One of the paradoxes of criminology is that although the criminal behaviour remains problematic (in that there is no consensus as to why people offend) nevertheless, predicting the probability of re-offending is possibly the best researched, and notably successful area. In England, for example, a reconviction prediction scale (RPS) was developed from a sample of 1965 discharges and was described subsequently by Nuttall et al (1977). In this study the usual procedure for prediction studies was adopted; that is, one half of the sample was used to construct a scale and then the remainder was used to validate it. Ten years later, however, a completely separate study used over 2,000 discharges to see how well the prediction scale continued to work (Ward, 1987). In this second study the prisoners were grouped into sizable classes of similar probability of re-offending; 21 classes in total with an average probability of re-offending ranging from 1% up to 94%. The actual proportion of each class re-convicted within two years was compared with the predicted proportion. The results are plotted in Figure 1, with predicted percentages reconvicted plotted on the vertical scale and actual percentages reconvicted plotted along the horizontal scale.
From Figure 1 it can be seen that the reconviction score was in very close agreement with the actual outcome. The line of best fit has been drawn through the data, and the correlation between the predicted and the actual outcome is 0.98.

Several points may be made about this result. First, this is an unusual validation sample as it was taken such a long period after the original reconviction scale was produced; it is in other words a very stringent test of the original scale. Second, the accuracy of the scale is considerable; despite the overall drop in reconviction over the period (from 50% of the original sample to 40% of the sample ten years later) the relative positioning of the risk groups has been very clearly maintained. Third, there are risk groups with very high or very low prediction scores (as extreme as 1% and 95% likelihood of re-offending); the scale is therefore very informative. Fourth, the scale from nearly 0% to approaching 100% offers great precision of measurement, (although the original scores before translation into percentages actually range from (-) 31 to (+) 31, ie a true range of over 60 points). Not only are there at least 60 different scores within the scale, there are also large groups of prisoners at every point in the range. At the bottom end of the scale for instance, over 4% of the sample scored on average 1% on the RPS (ie are virtually certain not to be reconvicted), and 4% of the prison population is a very large number of people. So the scale is of practical significance, as well as being precise, detailed, informative and accurate.
In Figures 2a and 2b, are set out the ingredients of the scale. For each characteristic listed, the individual prisoner gets a single sub-score. Notice the simplicity of the data; simplicity in coding, in content and in amount. This is not a complex range of aspects of individuals; they are simple parameters of the daily life of offenders.

**Figure 2a**

The raw score is obtained by adding together the relevant sub-scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main offence</th>
<th>Number of previous convictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homosexual offences</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking and driving away</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living on immoral earnings</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug offences</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunken driving</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other indictable offences</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration offences</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud and Forgercy</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving and handling</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterosexual offences</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other offences</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of previous imprisonments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15 or more</th>
<th>6 to 14</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1 to 4</th>
<th>nil</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at offence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 24</td>
<td>+5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 39</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and over</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Value of property stolen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nil</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>nil</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>nil</th>
<th>+4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than £50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£50 but less than £1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>£1000 or more</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of associates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nil</th>
<th>+4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 or fewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interval at risk since last release**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nil</th>
<th>+3</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>nil</th>
<th>+2</th>
<th>+4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months but less than 1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year but less than 2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years but less than 3 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Juvenile custodial treatment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nil</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved school only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borstal/detention centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Probation history**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nil</th>
<th>+1</th>
<th>+3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once, never breached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once only, not breached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once only under 17, with breach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once only 17 or over, with breach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once, with breach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notice also the simplicity of the calculation. Simple weights are given to simple variables and each person gets a sub-score according to his particular features within these variables. These sub-scores are totalled, and the result referred to the table in the lower right hand side of Figure 2b. In this way, the 60+ possible distinct total scores are translated into a percentage likelihood of re-offending.

**Figure 2b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison offences</th>
<th>Current marital status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 or more escapes</td>
<td>+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No escapes</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation (Registrar-General’s Class)</th>
<th>Conversion to recidivism prediction score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual I or Ii</td>
<td>Raw score 0 to less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual III</td>
<td>Raw score 0 to less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-manual IV</td>
<td>Raw score 0 to less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual II, III or IV</td>
<td>Raw score 0 to less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment at time of offence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Conversion to recidivism prediction score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part time</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full time</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Time in last job                     | Raw score 0 to less                    |
| Short or casual                      | +3                                     |
| No job for 5 years since release     | +2                                     |
| Less than 1 month                    | +3                                     |
| 1 but less than 6 months             | nil                                    |
| 6 months but less than 1 year        | -1                                     |
| 1 but less than 3 years              | -4                                     |
| 3 but less than 5 years              | -5                                     |
| 5 years or more                      | -6                                     |

| Living arrangements at time of offence | Raw score 0 to less |
| No fixed abode                       | +3                     |
| Sibling or friend                    | +1                     |
| Cohabiting                           | -1                     |
| Wife                                 | -2                     |
| Relatives/in-laws                    | -3                     |
| Other                                | nil                    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time in last job</th>
<th>Raw score 0 to less</th>
<th>RPS</th>
<th>Raw score 0 to less</th>
<th>RPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short or casual</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No job for 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 but less than 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months but less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But notice also, that however simple the arithmetic may be, this is not a procedure that one can readily do in one's head. In other words, when presented with prisoners with a range of problems of home, employment, education, and previous offending it is unlikely that any of us can readily, in our heads, calculate the equivalent of the reconviction prediction score. This is important since it is precisely this question of integrating data from disparate sources that is claimed to be at the heart of the skill represented by human judgement. Although the means to predict re-offending are mathematically simple, they are nevertheless too complex for substitution by normal human decision-making.

**Actuarial versus Clinical Prediction**

There has been a long running debate about the relative efficacy in prediction of actuarial methods (of which this reconviction prediction scale is an excellent example) and methods using human judgement. There is ample empirical evidence to support the claim that in predicting reconviction, actuarial methods are the only real contenders. I will cite two examples to demonstrate the frailty of human judgement in this particular area.

It is certainly true that psychologists have been able to predict the post-release behaviour of offenders. A good example occurred in the series of investigations of Corrective Trainees, (reported in Williams, 1975). For one group the accuracy of psychological prognosis was reasonably good; dividing prisoners into three groups - those with a better than evens chance of future reconviction, those with an average chance of reconviction and those with a less than average chance of reconviction - produced the results set out in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘good' risk</th>
<th>average risk</th>
<th>‘bad' risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number not reconvicted</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number reconvicted</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Reconvicted</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice immediately that the largest proportions are placed in the average column which clearly has the least practical utility. Notice also that the psychologists were able to locate prognosis into only three classes; there was none of the precision or detail of the RPS. A more important problem is the fact that prognosis as such confounds the specifically psychological aspects of the judgement with the information already known to predict reconviction. Nevertheless the psychologists were able to demonstrate some ability to predict future offending.
However, doubt is cast on this ability by further investigation. Prognosis was also reported at the point of discharge. Here the results are displayed in the next table, (the numbers are smaller due to transfers etc).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>'good' risk</th>
<th>average risk</th>
<th>'bad' risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number not reconvicted</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number reconvicted</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% reconvicted</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An obvious inference from these data is that when an inmate is assessed on entry into the system then the prognosis is reasonably accurate because of the weight given to the objective features of his past history. As the inmate passes through the system, however, greater weight is given to his institutional performance and this unfortunately is an invalid basis for judgement. Not only is it invalid; it is also given inordinate weight, so that the final judgement nullifies the original accuracy. A very similar result is obtained from governors at the discharging institution, so the apparent uncertainty was not restricted to psychologists.

Further evidence that this is the case may be drawn from another prison research study (Williams, 1975). In this study the psychologists had to give four predictions - probable success, possible success, possible failure and probable failure; and although they tended to avoid using the extremes, nevertheless there was a systematic relationship between the prediction and the outcome.

<p>| Probable  | Possible  | Possible  | Probable  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>success</th>
<th>success</th>
<th>failure</th>
<th>failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Category: 35</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Reconvicted: 49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However these judgements were made in the context of a random allocation experiment. The psychologists were also asked to prognosticate given that the individual went to one of three different training regimes (they were asked to make the same prediction, but for each of the three different possible treatment/training regimes). Subsequently their prediction could be set against the outcome from the actual training regime that the individual was sent to.
The results are displayed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probable success</th>
<th>Possible success</th>
<th>Possible failure</th>
<th>Probable failure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in Category: 81</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Reconvicted: 63</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case the extreme categories were more readily utilised but the differentiation no longer had a consistent relationship with outcome. The results taken together seemed to suggest that the marginal ability professional staff have to predict the outcome for any particular individual is markedly impaired given knowledge of the specific treatment actually applied; in effect, psychologists were giving an exaggerated weight to particular kinds of treatment.

**Predicting unusual or rare offences**

Although it may be easy and useful to predict overall reconviction, nevertheless an important aspect of imprisonment is related to more serious events such as violent or sexual offending. The question of predicting specifically serious offences is more problematic primarily due to the comparative rarity of the offences in question. However it is certainly possible as a recent English study shows (Thornton and Travers, 1990).

In this study all male adult prisoners discharged from prisons in England and Wales from a sentence of at least four years *for a sexual offence* were identified (in total, 313 individuals). Their full conviction record was then abstracted to provide a complete picture of offending both prior and subsequent to the 1980 release date. Using statistical procedures it was then possible to attempt to predict the subsequent behaviour (after 1980) on the basis of the prior behaviour (before 1980).

The results may be briefly summarised. Sexual reconviction over the ten year period was predicted by:

- the total number of previous convictions
- the specific presence of a sexual previous conviction.

Again, the continuity of behaviour is evident and, interestingly, the commission of sexual offences is *independently* influenced by the total extent of previous criminal activity (*evidence of the versatility of offending*) and the commission of specifically sexual offences (*evidence of some specialisation*). The second result to emerge from this analysis was a distinction between rape and other sorts of sex offences. This was revealed by the fact that when these two kinds of offence were predicted separately, different elements in the previous history predicted the different offences.
To calculate the score for the risk of a *general violent reconviction* the elements that proved predictive were

- a previous conviction for rape.
- a previous conviction for non-sexual assault
- youthfulness

On the other hand, to calculate a score for *non-violent sexual reconviction* the predictive elements were

- a previous conviction for a non-violent sexual offence
- the total number of previous convictions
- motor vehicle reconviction.

Clearly, using previous criminal history to predict behaviour gives a very limited set of information on which to draw. Nevertheless, given just these three features it was possible to place offenders into one of three categories:

- low risk, intermediate risk and high risk;

for either *non-violent sexual offences* or *violent offences in general*.

When this was done over the ten year period, the reconviction rates for *general violence offending* were

- for the low risk group was 6%,
- for the intermediate risk group was 23%, and
- for the high risk group was 51%.

Thus it was possible to separate out three groups very clearly different in their potential risk and hence their treatment needs.

In terms of future reconviction for *non-violent sexual offending*, the results were

- for the low risk group the rate was 5%,
- for the medium risk the rate was 21%, and
- for the high risk group the rate was 41%.

Again, the simple use of three characteristics produced widely differing groups in terms of reconviction over the ten year period.
Clearly there is evidence here that it is possible to predict rare but serious offences, given certain behavioural criteria. It should be borne in mind that all of these offenders had been imprisoned for a sexual offence; we are dealing therefore with a very restricted set of the total prison population. On the other hand of course, this is precisely the group that will be in line for treatment under the sex offender treatment programme.

A second point to bear in mind is that the comparative rarity of sexual and violent offences has been counteracted by taking a longer follow-up period. Clearly, if treatment is to play an important role in rehabilitation, then for this group of offences longer follow-up periods will be needed for the evaluation. This is already the case in charting the progress of released lifers, where the results are reported for both two year and five year follow-up periods.

Finally, the demonstration that we can produce very different prognoses using just simple parameters of previous convictions would lead us to anticipate that a more refined scale using other factors (as in the RPS) would produce a better predictive device.

**Predicting treatment effectiveness**

It is clear from research that actuarial methods are more effective than clinical judgement in predicting recidivism. It is equally clear that treatment effectiveness would also be better assessed using actuarial methods (which generally translate into conventional research methodology in evaluation). The problem with evaluating the effectiveness of treatment is twofold. First, most clinical evaluation looks at small numbers comparatively quickly following treatment (the judgement generally consists of simple assertions that particular individuals 'have benefitted'). Second is the fact that the important difference when measuring treatment impact may be small. An example is illustrative.

In a four year study tracing more than 7,000 federal inmates for a year post-release it was shown that job training and prison industry programmes reduced recidivism. The study was conducted by Schneider et al (1991) for the Federal Bureau of Prisons, and compared federal inmates who volunteered for job training or industry programmes with a group of inmates who shared similar work, educational and criminal histories, but did not volunteer. Within a year of release, 10.1% of the control group were re-arrested or sent back to prison for parole violation, compared to 6.6% of the inmates who participated in the job programmes. This is a nice example of the magnitude of change that an effective treatment may produce; it is not dramatic but reducing recidivism from around 10% to 6% is both statistically and practically significant.

The important question for the way forward is whether these two kinds of event (prediction of post-release behaviour using previous histories, and systematic programmes or choices within institutions) can be combined to provide a process of evaluation that will establish a systematic knowledge-base for ‘best practice’ in prison treatment and training.
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Points Raised in Discussion:

On the point that the reconviction prediction details focuses on background information rather than drawing on any in-prison details, Mr Nuttall commented that when the scale was originally devised, some elements of prison behaviour were included. However, the only prison variable which proved predictive of risk of reconviction was whether a prisoner had attempted an escape. Other variables, such as number of reports, were not predictive of risk. Mr Williams said that if you can predict failure at the point of entry, it indicates that prison has little impact. If successful prison programmes were achieved, this should mean that extra elements could in future be added to the prediction score.

Mr Nuttall went on to describe how you could show the predicted outcome over a relatively short period of time; it was not necessary to wait until an offender had been released for two years before this was assessed. You could start measuring the predicted outcome a month after release. Dr Thornton pointed out that the rate of re-offending for sex offenders was very low in the first few months, so in order to make a good prediction there would need to be a very large sample.

Mr Emes asked whether any account was taken of maturational effects and how this related to delay in offending. Dr Thornton pointed out that the effect of age would generally be a very long-term process. A new reconviction prediction score, currently being developed, allowed one to make predictions over time, but this would still be over periods too short to reflect adequately the effects of maturation. The elements in the new scale were very similar to those already used. Mr Nuttall informed the group that another, more general, prediction score, for use by Probation Department, was also being developed.

Miss McCormick asked whether the research on prediction scores was exclusively confined to male prisoners. Mr Williams confirmed that it was. It was suggested by Dr Thornton that the results for females would probably be very similar. Miss McCormick pointed out that the effect of marriage, for example, might reveal very different results for males and females.
Session 5

Aggression: Strengths and Limitations of Anger Management Programmes -

Introduction and Overview

The natural step after the development of a programme addressing sexual offending is to consider the problem of aggressive behaviour. An added impetus is given by the fact that serious aggression can (and does) frequently occur inside prison, directed both at staff and at other prisoners. Programmes addressing aggression will, therefore, serve the goals both of rehabilitation and effective prison management.

Dr Thornton’s paper describes how modern anger management packages, which combine traditional cognitive anger management with behavioural skills training, seem well designed for use in relation to prison violence: there is evidence that they are effective in improving prison behaviour. Examination of data on violent crime suggests that such packages may be relevant to a significant number of violent offenders, but there are important elements in violent crime which are not picked up by this kind of treatment. Dr Thornton describes four areas of violent crime where anger management may not be a relevant strategy:

- ‘Cold’ violence
- Neurological impairment
- Post-traumatic stress disorder
- Offences motivated by sexual pleasure in violence

A more complex system of assessment and treatment may be required, particularly if the more serious kinds of violent crime are to be addressed.
SESSION V

Aggression: Strengths and Limitations of Anger Management Programmes

David Thornton

What is Anger Management?

Anger Management programmes are a popular remedy for aggressive behaviour whether inside prison or outside. The classical anger management programme was developed by Novaco (1975). This procedure combines an educational, cognitive component with relaxation training. The cognitive component is designed to make people aware of the sequence of events that normally precede anger so that they can recognise this sequence at an early enough stage to do something about it. The role in this sequence of the way people interpret the situation is emphasised. Alternative ways of interpreting provoking situations are suggested. The relaxation component is designed to combat the physical tension that is associated with becoming angry or trying to restrain anger.

In applying this technique to offenders it is usual to emphasise the consequences of losing one’s temper. Young offenders, especially, tend to start such courses convinced that there are many situations where angry aggression is a good idea. Adding up the advantages and disadvantages of doing so vis à vis situations in which offenders have lost their temper is intended to convince them that uncontrolled anger nearly always leads to problems. Modern anger control courses for offenders also normally include an element of social skills training. This is designed to give the individual some positive and effective behaviour with which to replace their ineffective angry behaviour.

Anger Management in Prison

DIP2 is organising staff training designed to enable more prisons to run anger management programmes for inmates. At this stage these courses are intended for those inmates who display angry aggressive behaviour in prison. Some of the ways angry aggression can be manifested in prison are listed in Table 1 below. Clearly individual behaviours from this list could occur in isolation for other reasons. The angrily aggressive inmate is, though, likely to manifest several of them.

Depending on the way the regime is run such behaviours may or may not lead to the inmate being put on governor’s report. For example, in a dispersal prison such behaviours will often be dealt with in other ways while in a YOI they will normally lead to a disciplinary report. Whether or not such behaviours lead to
formal punishment they are clearly undesirable from the point of view of the smooth running of the prison or the peace of mind of either inmates or staff.

Table 1: Anger Indicators in Day-to-Day Behaviour of Inmates

- Throw items about cell/wing
- Smash own possessions
- Damage to other inmate or prison property
- Irritable and abusive at unlock
- Shouts at staff
- Aggressive posture/stance when talking to staff
- Bangs on cell door
- Makes veiled threats
- Refuses exercise
- Refuses food
- Stomps about the wing
- Points finger in conversation
- Goes red in the face
- Tears his clothes
- Kicks objects for no reason
- Rapid irrational speech
- Loudly disputes decisions in games or sports
- Shouts at other inmates
- Shoves and pushes other inmates
- Argues with other inmates
- Comes to wing office swearing and shouting
- Walks off in middle of conversation
- Won't accept 'No'
- Avoided by most inmates

Source: Psychology Unit, HMP Wakefield, 1992
The Effectiveness of Prison Anger Management Programmes

There has been comparatively little work evaluating the effectiveness of modern anger management courses. Such courses tend to combine elements from techniques which have sometimes been used separately. Thus they include a mixture of cognitive anger management, behavioural social skills training, and relaxation training. Fortunately, there has been a reasonable amount of research into the effectiveness of treatments which have used one or more of these components. This research has been reviewed by Thornton (1988). The general pattern is that after treatment inmates are put on governor’s report much less frequently.

There is also evidence of change on questionnaire measures of attitude and behaviour (e.g., McDougall et al., 1987; Cullen, 1987). Most of this research relates to young offenders and there is as yet no comparable body of work examining the effect of anger control and related treatment with serious adult offenders.

Prison Anger Management and Violent Crime

There is no evidence regarding the effect of prison anger management on violent crime after release. It is possible, though, to consider its potential relevance by drawing on research into violent crime to see whether it is the kind of thing which might potentially be affected by the kind of changes which anger management is designed to produce. The remainder of this paper addresses that issue.

Forms of Violent Crime

Henderson (1986) identified four settings within which adult males tended to have committed violent crime: with another crime; in a family context; in a public place; in an institution. Just considering such a list makes it clear how heterogeneous violent crime is. A related typology has recently been proposed in some as yet unpublished work by Morrison (1992). This distinguishes domestic offences which often arise around disputes over the custody of children; offences arising in pubs and night-clubs; offences on the way home from the pub; and offences that occur in public space. She reports that different factors seemed to be involved in the different contexts. The pub incidents arose very fast in a context where lethal weapons (bottles, glasses) were immediately to hand. Offences on the way home from the pub on the other hand seemed to have more of an element of bravado about them.

This research also distinguished three kinds of sequence which can lead to a violent offence. The offence could arise: when an aggrieved individual ‘takes the law into their own hands’ when someone has done something ‘out of order’; when the individual is caught up in circumstances that he did not feel he could get out of without a show of violence; and displaced violence in which unrelated frustration was taken out on someone who just happened to be in the wrong place at the wrong time.
Common Threads

None of these classifications should be regarded as definitive but they do illustrate the difficulty of reducing violent crime to a simple formula. Nevertheless it was possible to discern some common threads in both the people and incidents involved in this study. Violent offenders often saw violence as inevitable, even obligatory in the circumstances they found themselves in. Often, though, they had misunderstood these circumstances. They seemed to have problems communicating about personal issues and tended to employ very simplistic thinking and problem solving when faced with difficult social situations. Often this would result in a series of provocations which they felt unable to ignore, a situation which ‘got out of hand’, and an eventual loss of temper.

Clearly the pattern described in this research is quite compatible with the Anger Management model. There are related findings from other research which also give plausibility to this way of conceptualising violence. For example, more than half of the violent offences in which young offenders become involved are committed when they are angry (Thornton et al, 1990). There is independent evidence that aggressive people, especially children or adolescents, tend to interpret other’s behaviour as hostile (eg Stefanek et al, 1987).

We have, then, a picture of interpersonal incompetence, rigid thinking and poor self-control interacting with particular sets of social norms (honour, defending your family etc) in situations where misunderstandings or confrontations easily arise. This suggests that the kind of anger management course which includes a social skills component will be potentially relevant to at least some forms of violent crime. There are, however, other findings which suggest a more complicated picture.

Cold Violence

Although much violence takes place when people are angry, many cases are not like this. Morrison found that about a third of the serious violent incidents in her study were committed by people who appeared to have been calm and in control of themselves at the time. Thornton et al (1990) found that nearly half of young offenders who reported violent offences denied having been angry at the time these offences were committed. People who commit this kind of cold violence appear to have a distinctive personality profile. In that study they were distinguished by markedly tough-minded personalities as compared to those whose violence was committed in anger.
Other Sources of Violence

Three other sources of violence have been distinguished, different from those postulated in the anger-control model. Hart (1987) has reviewed a number of studies which indicate marked excesses of neurological impairment amongst individuals with a record of repeated violence. It is possible, then, that some of the ‘lack of control’ attributed to violent offenders has a more biological origin and does not simply reflect a lack of skills.

A second line of work has implicated what is called post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Hodge (1991) has reviewed research indicating that exposure to traumatic stress, especially where this stress involves violence, can generate persistent violent behaviour amongst people without a history of violence. This phenomenon has been most clearly documented for Vietnam War veterans suffering from PTSD. However, amongst the general USA prisoner population, symptoms of PTSD were found to be much more common amongst inmates with either a current or previous conviction for violence, regardless of whether they had combat experience.

Finally, there is evidence for a group of offenders whose violent offences are motivated by a sexual pleasure in violence. Some rapists are known to masturbate to fantasies of violence (Quinsey et al, 1984). Many rapists go on to be convicted for what are superficially non-sexual assaults (Thornton and Travers, 1991). And the probability that they will show this pattern of general violence in their reconvictions is predictable by the extent to which they show measurable sexual responses to depictions of non-sexual violence (Rice et al, 1990). This finding can probably be linked with the report that serial murderers develop increasingly elaborate fantasies which mix a sexual and violent content and then are, at least partially, acted out in their offences (Prentky et al, 1989).

Conclusions

Modern anger management packages which combine traditional cognitive anger management with behavioural skills training seem well designed for use in relation to prison violence: there is evidence that they are effective in improving prison behaviour. Examination of data on violent crime suggests that such packages may be relevant to a significant number of violent offenders but there are important elements in violent crime which are not picked up by this kind of treatment. Particularly if the more serious kinds of violent crime are to be addressed, a more complex system of assessment and treatment will be required.
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Points Raised in Discussion:

Mr Bone asked how the training in Anger Management being organised by DIP2 affected those establishments already running anger management courses, such as Wakefield. Dr Thornton replied that the package was very similar to the one being run at Wakefield. The aim was to standardise the courses offered across the system, by better staff training.

Mr Emes felt the information provided by Dr Thornton’s presentation would be useful in informing Area Managers of the need to reassess the courses currently being run in their area.

Dr Thornton’s presentation demonstrated that whilst anger management courses had been found to be useful strategies for modifying behaviour within the prison context, there was little evidence that the effects generalised to inhibit violent/aggressive behaviour in the outside world. This led to questions being raised as to:

- whether any evaluative component was being built into the anger management course currently being organised,
- whether any proper evaluative studies had so far been done.

In response to the first issue, Dr Thornton replied that up to now, courses were mostly run by psychology departments. The aim was to create a training manual and pass the training on to officers. Psychologists would provide consultation and support. A fairly simple evaluative measure would be used.

Dr Thornton’s reply to the second question was that there had been no evaluations using adequate control groups. At present we were looking at the potential for influencing anger management outside, and this necessitated looking at the factors involved in violent crime. As his paper had emphasized, whilst some violent crime implied components which would be amenable to anger management procedures, others did not fit so easily within the model. Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) was one of these areas, and Miss McCormick asked whether PTSD might be a result of physical or sexual abuse as a child. Dr Thornton said the indications were that this might be so, and the implication of this was that the problem would not therefore be addressed by anger management procedures, but required a focus on the initial trauma. This kind of issue illustrated the need for much more research. This might involve looking at other specialised programmes in the community.
Session 6
What are Regimes?

Introduction and Overview

The report of the Control Review Committee (CRC) which appeared in 1984 made important observations on the nature of the prison regime. The vagueness of the concept of the Regime was criticised and an alternative to the phrase 'regime activities' was recommended. Essentially, the Committee sought to emphasise the need to organise the different regime activities into individual 'prisoner programmes' or simply 'programmes'.

Two aspects were stressed. First, these programmes should be individualised and subject to continual review involving the prisoner's views and performance. Second, the successful management of these programmes required an efficient management information system to monitor delivery and performance.

The CRC report was influential and anticipated many features of sentence planning. Obviously in the context of the current seminar, the CRC recommendations also anticipated the view that treatment in prison should not consist simply of offence related programmes, but should in addition involve a range of life and social skills development that may find natural representation in prison work, education and routines.

In this session, David Longley used data drawn from the dispersal system to show how the prison regime may be described in a more definitive way. This is relevant to the development of the information technology necessary to facilitate and sustain coherent sentence planning. His main findings were:

☐ in the dispersal system about 60% of the day is 'non-contact' time for staff and inmates; primarily, the period when prisoners are locked in their cells

☐ 'contact' time between staff and inmates in the dispersal system is divided almost equally between work/education and meals/association

☐ prison misbehaviour is primarily committed when staff require co-operation from inmates in respect of the demands of the routines; incidents made subject to disciplinary reports peak twice during the day, at the beginning of the morning and afternoon activities

☐ the reporting points, feeding information into the regime monitoring system, provide a good basis for capturing the range and uptake of prison activities at present.
SESSION VI

What are Regimes?

David Longley

'We would like to see a move towards individual programmes for prisoners, incorporating more diverse activity than at present and geared towards the abilities and needs of the inmate himself. What we broadly envisage is that a long-term prisoner's individually tailored programme would be put together from the available modules during the period of initial assessment. Throughout the sentence there would be routine reviews, with the prisoner personally involved, where his participation in the modules would be discussed and changes to his programme would be considered.

'Encouragement of diverse activities and monitoring prisoners' performance in them is in no way opposed to the need to keep establishments' performance in delivering activities under close review too. The two objectives are complementary. Nevertheless, we do think that one factor that has hindered progress in this field is the tendency in this country to speak and think in terms of the regime. As we have noted, the concept of the regime is large and vague, and implies generally that every prisoner in an establishment is subject to the same process regardless of his needs or abilities; and measuring performance across its span raises complex questions. We would like to see the phrase "regime activities" replaced by some description that gives the, accurate, idea that what is at issue is a bundle of prisoner-orientated activities that are amenable to objective performance setting and efficiency audit. We suggest 'prisoner programmes' or simply "programmes".

'We emphatically do not see such programmes as soft options. Properly organised programmes would make greater demands of prisoners than do present regimes. In particular, the whole rationale of programmes emphasises personal responsibility, and we are sure that this is healthy. Furthermore, we believe that programmes which involve prisoners personally must be more conducive to control than the present industry-centred regimes which leave many prisoners under-employed and resentful.

'These suggestions for the development of programmes highlight the need for more timely and consistent management information about prison activities. This is but one example of the more general need to use new technology to up-rate management information in the Prison Department and that is already under active study.'


Paragraphs pp 27-30
Managing prisoners' programmes

The work outlined below began in early 1990 when the HQ section responsible was drafting a Circular Instruction to introduce one of the deferred 1984 Control Review Committee recommendations, namely the introduction of Sentence Planning for Long Term prisoners.

The proposal was to begin with those inmates serving ten years plus, with five or more years to their EDR. Our task initially was to assess whether Category A inmates, nearly all of whom are serving sentences of ten years or more, could be included under the terms of the Circular Instruction or whether the special security constraints pertaining to this group rendered this impracticable.

An analysis of the movements of these inmates revealed that in the main, the Category A inmates moved as often as other long term prisoners, moving on average every 12 to 18 months. In the light of this, and other analyses of what was available in prisons in the form of possible programmes and activities, we began to look at what might be done proactively with Category As (assuming that what could be done for this group could be done for the others). Perhaps the heart of the report from Regimes Research and Development Section in Autumn 1990 was:

'It is important to ensure that the individual programmes should mesh together and overlap in their effects; indeed, it is through the scheduling of such programmes that Sentence Planning may be defined. In many ways, it is not so much that Sentence Planning or Inmate Programmes need to be established, since so many of the component parts already exist; it is rather that the present situation should be more systematically developed, with a clearer practical rationale informing the revision of allocation and assessment procedures. And the assessment is not just of the prisoner. The gaps in our existing knowledge are not restricted to uncertainty about the inmate; the actual functions of activities are also unclear and will require extensive analysis......

'At a more general level any properly organised educational programme (for example) will develop a number of skills in addition to the subject named on the timetable. These could include social skills, communication skills, the ability to co-operate with others, to organise one's time, and so on. Different courses will lay different emphases on these 'hidden' aspects of the curriculum, and attention must be paid to them if a suitable programme is to be developed for any particular individual. Similarly a range of needs may be met through the proper choice of activity. Different jobs require and develop different abilities: for example, interpersonal skills, concentration, reliability, responsibility, or attention to detail. These will be present in varying degrees in all jobs, and a graded programme of activities can be used to address a range of problems in the natural context of the inmate's normal working day. Treatment need not necessarily and perhaps should not be seen as some separate activity grafted onto the prison regime.

'All of this is necessarily speculative, however, simply because no-one has in the past looked at the possibilities of this kind of development, and hence the information on any systematic scale is absent. It is our belief that it is at the informational level that planning should begin - there has to be a system capable of holding and making generally accessible the enormous amount of information required in the implementation and management of sentence planning'.

Programmes and Sentence Planning for Category A Inmates

Regimes, Research and Development Section, DIP2, September 1990
This paper attempts to provide an answer to the question 'what are regimes?' by
describing 'routines' and 'activities'. Regimes are the configuration of routines and
activities as detailed in the Governor's annual contract. Data from two dispersal prisons
are used to illustrate how the day to day routines and available activities naturally
constrain what can in fact be delivered in the context of Regime and Sentence Planning.

Bearing in mind the fact that inmates move between prisons on average each year or so,
the information presented here should set the context for the more specific proposals in
Session 8 which illustrate how these routines and activities can be used as effective
elements of a 'naturalistic' approach to behaviour modification or personal development.
In Session 8 a model of Sentence Management is specifically designed to serve as a
substrate for Sentence Planning, whilst at the same time providing an infrastructure for
the audit of regime delivery at whatever level this is required.

Routines & Inmate Activities

A. Routines

Figures 1 and 2 show how the time that each element of the weekday routines at HMP
Wakefield and HMP Parkhurst occupy. The time inmates are locked in their cells is
essentially staff-inmate 'non-contact time'.

FIGURE 1: HMP Wakefield
Elements of the 24 Hour Weekday Routine

- Evening Association 17.50–20.00
- Night Lock Up/Sleep 20.00–07.45
- Lock Up 16.35–17.50
- Tea 15.45–16.35
- Work 1 13.40–15.45
- Exercise 13.10–13.40
- Lock Up 11.45–13.10
- Lunch 10.45–11.45
- Work 1 08.40–10.45
- Breakfast 07.45–08.40
Figure 3 presents the same information, but here the elements of the routines have been aggregated by type to illustrate the proportion of the day taken up by each of the broad elements.
Figure 4 completes the series by excluding the 'non-contact time'. This figure makes the simple point that the major elements of 'staff-inmate contact time' are the 'Work/Education', and 'Meals/Association' periods.

These two basic elements of the routines are fundamental. If we look first to the 'Meals/Association' periods, and consider the amount of supervision these require, it makes sense to look to the incidence of disciplinary infractions as a measure of the level of inmate co-operation with these elements of the routine.

Figures 5 and 6 distribute Governor's Reports at HMP Parkhurst and HMP Wakefield over the past three years, both by time into the routine, and the location of the infraction. It is clear that in both prisons the majority of the infractions occur, in fact, with reference to the 'Work/Education' periods, both morning and afternoon.
If prison delinquency was simply a function of the time the elements of the routine occupy, we might expect there to be an equivalent number of infractions in the combined Meals/Association periods. Figure 4 illustrates that Meals/Association and Work/Education occupy a similar proportion of the day. However, Figures 5a and 6a demonstrate that they are not equivalent in terms of delinquency. It is primarily the demands of the routines with respect to the Work/Education periods which elicit most of the delinquency.
Despite the fact that Work/Education accounts for the same proportion of the day as the combined Meals/Association periods, the frequency of infractions is approximately twice as high during the combined work periods as it is during the Meals/Association periods.
Furthermore, as illustrated in Figure 7, the majority of the infractions occur on the wings, not in the work areas themselves. The infractions are antecedent to the work.

**Figure 7: HMP Parkhurst (B & M Wings) Disciplinary Report by Time Into Work Periods & Location of Infraction**

*Workshop/Education*  
*Other*  
*Wing/Landing/Movement*

![Bar chart showing disciplinary reports by time into work periods and location of infraction.

Figure 8 demonstrates that the reports tend to be primarily breaches of 'Offences Against Discipline', 'Refusal to Go to Work', and 'Abusive Behaviour'.

**Figure 8: HMP Wakefield – Disciplinary Report by Time Into Work Periods & Class of Infraction**

*Other*  
*Assaults*  
*Abusive Conduct*  
*Offences Against Discipline*  
*Refuse To Go To Work*
When the time of the offending is examined closely it is clear that the distribution is bimodal, one peak in the morning and another in the afternoon (and this is a consistent finding throughout the Dispersal System). Furthermore, within each of the work periods, the distribution of infractions is skewed, most infractions occurring in the early parts of this element of the routines.

Both Figures 7 and 8 make it clear that throughout the two periods which make up 'Work/Education', the incidence of offending progressively decays, supporting the conjecture that prison delinquency is primarily emitted when staff require co-operation from inmates with respect to the demands of the routines. Such delinquency is to be contrasted with co-operation with the routines, and as a potential area of attainment, this dimension of behaviour is focal at this stage of the argument for a system of Sentence Management as a substrate for Sentence Planning.

B. Activities

Turning from the routines, and looking more closely at the other main aspect of staff/inmate contact time, namely the periods of Work/Education, Figure 9 illustrates the number of inmates planned for each week (under function 17) at Parkhurst and Wakefield by staff supervising each class of inmate activity. The majority of inmates are involved in some form of education (Full-Time Education Classes, Vocational Training Courses, Civilian Instructor led courses), industrial activities (textile workshops, laundries etc.) or domestic tasks on the wings.

![Figure 9: HMP Parkhurst: Planned Inmates by Activity Area](image)

![Figure 9: HMP Wakefield: Planned Inmates by Activity Area](image)
Figures 10 and 11 break these activities down into sub-activities, or 'Reporting Points'. This shows how many inmates are accommodated in each particular workshop (at HMP Wakefield, these are mainly textiles shops), or class of education.
The focus of Session 8 is on how the demand characteristics of inmate activities (Reporting Points) and the routines (eg movements to these activities), might most effectively be used in the service of Sentence Planning.

Finally, there is a strong argument for demanding consistency of practice between prisons in that, especially in the long term prison estate, inmates are regularly moved between prisons, often as part of long term plans. Fundamental to consistent practice is the concept of an inmate’s record of attainment determining future planning. Given this, a common system for capturing information throughout the estate must be implemented if Sentence Planning is to be a systematic, deliverable, and thereby credible process.

**Points Raised in Discussion**

Because of the intimate relationship between the work reported here and that to be introduced in Session 8, discussion was deferred until after that session.
Session 7
The Impact of Regime on Offending -

Introduction and Overview

An important corollary to the assertion that a well-designed prison treatment can have a beneficial impact on reconviction is that badly-designed treatment could therefore actually make matters worse. David Thornton reviews the evidence that this is indeed the case, drawing particularly on the research surrounding the prevention and treatment of delinquency inside prison.

Two distinct patterns of results emerge:

☐ absconding, in-sentence failure and 'successful' delinquent behaviour in an institution all seem to lead to an increased risk of reconviction; and

☐ repeated institutional punishment and loss of remission seem to be associated with return to custody and specifically with reconviction for violent offences.

However, when prison staff succeed in leading prisoners to behave less delinquently in prison, the evidence suggests that this effect carries over to less criminal behaviour after release.
The Impact of Regime on Offending

David Thornton

Prison Adjustment and Re-offending

Much of the efforts of prison staff are directed to securing inmates co-operation with prison regimes and discouraging inmates from preying on each other. Put more generally, this effort is directed to the discouragement of delinquency in prison. This is clearly a necessary and worthwhile activity in its own right but the question arises, does it make any difference to inmates behaviour after release? Does the predatory, defiant or manipulative inmate become more dangerous after release as a result of this manner of coping with the prison environment? This paper outlines the results of a series of studies which were designed to look at this issue. The studies considered fall into four groups: studies of absconding; studies of in-sentence failure; studies of defiance; and studies of contingency. Each type of study will be examined in turn but before doing so it is worth considering one or two methodological points which apply to almost all the studies.

Methodological Issues

Most of the studies to be considered here adopt some way of classifying inmates adjustment in prison and then examine the reconviction rates of inmates who show different ways of adjusting to prison. The problem with such a design is that inmate characteristics which pre-exist their sentence may influence both their adjustment to prison and their probability of re-offending after release. For example, age and number of previous convictions both reliably predict reconviction rates. Young inmates tend to be reconvicted more often and may also be more difficult to manage. The problem then is how to make appropriate allowance for such background factors when examining the reconviction rates of inmates who have shown different forms of adjustment to prison.

One method is to use human judgement to interpret information about an offender’s life prior to sentence or to integrate this information together with information about their conduct in prison. This method was used by Williams (1975). The results were quite striking. Psychologists using background information alone were quite good at predicting reconviction. With the addition of information about prison adjustment, however, their judgements became hopelessly inaccurate. Taken at face value this result suggested that prison conduct was an irrelevant distraction from the real predictor which was past criminal history.
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The difficulty with that interpretation is that it may be that the judges simply disregarded criminal history when they felt they knew what the inmate was 'really' like on the basis of observations of the inmate in prison. Thus their ability to predict may have deteriorated not because prison conduct was unimportant but because you need to take both it and prior history into account when predicting reconviction.

A more appropriate methodology is to use statistical analysis of the relationship between background characteristics and reconviction to calculate an 'expected reconviction rate' and then to see whether inmates who show a particular form of adjustment to prison have a reconviction rate which is different from that which is expected on the basis of their past histories. There are two ways in which such 'expected reconviction rates' can be obtained, one is to use a prediction scale derived from previous research and the other is to use data from the sample under examination to, in effect, construct such a prediction scale for that sample. The statistical methodology for these kinds of analysis is now well established. The method of choice is generally Logistic Regression though nearly equivalent results can be obtained using more primitive procedures.

However sophisticated the statistical methodology though it must be remembered that a statistical calculation of 'expected reconviction rate' is only as good as the background variables which are included in the calculation. Thus if some important aspect of the offender's background is omitted from the calculation the results may be biased. Fortunately this is not such a big problem as might appear. There has been considerable research into the prediction of reconviction from background characteristics. The main predictors are now well established. Whilst new predictors may be identified in the future it is most unlikely that they will make more than a marginal difference to prediction. Thus so long as the main predictors are included in the calculations there is likely to be little or no bias in the calculation of expected reconviction rates for groups of inmates showing different forms of adjustment to prison.

An alternative procedure is to show that the institutional behaviour in question varies strikingly as a function of how the institution is run but that differences between institutions are independent of the kinds of inmate they receive. Where that is true, it is possible to interpret correlations between average institutional behaviour and average reconviction rate as indicating that generating bad institutional behaviour thereby generates higher reconviction rates.

Studies of Absconding

Clarke and Martin (1971) provide a review of their studies of absconding from Approved School. They found that Approved Schools varied dramatically in their abscond rates in ways which did not reflect their intake. Thus absconding was largely dependent on the way the school was run. Despite this, those inmates who absconded went on to be reconvicted at a higher rate than expected. A subsequent study by Dunlop (1975) confirmed that Approved Schools with high
abscond rates had higher reconviction rates than would be expected on the basis of the kind of inmates they received. Sinclair and Clarke (1982) went on to argue that the experiences involved in absconding specifically made people more criminal. They pointed out that the short term consequences of absconding were nearly always attractive to the offender so that in effect they had the experience of delinquent behaviour in the institution (the abscond itself) making their life easier. In addition, during the abscond they would not uncommonly need to turn to crime to make their way and so again they would have the experience of delinquent behaviour being useful to them.

Studies of In-Sentence Failure

Absconding might be regarded as an example of delinquent behaviour occurring during the sentence. Especially in open settings it is possible for more straightforward types of crime (burgling the neighbours for example) to occur during sentence. Sinclair (1981) calculated failure rates for the inmates of probation hostels. The focus here was on failure occurring during the twelve months the offenders spent at the hostel. Sinclair showed that failure rates varied considerably between hostels in a way which reflected how the hostel was run rather than the type of probationer in the hostel. Cases were then followed up in the subsequent two years. In that follow-up period 70% of cases who had failed while at the probation hostel were reconvicted as compared to 50% of those who had succeeded at the probation hostel.

Sinclair’s own analysis failed to properly address the question of whether hostels with high in-hostel failure rates had a correspondingly high reconviction rate. Thornton (1987) re-examined Sinclair’s data and was able to calculate that establishments with a low in-hostel failure rate would have had a reconviction rate at least ten percentage points lower than those hostels with a high in-hostel failure rate. Thus hostels which generated a high in-sentence failure rate seemed also to generate an unexpectedly high reconviction rate.

Analogous results were obtained when Mark Williams and I analysed the reconviction data relating to Taylor House Hostel (YOPU, 1980). This was a borstal hostel. Pairs of suitable cases were matched on criminal history and other relevant variables and then a randomly selected member of each pair was assigned to the hostel while the other member of the pair remained in the borstal until release. Assigning inmates to the hostel appeared to be mildly beneficial over all. The reconviction rate for hostel cases was 46% as compared to 56% for those who stayed in the borstal. It is necessary to re-analyse the data in order to make it relevant to our present concerns.

Allocation to the hostel opened up a possibility of failing before release in a way which the security of the borstal would have prevented. The first issue then is whether cases which failed while at the hostel were worse risks than those who succeeded there. A rather complicated analysis had to be carried out to assess
this (see note 1). This analysis indicated that the cases that failed while at the borstal hostel were not worse risks for reconviction than those who succeeded. This means that we can go on to compare the reconviction rate of hostel cases who succeeded while at the hostel to the rate of those who failed there. The former group had a reconviction rate of 37% while the latter had a reconviction rate of 59% (this difference is statistically significant at the 0.05 level). Thus failure at the hostel does seem to be associated with an unexpectedly high reconviction rate.

Studies of Defiance

Within a reasonably secure institution failures of the kind considered above are, to a fair extent, precluded. On the other hand delinquency within the prison can still be manifested by rejecting or defying staff authority. Defiance of staff authority is naturally recorded within prisons by the system of disciplinary reports and the associated punishments though such variables must be used cautiously as institutions and staff may vary in the level of mis-behaviour that has to be exhibited before the formal disciplinary procedure is invoked.

Despite this there have been some positive results. Unpublished analyses of the data reported by Thornton et al (1984) indicated that amount of remission lost predicted return to custody in the year following release for both senior and junior detention centre. Loss of remission was however quite independent of previous criminal history.

A similar result was reported by Broadhurst and Maller (1992) drawing on a computerised data base covering all prisoners discharged from prisons in Western Australia from mid 1975 to mid 1987 (over 16,000 cases). They examined probability of being reconvicted and returned to prison as a function of a variety of background variables and prison discipline record. They report that cases who repeatedly incurred punishment in prison were significantly more likely to be reconvicted and returned to prison. That is, their return to prison rate was reliably higher than would have been expected on the basis of their prior history. This pattern held up both for the prison population as a whole and for sex offenders in particular.

Both the detention centre data and Broadhurst and Maller’s study focused on return to custody. Consequently it is the more serious kind of reconviction that is likely to have been associated with prison defiance. To examine this possibility further I analysed data from a six year follow-up of male youth custody trainees. There were just over 600 cases in this sample. Two forms of reconviction were examined: reconviction for any offence and reconviction for a violent offence. Regression analyses were used to examine the effect of having incurred governor’s reports while statistically allowing for the effect of number of previous convictions, number of previous violent convictions, and age on discharge. For violent reconviction there was a statistically significant trend indicating that the more governors reports inmates had incurred the more their
reconviction rate rose above that to be expected on the basis of their previous history. A similar trend was apparent in the analysis of general reconviction but it was weaker and not statistically reliable.

Broadhurst and Maller emphasise that the trend is particularly clear where a repeated pattern is involved. Following this suggestion the table below relates convictions for repeated violence (either before or after the current sentence) to repeated disciplinary infractions during sentence.

**Previous and Subsequent Violence as a Function of Prison Punishment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary History</th>
<th>% Repeated Previous Violence</th>
<th>% Repeated Subsequent Violence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent convictions for those with 0 or 1 Governors Reports</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent convictions for those with Repeated Governors Reports</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table should be read as indicating that the inmates who repeatedly got into trouble inside prison were no more violent outside prison prior to this experience but they were nearly twice as violent outside prison after this experience.

**Studies of Contingency**

The studies examined so far all indicate that when a regime elicits delinquent behaviour inside prison the effect carries over to some extent to the outside world. This may be too simple a picture though. The following study was carried out to test the idea that delinquent behaviour in the institution would be more likely to be carried over if it had worked. 'Worked' here means made the inmates life in prison easier.

Junior detention centre trainees were interviewed about their experience in DC using the Custodial Adjustment Questionnaire (Thornton, 1987). This allowed them to be classified according to the degree of delinquency they had shown inside (delinquency here meaning defiance of staff, thieving, vandalism, and fighting) and the degree of distress (anxiety, depression etc) they were experiencing. Interview and follow-up data were available for just over 400 cases. These data were then related to reconviction after release. Regression analysis showed that delinquency in the institution was related to reconviction only when it was accompanied by low levels of distress. This pattern held up even when the effect on reconviction of a large array of personality variables as well as social history and criminal record were taken into account. That is, those inmates who experienced the combination of delinquent behaviour in the DC and low distress had higher reconviction rates than would have been expected given their personalities and past histories. On the other hand inmates who
behaved delinquently in the institution but who experienced distress while doing so did not appear to carry their delinquent behaviour over to the outside world after release. Based on this result it is possible to advance the more general proposition that we can expect inmates to become more delinquent, to show raised reconviction rates, where a change in regime relaxes the normal contingencies which, as it were, discourage delinquency in the institution.

A more direct way of studying the effect of the consequences that inmates experience for their misbehaviours is to examine the results obtained from studies which examine the effectiveness of regimes which have systematically arranged that 'good' institutional behaviour leads to having a 'better time' than bad institutional behaviour.

Some degree of control over delinquent behaviour in prison is attempted in all establishments. Failing in this would make it impossible to run prisons. There are however special kinds of regime which very specifically try to create an effective contingency between the quality of an inmates behaviour in prison and how good a time they have. The best established of this kind of procedure is what is called a token-economy. In a token economy well defined 'good' and 'bad' behaviours are identified in a way which can be reliably measured. When inmates exhibit specific 'good' behaviours they receive tokens which can be exchanged for desirable goods. These regimes do obtain a very powerful control over inmate behaviour, inmates behave much better under them. If delinquent behaviour inside prison is transferred to the outside world then this encouragement of non-delinquent behaviour inside should lead to lowered reconviction rates. Meta-analyses of these programmes (which collate results across studies to identify general patterns) have found that they do generally lead to reduced reconviction rates and that this effect is at least as powerful as any specific 'treatment programme'.

Summary and Conclusions

Two distinct patterns of results have been identified here:

☐ absconding, in-sentence failure, and successful delinquent behaviour in the institution all seem to lead to a raised risk of reconviction,

☐ repeated institutional punishment and loss of remission on the other hand, seem to be associated with return to custody, and, specifically, with reconviction for violent offences.

Prison inmates are repeatedly faced with choosing between more or less delinquent ways of coping with the threats and opportunities posed by the prison environment. Prison staff devote a great deal of effort to leading prisoners to behave less delinquently in prison. The evidence reviewed here suggests that when they succeed in this the effect carries over to less criminal behaviour after release.
Note 1

The data set did not contain any background information on the cases so it was not possible to determine directly whether cases who failed at the hostel were worse risks for reconviction than those who succeeded at the hostel. However the matter can be approached indirectly by analysing the reconviction rates for the cases who were not assigned to the hostel. It will be remembered that the procedure for assigning cases between hostel and borstal involved forming pairs of cases which had been matched on past criminal history. This means for each case who was assigned to the hostel there was a ‘twin’ (with the same criminal history) who was assigned to the borstal. Thus if the cases who failed at the hostel had certain characteristics (say lots of previous convictions) then their ‘twins’ assigned to the borstal must as well. Equally if the cases who succeeded at the hostel had particularly small criminal histories then their ‘twins’ must too. Put more generally, if the hostel failures had characteristics which made them bad risks for reconviction then so must their borstal ‘twins’. And if the hostel successes had characteristics which made them better risks for reconviction then their ‘twins’ must also be better risks.

Thus corresponding to the two groups of hostel cases (hostel failures and hostel successes) there are two groups of borstal ‘twins’ (cases twinned to the hostel failures and cases twinned to the hostel successes). The two groups of ‘twins’ must therefore perfectly mirror any prior differences in risk of reconviction between the hostel failures and the hostel successes. The only difference between a ‘twin’ and the corresponding hostel case is that the hostel case has had all the experiences associated with the hostel (including succeeding or failing there) while the ‘twin’ has not. This means that we can test whether there was a difference in prior risk of reconviction between hostel failures and hostel successes by comparing their respective groups of ‘twins’. If there was such a difference then this will have generated a corresponding difference between the groups of ‘twins’. And this difference in risk of reconviction between the groups of ‘twins’ should express itself in a difference between the two groups of ‘twins’ in their actual observed reconviction rates.

In fact the borstal cases matched to ("twinned with") hostel successes had a one year reconviction rate of 58% while the borstal cases matched to ("twinned with") the hostel failures had a one-year reconviction rate of 52%. The difference is small, not statistically reliable and in the opposite direction to that which would be expected if cases who failed at the hostel had been worse risks than those who succeeded there. It seems reasonable to conclude that hostel-failure was under environmental control and not related to prior criminality.
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Points Raised in Discussion:

Discussion of the first pattern of results referred to by Dr Thornton (relating to absconding, in-sentence failure, and successful delinquency in the institution) began with Mr Emes raising two questions about the relationship between absconding and reconviction rates:

- is the fact that absconding is related to higher reconviction rates explicable simply in terms of differences in the security facilities at different institutions? and

- is the effect of high absconding rates on subsequent reconvictions exhibited at a general level (influencing the reconviction rates of the institution as a whole) or at a more specific level (affecting only the particular individuals)?

Dr Thornton replied that the approved schools where the research had been conducted were all open institutions; and the influence of absconding on reconvictions was at the individual rather than the institutional level.

Whether it was possible to detect the specific factors within the regime which lead to a high absconding rate was also raised. Dr Thornton replied that there was probably a combination of factors, which might vary from institution to institution. One simple factor, for example, was proximity to a main road. This was a matter of opportunity rather than concerning the nature of the regime. Other factors, more directly related to the regime, included the way that workshops operated in the institution, and the amount of bullying that occurred.

In relation to the second pattern of results described by Dr Thornton, that loss of remission and repeated punishments within the institution were both related to higher reconvictions for serious violent offences, it was pointed out that both of these suggest the opposite of ‘successful delinquency’. Mr Bone raised the question of whether the significant factor was the amount of punishment received, or the behaviour which led to that punishment. Dr Thornton said that it was difficult to answer that question with any certainty.

The discussion widened into a debate on the problems of identifying the important mechanisms underlying the institutional behaviour related to high reconvictions. Dr Thornton pointed out that it was possible to identify aspects of the regime which do not make a difference to reconviction rates. For example, whether a regime was tough or easy did not apparently influence reconviction rates. However, the amount of delinquent behaviour occurring within the regime does have an impact. A ‘quiet nick’ might be a bad sign if it meant that a lot of successful (ie hidden) delinquency was going on. What the research clearly indicated was the importance of preventing successful delinquency occurring in establishments.
Session 8
Sentence Management and Sentence Planning

Introduction and Overview

Sentence Planning (SP) is obviously an extremely important development in the management of imprisonment. The necessity to integrate offence-related treatment with other prison training and general prison-life experience is implied by the research described in earlier sessions. This in itself adds weight to the arguments in favour of Sentence Planning. The logistics of SP are considerable, however.

David Longley presented a model for SP that he believed was sufficiently detailed both to reflect adequately the policy, but also to address the operational problems and practicalities of implementation.

A detailed specification follows that was prepared earlier for the Sentence Planning group, looking at Category A prisoners.

The major points made were that at the heart of SP was a five step cycle:

- inmates are observed under natural conditions of activities
- observed behaviour (attainment in activities) is recorded (continuous assessment)
- profiles of attainments become the focus for interview dialogues and contracts with prisoners
- inmates are set targets based on attainments
- elements of problem behaviour are addressed by appropriate allocation.

How this could be implemented, using existing information technology was described together with the relationship to current Regime Monitoring.
SESSION VIII

SENTENCE MANAGEMENT and SENTENCE PLANNING

A Discussion Document from the Regimes Research & Development Section

Introduction

Over the past 16 months, the RRD Section has carried out research into the viability of Sentence Planning for Category A inmates and continued research and operational profiling of behaviour in the Long Term Prison system (using PROBE). From this work, the Section has developed a possible strategy for the general management of Inmate Programmes which is here referred to as Sentence Management; a logical foundation upon which an effective approach to Sentence Planning can be built.

Since the reorganisation in September 1990, the Section has worked with both DIP1 and DOC1 on the development of Sentence Planning policy. This paper summarises the way the future operation of this policy might best be shaped under the direction of Directorate of Inmate Programmes.

The general approach to Sentence Planning adopted by DIP1 and DOC1 has been consultative, encouraging establishments to adopt a minimal framework whereby they develop their own style of Sentence Planning, with the emphasis on Planning. Very much with resources in mind, DIP1 has outlined seven main points with which it expects establishments to comply:

- There will be an initial profile including an account of offending behaviour, personal background and the prisoner’s needs and plans.
- This will form the basis for a more considered plan to use the resources and time available to help the prisoner to lead a law-abiding and useful life in custody and after release.
- Where appropriate the plan will have two elements: the firm and foreseeable and the longer-term and more provisional.
- The plan will be reviewed regularly throughout the sentence.
- The plan will be written in a document to which the prisoner will have access on request. This document will enable prisoners to record their comments.
- This document will accompany prisoners during their sentence and a copy will be given to the prisoner and the after-care supervisor on release.
- The existence of the plan and a simple code indicating its main features would be included in LIDS to ensure that it is considered when decisions about the prisoner are taken. This will also provide a basis for resource planning.
Along with guidenotes, DIP1 has circulated to establishments a standard, *Sentence Plan Summary Form*. This form makes provision for the recording of Short and Long Term Targets, is signed by the inmate and staff and is periodically supplemented by new Summary Forms as targets are completed, and new targets identified. The RRD system outlined below is consistent in principle with the guidelines issued by DIP1, and may be understood as the provision of a substrate for both the guidelines and Sentence Plan Summary Form, whilst also serving as an information base for sections such as DOC2 and DOC1 who have specific information needs with respect to the inmate groups they manage and assess. The system outlined in this paper is flexible enough to allow all groups to define the information they need, and ensure that it is collected and collated systematically. RRD’s research has led to the conclusion that Sentence Planning will require a fundamental, systematic, and nationally implemented information base and that this could most efficiently be derived from the management of inmate activities throughout the estate. According to this view, *Sentence Planning* needs to be supported by a system of ‘*Sentence Management*’ which focuses on the structure and functions of available and potential inmate activities. In this way, Sentence Planning would be integrated with the *Regime Monitoring System*, effectively developing within the framework outlined in CI 55/1984.

This implies that the most effective way to launch Sentence Planning is not as an additional task grafted onto the regime, but as a natural development and improvement of inmate review and reporting practices.

The system specified below is efficient and cost-effective with the potential infrastructure to support and integrate several initiatives which have begun since the re-organisation. Although not covered in this note, two of the most significant are *Prisoners Pay*, and *The Place of Work in the Regime*.

In broad outline, what is proposed has much in common with the Department of Education and Science’s 1984 initiative *Records of Achievement* and has the benefit of using this nationally implemented programme of behaviour assessment as a source of best practice. Whilst the initiative outlined below is an independent development which took its cue from recommendations published in the 1984 CRC Report, from which the PROBE (PROfiling BEhaviour) project developed, results of research and development work over the past six years are reassuringly compatible with the work done throughout the education system during the same period. In this context, what is outlined below focuses on what the DES refers to as *Formative Profiling* (continuous assessment and interactive profiling involving the inmate throughout his career) rather than *Summative Profiling* (which provides a review somewhat akin to the parole review, or more locally, Long Term Reviews, and is basically what is captured by the DIP1 Summary Form). In all that follows, the recommendations of the CRC Report are seen to be integrally related to the policy set out in CI 55/1984.
Broad Outline

The system, for national implementation, across all sentence groups can be specified as a five step cycle:

- 1. Inmates are observed under natural conditions of activities.
- 2. Observed behaviour (attainment in activities) is recorded (continuous assessment).
- 3. Profiles of attainments become the focus for interview dialogues/contracts.
- 4. Inmates are set targets based on attainments.
- 5. Elements of problem behaviour are addressed by opposite allocation.

Some immediate comments follow.

With little intrusion into the running of Inmate Activities, behaviour which is central to these activities can be monitored and recorded more directly to identify levels of inmate competence across the range of activities. The records of competence would guide the setting and auditing of individual targets.

Targets will be identified within the Activity Areas supported by the regime. This requires continuous assessment of inmates within activities, and the setting of targets based on a set of possible attainments drawn from those activities. Such attainment profiles would serve to identify and audit targets and would enable allocation staff to judge the general standard of attainment within and across activities, thereby enhancing both target-setting and auditing.

The frequency of behaviour assessment within activities and routines, and the auditing of the whole process must be driven by what is practicable. The system requires assessment of attainment to be undertaken monthly, in order to ensure standardisation in collection of Regime Monitoring data. Targets set are to be based on observations of behaviour which are already fundamental to the running of activities and routines, and the progress in achieving targets will be discussed with the inmate, thereby guiding allocation to activities within and between prisons. These steps are in accordance with the policy guidelines set out by DIP1.

Whilst the targets set will be individual, and when collated will comprise a set of short and long term objectives defining the ‘Sentence Plan’, they will fall into some broad areas (social behaviour, health, performance at work, and so on). By making more systematic use of the information which is already being used to select, deselect and manage inmates within activities and with respect to routines, Sentence Planning will become a natural co-ordinating feature of the prison’s regime.

Specific programmes for problem behaviour (eg sex offenders) can be seen as particular inmate activities with their own, more intensive assessment, activity and target setting procedures explicitly designed to address problem behaviour. Development of, and allocation to such programmes will be integrated with other activities. These programmes are seen as both drawing on and informing ‘Risk Assessment’.
Specific Details

Fundamental to the system outlined above is the fact that classes of behaviour (as opposed to properties of inmates) are taken as the basic data. These classes of behaviour are demanded by activities and routines, and should serve as basic data for Regime Monitoring. Observations of inmate behaviour are observations of an inmate’s level of attainment with respect to characteristics that staff responsible for the activities have specified in advance as essential to the task.

Activities and routines have a structure quite independent of the particular inmates who are subject to the demands of activities and routines. Perhaps the defining feature of Sentence Management is that it comprises a process of objective continuous assessment, where what are assessed are levels of attainment with respect to pre-set aims and objectives, themselves defining activities and routines. Since the focus is on classes of behaviour rather than attributes of inmates, all of the assessments are of progress with respect to pre-determined classes of behaviour which are requirements of activities and routines.

ATTAINMENT AREAS

Each activity area can be specified in terms of classes of behaviour which the activity requires. These classes of behaviour are basic skill areas which are fundamental to the nature of the activity, which in combination account for activities being distinguishable from each other. These basic skill areas will be referred to as Attainment Areas. They need to be carefully selected as they will be taken to be the defining features of the activity. From this point of view, any part of the daily routines should be specifiable in these terms, and staff should be encouraged to think about how best their area of inmate supervision could be so sub-classified. Whilst the identification of Attainment Areas may, at first glance seem a demanding or unfamiliar task, it is soon appreciated that the identification of Attainment Areas is in fact a pre-requisite to the establishment of any activity in prison, be it an education course, industrial activity or simple housework.

ATTAINMENT CRITERIA

Each Attainment Area can be further classified into up to five levels of attainment. These are levels of the same skill, progressing from a low level of competence to a high level of competence. These must be described in a series of direct statements, specifying particular skills of graded sophistication which can be observed, and checked as having been observed. Levels of competence are therefore NOT to be specified as a scale from LOW to HIGH, but rather as a series of specific, and observable behaviours. These are the Attainment Criteria of the activity or routine. Just as Attainment Areas are naturally identified by staff who design activities, so too are Attainment Criteria natural pre-requisites for day to day supervision.

COMPETENCE CHECKLISTS (SM-1s)

For each set of Attainment Areas the Attainment Criteria together comprise a COMPETENCE CHECKLIST, against which performance can be monitored. Competence Checklists are referred to within the system as SM-1s.
**RECORD OF TARGETS (SM-2s)**

Targets are identified using a second form, referred to as SM-2. Targets will generally be identified from the profile of Attainment Criteria within Activities, (Competence Checklists being completed on a monthly basis provide a record of progress over the four week period). But Targets may also be identified outside of standard activities, based on an analysis of what is available within the Regime Digest, or Directory which will be a natural product of the process of defining Attainment Areas and Attainment Criteria, and the printing of the Competence Checklists. Attainment Areas and Criteria are defined by Activity/Routine suspension on an RM-1

The two forms, ATTAINMENTS (SM-1) and RECORD OF TARGETS (SM-2) comprise the building blocks of the system. These forms are now available as final drafts (and will incidentally be machine readable). Both forms are designed to be stored in the third element of the system, the inmate’s Sentence Management Dossier. This is simply a ‘pocket file’ to hold the sets of the two forms, and the proposal is that the Head of Inmate Activities and his/her staff be responsible for maintaining the system.

Through an analysis of the SM-1s both within and across activity areas, HIAs would have a better picture of the structure of the activities, and of the relative progress of inmates within activities. With inmates actively involved in the process of target negotiation, and with the system being objective, problems of confidentiality so characteristic of subjective reports, would become substantially reduced. Whilst the system can run as a paper system, once computerised, the data collected via SM-1s and SM-2s will form the basis of automated reports.

**Relationship to the Regime Monitoring System (RMS)**

The proposed procedure for recording Sentence Management is intimately related to Regime Monitoring, as it is largely based on the same Reporting Points within Activity areas which up the RMS. This will be even more apparent when Regime Monitoring embraces more activities than it does at present. *It has the promise also of providing the more qualitative measure of regime delivery in that the record of attainments will be an objective record of achievement.*

The design of the SM-1 form provides for the capture of the basic data required for maintenance of the Regime Monitoring System (RMS). The form provides an efficient means of collecting such data since each SM-1 records an inmate’s daily attendance in the activity via a four by seven day register covering each morning and afternoon session attended.

Since the form is designed to record attendance and attainment data each month, it implicitly allows the number of hours to be calculated for each inmate, each reporting point, and at a higher level of aggregation to produce data on the number of inmates for each activity area, sub-establishment and so on.

In terms of paperwork, this is not a demanding task, and in capitalising on what is already done at Reporting Points (where daily logs are maintained already) it promises to be an efficient and accurate way of collecting the required data.
For a Reporting Point with 15 inmates, the system would require 15 SM-1s to be completed and returned to the HIA each month. As mentioned above, the design of the forms renders them potentially able to be processed by an Optical Mark Reader, allowing the data to be converted to computer storable data, thereby making the whole system easier to manage and audit.

The basic principle has been piloted at HMP Parkhurst and Wakefield over the past year, although the SM-1 form is now radically different in design to checklists used in the pilot. Fundamental to the design of the SM-1 is the fact that the Attainment Criteria are generated by staff who will be using them, each SM-1 being tied specifically to an activity. The content of the form is ‘user definable’.

More than one SM-1 form will be completed per inmate per month since the inmate will be assessed at more than one Reporting Point. To record behaviour in daytime activities and domestically on the wings, one SM-1 would be completed each month as a record of attainment at the allocated work/education Reporting Point, and another on the wings, the latter providing an assessment of the inmate’s level of co-operation/contribution to the general running of the routines, though not necessarily contributing to the overall Regime Monitoring figures.

Although inextricably linked to the Regime Monitoring System (RMS), the focus is at a more fundamental level of the regime - the recording of attainment levels of individual inmates - with the RMS data being logically compiled or deduced from those individual assessments. In defining Attainment Areas and Attainment Criteria by staff supervising the Reporting Point, in consultation with the HIA, the SM-1s and SM-2s would allow staff to define the nature and objectives of the Reporting Points, storing them within the proposed Sentence Management System to serve as the basic statements for any subsequent computer profiling of the inmate’s progress as well as serving as the basic material for a local and national directory or digest of activities and their curricula. Reports in this system are naturally emergent, statements of what has happened.

Costs and Benefits

The cost of an Optical Mark Reader (OMR: the machine to read the contents of the forms directly into a computer) to automate the storage of the attainments data would be in the order of £8,000 per prison, and substantially less if the systems were bought in bulk (approx £5,500). A small system to hold and analyse the data (including appropriate software) would cost in the order of £6000. We suggest that the management of the Sentence Management System would most naturally rest with the HIA, who would naturally liaise with other relevant functional managers.

This relatively simple monitoring system would provide both Sentence Management and Regime Monitoring information in one system. Furthermore, the system could be Wide Area Networked (WAN), with each AREA of eight to 14 prisons being polled automatically by the Area Managers' systems at HQ, these in turn being polled by DIP2. The system would be able directly to provide regime providers in DIP2 and DSP (eg PSIF) with information bearing on their areas of concern, as well as HQ groups with special management responsibility for particular groups (ie DOC and DIP2).
This communications improvement is something which DIP2/RRD has already proposed to improve the efficiency of the current Regime Monitoring, and is something which we have costed at approximately £100 per site, plus the addition of hard disks to the Area Managers' systems.

With data being collated once a month via SM-1s, weekly data would only be available retrospectively once a month. Nevertheless, this may well be a small price to pay for a substantial reduction in data handling and the provision of a far more useful system. Such a system would make Regime Monitoring a naturally emergent indicator of Sentence Management, and could be implemented using much of the already installed infrastructure for running and auditing inmate activities.

A significant benefit is in the potential for automatic machine-generated reports of inmate progress. These could save many thousands of officer-hours. A further significant benefit is that the system, comprising

- the forms,
- software for converting the forms to computer data and compiling the Regime Directory, compiled from RMIs,
- the database to hold and analyse the materials, and
- the network to support the transfer of data

already exists in prototype form.

Coverage of Non-Standard Inmate Activities

The SM-1 form is designed to allow all staff to formally assess any programme of activity in a standard manner (ie, marking whether behaviour in the activity matches the attainment criteria on the Competence Checklist). The SM-1 and SM-2 both have provision to record a Checklist and Task Code, along with the activity and reporting point identifier. These Codes will allow more than one checklist to be generated for each Reporting Point if the extent or modular nature of the activity requires multiple checklists for comprehensive assessment of the skills which the activity offers.

Similarly, the SM-2 form allows targets to be identified by staff both within an activity, or from a knowledge of what the regime has on offer. The HIA, in building a library of Attainment Areas and Attainment Criteria, (the Regime Digest, or Directory based on RMIs) will be able to provide interested staff, such as Review boards, with a digest of what activities are available and how they are broken down by attainment areas and criteria.

In this way, short duration intervention programmes can be included in the 'Sentence Management Dossier' in the same way as are the more formal activities. Formal activities (as currently defined within the Regime Monitoring System) are so regarded because they tend to occupy large groups of inmates in activities which are basically structured to have inmates participate for a relatively fixed period (eight weeks to several years).
Using this form of assessment, those staff wishing to run ad hoc programmes, occupying either small groups or single inmates in short modules would be tasked with defining **Attainment Areas** and **Attainment Criteria** on RMIs as a *sine qua non* for running the proposed programme, submitting the RMI to the HIA to be considered as an element of the regime.

The fact that each SM-1 has an attendance register will permit the system to capture the extent of all inmate activity throughout the regime, thereby contributing to a more comprehensive profile of inmate activity within each establishment and the estate in general. The HIA's task would more clearly become one of co-ordinating **Attainment Areas** to bring about a balanced and appropriately monitored regime, and the data would serve as a sound information base from which staff could build Sentence Plans as outlined by DIP.

**Points Raised in Discussion:**

Mr Longley's presentation highlighted the importance of initiating sentence management at the workface end of the management system rather than at the other end, since this was where most staff/inmate contact occurred. His research had indicated that two areas of the daily routine were particularly important: activities (eg work, education) and the cooperation with the routines in residence. The aim now was to look at how the daily routines of work and leisure time could be used to set targets for behaviour.

Mr Guy asked who would be setting the targets, Mr Longley replied that this would be done by the staff running courses or workshops, or supervising inmates on landings. To a certain extent, targets would be set by the tasks themselves, although targets were also dependent on the abilities of the individual. Mrs Stiling pointed out that target setting within education entailed two areas, educational attainments and social skills. Whilst the former could be fairly straightforward and objective, the latter area was more problematic and subjective. Mr Longley said that it was important to define clear targets within any activity; regime activities could not operate properly unless there was firstly a clear idea of what the tasks required.

In response to a question about initial decisions about labour allocation, Mr Longley pointed out the need to keep clear records of the basic work experience of inmates, for example, how long an individual had spent in a particular workshop. If this kind of information was routinely recorded, then allocating inmates to activities would be facilitated. At present, the only dispersal establishments which recorded (in PROBE) how long prisoners spent in activities were Parkhurst and Long Lartin. The Sentence Management system naturally generates this data.

Mr Longley's description of attainment areas, attainment criteria, and competence checklists led Mr Blakey to raise the problem of gaining inmate cooperation with the system. He pointed out that to some prisoners, work was seen as a sign of weakness, and many simply refused to go to work. Mr Williams pointed out that the system being advocated had the advantage of being able to pick up and record this kind of information. It was not being suggested that it would solve the problems of empty workshops, but rather that the problems that existed would become more apparent, and amenable to intervention.
Mr Emes said that the assumption was that prisoners and staff would use the system of target setting to devise some sort of contract. It would not be possible to have any kind of contract without cooperation, but it would be possible to set up some sort of dialogue, recognising what an inmate was willing to do. This was a starting point, providing a basis for bargaining and agreement. Mr Papps agreed that the system proposed enabled one to negotiate with the reluctant prisoner to make a first step in the right direction.

It should not be left to just one member of staff to make decisions on the allocation of labour. There would need to be a lot of communication between different staff; for example, acceptance on a Painting and Decorating course may first require time in education gaining a basic maths qualification. The integration of educational and vocational training was already happening in some establishments; although industry and education was not being integrated as yet. Mr Longley suggested that the development of a Regime Digest would facilitate this integration by enabling cross-referencing. It was important to encourage staff running activities to describe the attainment areas and criteria for their specific workplace. All the information was available to them already, it was just a matter of recording it.

Mr Rudgard pointed out the similarities of the system being described and the NVQ initiative. He asked whether the five levels of attainment criteria referred to by Mr Longley were the same as NVQ levels. The introduction of NVQs was prison policy and would be operating in all industrial activities shortly. Mr Longley agreed that there were similarities, and indeed the development of the Sentence Management system had drawn on initiatives in general education to some extent. The type of profile being proposed had also been used within the PROBE system since 1986, in relation to control issues. Mr Williams pointed out that one of the advantages of the system described by Mr Longley was that it would serve the NVQ initiative as well. The sentence management system was very flexible in that it involved a blank form; the areas/levels could be defined by the staff running the activity. NVQ levels could be used if these were seen as most appropriate in a given activity.

Mr Wheatley raised a note of concern about the amount of form filling the system generated, and whether staff could cope with it. Mr Longley pointed out that the contents of the forms were generated by the staff themselves. Mr Williams added that 50% of prison officers' time was currently spent on clerical tasks; this system would actually reduce some of that work, and it was hoped to eventually introduce machine-readable forms.

Mr Guy asked how widely the system was being used at present at Wakefield, and where it was being piloted. Mr Longley replied that currently Wakefield had yet to define RM-1s, but that Parkhurst had defined wing RM-1s and was ready to start using them once they were provided with the forms and software. Mr Longley said it was important to firstly define reporting points. Mr Wheatley asked whether documentation would be filled out at each location, and Mr Longley said that if it was a regular activity for the inmate, then this was the case. Currently inmate names are recorded at each activity, so this would not entail much more administration than at present.

There was some discussion about the utility of machine-readable forms. Mr Rudgard said that the NVQ team had acknowledged that this kind of equipment was necessary.
The group then discussed further the relationship between NVQ and the sentence management system. Mr Rudgard pointed out that laundries would be funded for NVQ so the criteria used there would need to be those necessitated by NVQ. Dr Thornton asked whether there was any scope for recording attitudinal aspects in the NVQ system. Mr Rudgard said that it was the case that some attitudinal aspects would be recorded, e.g. whether an individual showed willingness to co-operate with others in a team. On the other hand, NVQ did not involve the continuous assessment of behaviour. Fluctuations in attitude would therefore not be recorded, and once a vocational skill had been acquired, no further monitoring would occur. Mr Williams suggested that the NVQ system was concerned with primarily with deficit reduction. Sustaining any improvements that occurred could be carried out by the sentence management system operating in the work programme.

There was a query about whether the proposed system actually provided an objective measure of change. Mr Wheatley suggested that some abuse of the system might occur. However, Mr Papps pointed out that it was at least more objective than the current reporting system. Mr Williams added that with the introduction of open reporting it was necessary to produce a more factual and objective record, which could be shown to inmates.

The discussion moved to the question of resources. Mr Emes felt that the main problems in introducing the system were related to persuading staff to utilise the forms, and also persuading them that the system would be advantageous to them. There was a general discussion on the logistics of collecting the forms, and then the discussion returned to the question of resources. In particular, Area Managers asked about the cost of the equipment required for machine-readable forms (OMRs), how many machines would be required, and requested actual costs of the technology bought in bulk, and whether it would be a matter of a single tender. There were also queries about the staff needed to operate the machines. Mr Williams pointed out that the concept of sentence management needed to be discussed and accepted before moving on to the finer details of staffing and costs.

Mrs Grimsey asked how the forms being planned fitted in with those already designed for sentence planning in DIP1. Mr Longley said the forms he described could provide a source of information for the DIP1 system. The approach he was describing had the advantage that it also involved the potential for capturing regime monitoring, and the provision of a digest of what is available in regime terms across the prison estate. Non-standard activities, such as those involving chaplaincy, could also be captured using this approach. The Venerable Pound queried how one-to-one encounters could be recorded, and Mr Longley replied that for psychologists, it had been possible to show when a number of sessions had been contracted with an inmate.

Mr Emes raised a further point, saying that whilst the system could provide a better record of what was actually happening within the regime, it had an added advantage, which was that, if properly applied, it should in itself be product enhancing by involving staff in defining the product. This fitted in very well with the 'Better Jobs' initiative.

Mr Wheatley expressed some doubts about the utility of the checklists described by Mr Longley, since he had reservations about using a 'tick boxes' approach. Mr Williams replied that if reports were to be shown to prisoners, it was important to have a system which enabled
you to follow a systematic and consistent procedure, which this system did. The job satisfaction issue lay in the fact that it was a more efficient process.

The question of the objectives of the system was raised. Whilst it may lead to better reporting, it would not necessarily lead to better output. Workshops at present had to fulfil certain quotas. These were issues which needed to be examined in more depth, and it was agreed that there was an urgent need to set up further pilot schemes. At present, pilots were beginning in two dispersal prisons, and could also operate in some Category B training prisons. Mr Lockwood suggested it was important to extend the pilot scheme to include Category C establishments also.

The discussion broadened into an examination of the role of workshops and what their objectives should be. For example, the purpose of the laundry might be to wash a certain number of shirts within a set time limit. The point being made here was that there may be other objectives too, which might be more important. Miss McCormick pointed out that a lot of the points being made about output were already being dealt with within the new incentive pay scheme.

Further discussion centred on how to take the Sentence Management initiative forward, and the need for thorough piloting. Mr Emes suggested that it would be useful to set up a Steering Group to help with these developments, and to have Governors and Area Managers involved. It was decided that Mr Guy and Mrs Grimsey should discuss this further and decide on the Chairmanship and composition of the Steering Group.
ANNEX A Illustration of the concept of ATTAINMENT AREAS & ATTAINMENT CRITERIA

Based on a Single Reporting Point (a City and Guilds General Preparation Course)

A - D are Attainment Areas

1 - 5 within each Attainment Area are progressive Attainment Criteria

A. TALKING AND LISTENING

1. Make suitable responses when spoken to.
2. Follow verbal instructions.
3. Give simple descriptions and explanation.
4. Communicate effectively with a range of people in a variety of situations.
5. Present a logical and effective argument. Can analyse other’s arguments.

B. READING AND WRITING

1. Read and write short sentences.
2. Follow straightforward written instructions.
3. Give straightforward written instructions and explanations.
4. Write reports describing work done.
5. Select and criticise written data and use it to produce own written work.

C. SEEKING INFORMATION

1. Ask questions.
2. Find needed information when guided.
3. Use standard sources of information.
4. Assemble information from several sources.
5. Show initiative in seeking and gathering information for a wide variety of sources.

D. PLANNING

1. Describe the sequence of steps in simple everyday tasks.
2. Identify the sequence of steps in a complex task.
3. Chose from identified alternatives the best way of tackling a task.
4. Modify/extend given plan/routines to meet changed circumstances.
5. Create new plans/routines from scratch.
ANNEX B Practical Illustration of the concept of ATTAINMENT AREAS & ATTAINMENT CRITERIA: - PSIF Laundry - HMP Parkhurst

Parkhurst Laundry (Criteria generated by first-line staff)

A. Motivation
   1. requires no instruction
   2. requires little instruction
   3. requires intermittent instruction
   4. requires regular instruction
   5. requires constant instruction

B. Written information
   1. is able to cope with standard written information with out assistance.
   2. requires little assistance with written information.
   3. requires intermittent assistance with written information.
   4. requires repeated assistance with written information.
   5. requires someone to read all written information for him.

C. Physical performance
   1. work output is always neat and tidy.
   2. work output is usually neat and tidy.
   3. work output is occasionally neat and tidy.
   4. work output is rarely neat and tidy.
   5. work output is never neat and tidy.

D. Decision making
   1. makes all decisions regarding his work himself.
   2. makes most decisions regarding his work himself.
   3. makes some decisions regarding his work himself.
   4. requires instructor to make most decisions for him.
   5. requires instructor to make all decisions for him.

E. Physical strength
   1. is able to load and unload heavy loads.
   2. is able to load heavy loads but needs help to unload.
   3. is able to load and unload medium loads.
   4. is able to load some loads but is unable to unload them.
   5. is unable to load or unload.

F. Co-operation
   1. is able to work in a team.
   2. is able to work with most people.
   3. is able to work with some people.
   4. is able to work with few people.
   5. works alone.
ANNEX C - Drafts of RM-1, SM-1 and SM-2

Colour versions of the SM1s and SM2s are attached. Software is now available to permit HIAs to 'overprint' Attainment Areas and Attainment Criteria on the reverse side of the pre-printed SM1s.

In entering the Attainment Areas and Attainment Criteria into the supplied software, the HIA will effectively be building a Directory of The Regime. This directory, along with the information held on SM1s and SM2s, would comprise the basic structure of the Sentence Management System, analysis of which would, in aggregate, provide Regime Monitoring Data.

The Regime Directory (Digest) will be built from the Attainment Areas and Criteria submitted to the HIA by staff designing and supervising activities. These 'one-off' submissions will be on a form almost identical to the SM-1, and will be referred to as RM-1s (Regime Management 1) as this form is a description of the demand characteristics of the specified activity/routine/programme. It is recommended that RM-1s are defined as part of the Governor's Contract with Area Managers, and that RM-1s be defined by staff under Function 17 of the contract.

Example RM-1s for one activity (HMP Parkhurst Laundry), and one aspect of the routines B Wing Parkhurst are provided. In each case, the Attainment Areas and Criteria were generated by first line staff supervising the activity and behaviour on the wings. In the case of the latter, the Attainment Areas and Criteria are spread over two RM-1s, illustrating how the system can capture as many demands of the regime as staff require.
**REGIME MANAGEMENT**

Definition of ATTAINMENT AREAS and ATTAINMENT CRITERIA (RM-1).

This form (RM-1) should be used to define **Attainment Areas** and **Attainment Criteria** for the Reporting Point, or element of the routine, which you supervise.

Standard Reporting Points are those defined under activities within the Regime Monitoring System, but this form, in addition to recording those Reporting Points, may be used to identify other inmate programmes, perhaps of a shorter duration (e.g., an Anger Management Programme). "Routines" on the other hand refer to tasks such as movements to work, collection of meals etc., i.e. the general day-to-day routines with which inmates are required to co-operate.

**Attainment Areas** are characteristics of the activity or routine with which inmates are required to co-operate.

**Attainment Criteria** are descriptions of skill levels within each of the specified Attainment Areas.

There are 51 lines available. Please define each **Attainment Area** so that it gives a clear picture of the demands of the activity or routine.

Please select for your **Attainment Criteria** up to five clear and observable levels of skilled behaviour within each identified **Attainment Area**. These five criteria should describe behaviours reflecting increasing levels of competence where the behaviour at level one fully meets the requirements of the activity.

More than one checklist may be defined if required; either as a continuation sheet (checklist code 02 etc.) when more **Attainment Areas** are needed to describe one activity, or, if your activity/routine consists of a number of distinct tasks with different **Attainment Areas**, each task can be labelled with a different letter in the column headed TASK CODE (task code A etc.).

The Task and Checklist codes, along with the Activity and Reporting Point Codes will uniquely identify this area of activity and the skills which it requires and assesses.

Provision is also made for you to specify the planned number of inmates for this activity, and the planned number of operating hours for the week. These should be recorded in the section labelled: **PLANNED INMATES** (per day) and **PLANNED OPERATING HOURS** (per week).

This form will be used as an element of the establishment's Regime Directory. The information will be used to print SM-1s (Record of Attainments) for this activity/routine. Inmates will be routinely assessed against these **Attainment Areas** and **Criteria**, and personal goals will be negotiated with respect to these criteria using SM-2s (Record of Targets).

Complete the sections below in block capitals in the boxes and place a horizontal pencil mark through the small box below the appropriate letter/number as illustrated in the example. Please turn to the reverse side and enter your **Attainment Areas** and **Criteria** in block capitals.

Please return the completed RM-1 to the HIA or whoever is responsible for coordinating the system so this information can be entered into the Regime Directory.

Please mark the appropriate boxes like this: —

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example: Probation will be marked thus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRISON CODE</th>
<th>SUB ESTAB CODE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY CODE</th>
<th>REPORTING POINT CODE</th>
<th>TASK CODE</th>
<th>CHECKLIST CODE</th>
<th>TODAY'S DATE</th>
<th>PLANNED INMATES</th>
<th>PLANNED OPERATING HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORTING POINT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
## REGIME MANAGEMENT

**Definition of ATTAINMENT AREAS and ATTAINMENT CRITERIA (RM-1).**

This form (RM-1) should be used to define **Attainment Areas** and **Attainment Criteria** for the Reporting Point, or element of the routine, which you supervise.

Standard Reporting Points are those defined under activities within the Regime Monitoring System, but this form, in addition to recording those Reporting Points, may be used to identify other inmate programmes, perhaps of a shorter duration (e.g. an Anger Management Programme). "Routines" on the other hand refer to tasks such as movements to work, collection of meals etc., i.e. the general day-to-day routines with which inmates are required to co-operate.

**Attainment Areas** are characteristics of the activity or routine with which inmates are required to co-operate.

**Attainment Criteria** are descriptions of skill levels within each of the specified Attainment Areas.

There are 51 lines available. Please define each **Attainment Area** so that it gives a clear picture of the demands of the activity or routine.

Please select for your **Attainment Criteria** up to five clear and observable levels of skilled behaviour within each identified **Attainment Area**. These five criteria should describe behaviours reflecting increasing levels of competence where the behaviour at level one fully meets the requirements of the activity.

More than one checklist may be defined if required; either as a continuation sheet (checklist code 02 etc.) when more **Attainment Areas** are needed to describe one activity, or, if your activity/routine consists of a number of distinct tasks with different **Attainment Areas**, each task can be labelled with a different letter in the column headed TASK CODE (task code A etc.). The Task and Checklist codes, along with the Activity and Reporting Point Codes will uniquely identify this area of activity and the skills which it requires and assesses.

Provision is also made for you to specify the planned number of inmates for this activity, and the planned number of operating hours for the week. These should be recorded in the section labelled: PLANNED INMATES (per day) and PLANNED OPERATING HOURS (per week).

This form will be used as an element of the establishment’s Regime Directory. The information will be used to print SM-1s (Record of Attainments) for this activity/routine. Inmates will be routinely assessed against these **Attainment Areas** and **Criteria**, and personal goals will be negotiated with respect to these criteria using SM-2s (Record of Targets).

Complete the sections below in block capitals in the boxes and place a horizontal pencil mark through the small box below the appropriate letter/number as illustrated in the example. Please turn to the reverse side and enter your **Attainment Areas** and **Criteria** in block capitals.

Please return the completed RM-1 to the HIA or whoever is responsible for coordinating the system so this information can be entered into the Regime Directory.

Please mark the appropriate boxes like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRISON CODE</th>
<th>SUB EST AB CODE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY CODE</th>
<th>REPORTING POINT CODE</th>
<th>TASK CODE</th>
<th>CHECKLIST CODE</th>
<th>TODAY'S DATE</th>
<th>PLANNED INMATES</th>
<th>PLANNED OPERATING HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P K C</td>
<td>1 04</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>A 01</td>
<td>010192</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAUNDRY

A. MOTIVATION
   1. REQUIRES NO INSTRUCTION.
   2. REQUIRES LITTLE INSTRUCTION.
   3. REQUIRES INTERMITTENT INSTRUCTION.
   4. REQUIRES REGULAR INSTRUCTION.
   5. REQUIRES CONSTANT INSTRUCTION.

B. WRITTEN INFORMATION:
   1. IS ABLE TO COPE WITH STANDARD WRITTEN INFORMATION WITHOUT ASSISTANCE.
   2. REQUIRES LITTLE ASSISTANCE WITH WRITTEN INFORMATION.
   3. REQUIRES INTERMITTENT ASSISTANCE WITH WRITTEN INFORMATION.
   4. REQUIRES REPEATED ASSISTANCE WITH WRITTEN INFORMATION.
   5. REQUIRES SOMEONE TO READ ALL WRITTEN INFORMATION FOR HIM.

C. PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE
   1. WORK OUTPUT IS ALWAYS NEAT AND TIDY.
   2. WORK OUTPUT IS USUALLY NEAT AND TIDY.
   3. WORK OUTPUT IS OCCASIONALLY NEAT AND TIDY.
   4. WORK OUTPUT IS RARELY NEAT AND TIDY.
   5. WORK OUTPUT IS NEVER NEAT AND TIDY.

D. DECISION MAKING
   1. MAKES ALL DECISIONS REGARDING HIS WORK HIMSELF.
   2. MAKES MOST DECISIONS REGARDING HIS WORK HIMSELF.
   3. MAKES SOME DECISIONS REGARDING HIS WORK HIMSELF.
   4. REQUIRES INSTRUCTOR TO MAKE MOST DECISIONS FOR HIM.
   5. REQUIRES INSTRUCTOR TO MAKE ALL DECISIONS FOR HIM.

E. PHYSICAL STRENGTH
   1. IS ABLE TO LOAD AND UNLOAD HEAVY LOADS.
   2. IS ABLE TO LOAD HEAVY LOADS BUT NEEDS HELP TO UNLOAD.
   3. IS ABLE TO LOAD AND UNLOAD MEDIUM LOADS.
   4. IS ABLE TO LOAD SOME LOADS BUT IS UNABLE TO UNLOAD THEM.
   5. IS UNABLE TO LOAD OR UNLOAD.

F. CO-OPERATION
   1. IS ABLE TO WORK IN A TEAM.
   2. IS ABLE TO WORK WITH MOST PEOPLE.
   3. IS ABLE TO WORK WITH SOME PEOPLE.
   4. IS ABLE TO WORK WITH FEW PEOPLE.
   5. WORKS ALONE.
**REGIME MANAGEMENT**

**Definition of ATTAINMENT AREAS and ATTAINMENT CRITERIA (RM-1).**

This form (RM-1) should be used to define **Attainment Areas** and **Attainment Criteria** for the Reporting Point, or element of the routine, which you supervise.

Standard Reporting Points are those defined under activities within the Regime Monitoring System, but this form, in addition to recording those Reporting Points, may be used to identify other inmate programmes, perhaps of a shorter duration (e.g. an Anger Management Programme). "Routines" on the other hand refer to tasks such as movements to work, collection of meals etc., i.e. the general day-to-day routines with which inmates are required to co-operate.

**Attainment Areas** are characteristics of the activity or routine with which inmates are required to co-operate.

**Attainment Criteria** are descriptions of skill levels within each of the specified Attainment Areas.

There are 51 lines available. Please define each **Attainment Area** so that it gives a clear picture of the demands of the activity or routine.

Please select for your **Attainment Criteria** up to five clear and observable levels of skilled behaviour within each identified **Attainment Area**. These five criteria should describe behaviours reflecting increasing levels of competence where the behaviour at level one fully meets the requirements of the activity.

More than one checklist may be defined if required; either as a continuation sheet (checklist code 02 etc.) when more **Attainment Areas** are needed to describe one activity, or, if your activity/routine consists of a number of distinct tasks with different **Attainment Areas**, each task can be labelled with a different letter in the column headed TASK CODE (task code A etc.). The Task and Checklist codes, along with the Activity and Reporting Point Codes will uniquely identify this area of activity and the skills which it requires and assesses.

Provision is also made for you to specify the planned number of inmates for this activity, and the planned number of operating hours for the week. These should be recorded in the section labelled: PLANNED INMATES (per day) and PLANNED OPERATING HOURS (per week).

This form will be used as an element of the establishment's Regime Directory. The information will be used to print SM-1s (Record of Attainments) for this activity/routine. Inmates will be routinely assessed against these **Attainment Areas** and **Criteria**, and personal goals will be negotiated with respect to these criteria using SM-2s (Record of Targets).

Complete the sections below in block capitals in the boxes and place a horizontal pencil mark through the small box below the appropriate letter/number as illustrated in the example. Please turn to the reverse side and enter your **Attainment Areas** and **Criteria** in block capitals.

Please return the completed RM-1 to the HIA or whoever is responsible for coordinating the system so this information can be entered into the Regime Directory.

Please mark the appropriate boxes like this: ———

---

**Example:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRISON CODE</th>
<th>SUB ESTABL CODE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY CODE</th>
<th>REPORTING POINT CODE</th>
<th>TASK CODE</th>
<th>CHECKLIST CODE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**REPORTING POINT NAME**

---

**PLANNED INMATES**

---

**PLANNED OPERATING HOURS**

---

---
B WING - PART I

A. STAFF/INMATE INTERACTIONS
1. BEHAVES IN A FRIENDLY AND APPROACHABLE MANNER EVEN IN THE PRESENCE OF OTHER INMATES.
2. FRIENDLY AND APPROACHABLE IN THE ABSENCE OF OTHER INMATES.
3. SOMETIMES FRIENDLY ESPECIALLY WHEN HE WANTS SOMETHING.
4. CAN BE THREATENING OR INTIMIDATING UNLESS HE WANTS SOMETHING.
5. BEHAVES IN A THREATENING AND INTIMIDATING WAY.

B. LEVEL OF ACTIVITY (PHYSICAL)
1. REGULARLY ATTENDS GYM AND USES COMPOUND FOR EXERCISE.
2. OCCASIONALLY ATTENDS GYM AND COMPOUND FOR EXERCISE.
3. WILL REGULARLY USE COMPOUND FOR EXERCISE.
4. WILL OCCASIONALLY USE COMPOUND FOR WALKING.
5. MAXIMUM LEVEL OF EXERCISE CONSISTS OF COLLECTING HIS FOOD.

C. PREPAREDNESS TO FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS
1. WILLING TO FOLLOW INSTRUCTIONS WITHOUT ANIMOSITY.
2. GENERALLY Follows INSTRUCTIONS WITHOUT ANIMOSITY.
3. GRUDGINGLY Follows INSTRUCTIONS.
4. USUALLY Follows INSTRUCTIONS GRUDGINGLY AND IN HIS OWN TIME.
5. REGULARLY PLACED ON REPORT FOR NOT FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS.

D. GOING TO LABOUR
1. TOTALLY PREPARED, READY AND WAITING TO GO.
2. PREPARED FOR LABOUR ON "FIRST CALL LABOUR".
3. READY TO GO, BUT LABOUR THE BEST OF A POOR CHOICE.
4. USUALLY JUST MAKES IT FOR "LAST CALL LABOUR".
5. UNPREPARED AND TRYING TO AVOID GOING TO LABOUR.
   (FREQUENTLY ON REPORT FOR FAILING TO GO TO LABOUR).

E. INMATE/INMATE INTERACTION
1. FRIENDLY AND APPROACHABLE BY ANYONE.
2. FRIENDLY AND APPROACHABLE BY MOST INMATES.
3. NOT FRIENDLY BUT NOT THREATENING - A LONER.
4. THREATENING AND INTIMIDATING TO THOSE OUTSIDE HIS GROUP
5. THREATENING AND INTIMIDATING TO OTHER INMATES.

F. CALMING/DISRUPTIVE INFLUENCE
1. IS FREQUENTLY SEEN TRYING TO CALM DOWN OTHER INMATES.
2. IS OCCASIONALLY SEEN TRYING TO CALM DOWN OTHER INMATES.
3. IS NEVER SEEN TO BE INVOLVING HIMSELF IN OTHERS BUSINESS.
4. IS OCCASIONALLY SEEN TRYING TO EXCITE OTHER INMATES.
5. IS FREQUENTLY SEEN TRYING TO EXCITE OTHER INMATES.

G. BEHAVIOUR ABOUT THE WING
1. IS NEVER SEEN TO BE AGITATED BY EVENTS AROUND HIM.
2. IS SOMETIMES SEEN TO BE AGITATED BY EVENTS AROUND HIM.
3. IS FREQUENTLY SEEN TO BE AGITATED BY EVENTS AROUND HIM.
4. APPEARS AGITATED MOST OF THE TIME AND MADE MORE SO BY EVENTS AROUND HIM.
5. ALWAYS APPEARS AGITATED AND MADE MORE SO BY EVENTS AROUND HIM.
**REGIME MANAGEMENT**

Definition of ATTAINMENT AREAS and ATTAINMENT CRITERIA (RM-1).

This form (RM-1) should be used to define **Attainment Areas** and **Attainment Criteria** for the Reporting Point, or element of the routine, which you supervise.

Standard Reporting Points are those defined under activities within the Regime Monitoring System, but this form, in addition to recording those Reporting Points, may be used to identify other inmate programmes, perhaps of a shorter duration (e.g. an Anger Management Programme). "Routines" on the other hand refer to tasks such as movements to work, collection of meals etc., i.e. the general day-to-day routines with which inmates are required to co-operate.

**Attainment Areas** are characteristics of the activity or routine with which inmates are required to co-operate.

**Attainment Criteria** are descriptions of skill levels within each of the specified Attainment Areas.

There are 51 lines available. Please define each **Attainment Area** so that it gives a clear picture of the demands of the activity or routine.

Please select for your **Attainment Criteria** up to five clear and observable levels of skilled behaviour within each identified **Attainment Area**. These five criteria should describe behaviours reflecting increasing levels of competence where the behaviour at level one fully meets the requirements of the activity.

More than one checklist may be defined if required; either as a continuation sheet (checklist code 02 etc.) when more **Attainment Areas** are needed to describe one activity, or, if your activity/routine consists of a number of distinct tasks with different **Attainment Areas**, each task can be labelled with a different letter in the column headed **TASK CODE** (task code A etc.). The Task and Checklist codes, along with the Activity and Reporting Point Codes will uniquely identify this area of activity and the skills which it requires and assesses.

Provision is also made for you to specify the planned number of inmates for this activity, and the planned number of operating hours for the week. These should be recorded in the section labelled: **PLANNED INMATES** (per day) and **PLANNED OPERATING HOURS** (per week).

This form will be used as an element of the establishment's Regime Directory. The information will be used to print SM-1s (Record of Attainments) for this activity/routine. Inmates will be routinely assessed against these **Attainment Areas** and **Criteria**, and personal goals will be negotiated with respect to these criteria using SM-2s (Record of Targets).

Complete the sections below in block capitals in the boxes and place a horizontal pencil mark through the small box below the appropriate letter/number as illustrated in the example. Please turn to the reverse side and enter your **Attainment Areas** and **Criteria** in block capitals.

Please return the completed RM-1 to the HIA or whoever is responsible for coordinating the system so this information can be entered into the Regime Directory.

Please mark the appropriate boxes like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example:</th>
<th>PRISON CODE</th>
<th>SUB ESTAB CODE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY CODE</th>
<th>REPORTING POINT CODE</th>
<th>TASK CODE</th>
<th>CHECKLIST CODE</th>
<th>TODAY'S DATE</th>
<th>PLANNED INMATES</th>
<th>PLANNED OPERATING HOURS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P K C</td>
<td>1 50 01</td>
<td>A 02</td>
<td>010192</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REPORTING POINT NAME**
H. USE OF ALCOHOL AND DRUGS
   1. NEVER SEEN TO BE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF OR TAKING DRUGS/ALCOHOL.
   2. RARELY SEEN TO BE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF OR TAKING DRUGS/ALCOHOL.
   3. OCCASIONALLY SEEN TO BE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF OR TAKING DRUGS/ALCOHOL.
   4. REGULARLY SEEN TO BE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF OR TAKING DRUGS/ALCOHOL.
   5. FREQUENTLY SEEN TO BE UNDER THE INFLUENCE OF OR TAKING DRUGS/ALCOHOL.

I. EXCHANGING PROPERTY WITH OTHER INMATES
   1. NEVER SEEN RECEIVING OR DISPOSING OF GOODS.
   2. RARELY SEEN RECEIVING OR DISPOSING OF GOODS.
   3. OCCASIONALLY SEEN RECEIVING OR DISPOSING OF GOODS.
   4. REGULARLY SEEN RECEIVING OR DISPOSING OF GOODS.
   5. FREQUENTLY SEEN RECEIVING OR DISPOSING OF GOODS.

J. SELF PRESENTATION
   1. ALWAYS VERY CLEAN AND TIDY IN APPEARANCE.
   2. CLEAN AND TIDY IN APPEARANCE.
   3. USUALLY CLEAN AND TIDY IN APPEARANCE.
   4. RARELY CLEAN AND TIDY IN APPEARANCE.
   5. NEVER CLEAN AND TIDY IN APPEARANCE.

K. STANDARD OF CELL CARE
   1. VERY CLEAN AND ORDERLY.
   2. CLEAN AND ORDERLY.
   3. REASONABLY CLEAN AND ORDERLY.
   4. FREQUENTLY UNCLEAN AND DISORDERLY.
   5. ALWAYS UNCLEAN AND DISORDERLY.

L. WHEN COLLECTING MEALS
   1. NEVER COMPLAINS ABOUT THE FOOD.
   2. OCCASIONALLY EXPRESSES DISSATISFACTION WITH THE FOOD.
   3. FREQUENTLY EXPRESSES DISSATISFACTION WITH THE FOOD.
   4. USUALLY EXPRESSES DISSATISFACTION WITH THE FOOD.
   5. ALWAYS EXPRESSES DISSATISFACTION WITH THE FOOD.

M. AT LOCK UP
   1. ALWAYS LOCKS UP PROMPTLY.
   2. LOCKS UP FOLLOWING FIRST REMINDER.
   3. REQUIRES A SECOND REMINDER TO LOCK UP.
   4. COMES CLOSE TO REPORT FOR LATE LOCK UP.
   5. ON REPORT FOR LATE LOCK UP.

N. NECESSARY COMMUNICATIONS WITH STAFF
   1. ALWAYS POLITE AND CO-OPERATIVE WHEN MAKING REQUESTS OR SEEKING INFORMATION.
   2. USUALLY POLITE AND CO-OPERATIVE WHEN MAKING REQUESTS OR SEEKING INFORMATION.
   3. RARELY AGGRESSIVE AND DEMANDING WHEN MAKING REQUESTS OR SEEKING INFORMATION.
   4. FREQUENTLY AGGRESSIVE AND DEMANDING WHEN MAKING REQUESTS OR SEEKING INFORMATION.
   5. AGGRESSIVE AND DEMANDING WHEN MAKING REQUESTS OR SEEKING INFORMATION.
SENTENCE MANAGEMENT

ATTAINMENTS, and Record of Targets - (SM-1)

Instructions:
This form (SM-1) is designed to allow the recording of an inmate’s levels of attainment within this Activity. Printed overleaf are a set of Attainment Areas characteristic of the Activity. Each Attainment Area is further broken down into sentences (Attainment Criteria) which describe levels of achievement within that Area. These Attainment Areas and Criteria will have been generated from within your activity by those who supervise it. Please make sure you enter below, the appropriate Activity, Reporting Point, Task and Checklist Codes. Further below you will see there is an attendance register. Please identify the inmate’s presence in this Activity over the last 4 Reporting Weeks by placing a mark through the correct box for each day the inmate attended. After completing the above details, please turn to side two, and place a pencil mark through the boxes which from your observations, accurately capture the inmate’s levels of attainment in this Activity. Once completed, please forward the form to the HIA for filing in the inmate’s Sentence Management Dossier.

Please mark the appropriate boxes like this:
Do NOT mark like this:  ✓ X ○ —

Example: Probation will be marked thus

Inmate's Name: ........................................................................

INMATE NATIONAL NUMBER    PRISON CODE    SUB ESTAB. CODE    ACTIVITY CODE    REPORTING POINT CODE    TASK CODE    CHECKLIST CODE    TODAY'S DATE    DAY    MONTH    YEAR

REPORTING POINT NAME

REGISTER OF ATTENDANCE

Period 1
Period 2
SENTENCE MANAGEMENT

ATTAINMENTS, and Record of Targets – (SM-1)

Instructions:
This form (SM-1) is designed to allow the recording of an inmate's levels of attainment within this Activity. Printed overleaf are a set of Attainment Areas characteristic of the Activity. Each Attainment Area is further broken down into sentences (Attainment Criteria) which describe levels of achievement within that Area.

These Attainment Areas and Criteria will have been generated from within your activity by those who supervise it. Please make sure you enter below, the appropriate Activity, Reporting Point, Task and Checklist Codes.

Further below you will see there is an attendance register. Please identify the inmate's presence in this Activity for the last 4 Reporting Weeks by placing a mark through the correct box for each day the inmate attended.

After completing the above details, please turn to side two, and place a pencil mark through the boxes which from your observations, accurately capture the inmate's levels of attainment in this Activity.

Once completed, please forward the form to the HIA for filing in the inmate's Sentence Management Dossier.

Please mark the appropriate boxes like this:
Do NOT mark like this: ✓ × ○

Example: Probation will be marked thus

ACTIVITY
CODE

Inmate's Name
Smith J.T.

REGISTR OF ATTENDANCE

Period 1

Period 2

REPORTING POINT NAME
Laundry

INMATE NATIONAL NUMBER
PRISON CODE
SUB
ESTAB.
CODE
ACTIVITY
CODE
REPORTING
POINT
CODE
TASK
CODE
CHECKLIST
CODE
TODAY'S DATE
Day
Month
Year

RM 1234 PKC 1 50 01 01 010192
LAUNDRY

A. MOTIVATION
1. REQUIRES NO INSTRUCTION.
2. REQUIRES LITTLE INSTRUCTION.
3. REQUIRES INTERMITTENT INSTRUCTION.
4. REQUIRES REGULAR INSTRUCTION.
5. REQUIRES CONSTANT INSTRUCTION.

B. WRITTEN INFORMATION.
1. IS ABLE TO COPE WITH STANDARD WRITTEN INFORMATION WITHOUT ASSISTANCE.
2. REQUIRES LITTLE ASSISTANCE WITH WRITTEN INFORMATION.
3. REQUIRES INTERMITTENT ASSISTANCE WITH WRITTEN INFORMATION.
4. REQUIRES REPEATED ASSISTANCE WITH WRITTEN INFORMATION.
5. REQUIRES SOMEONE TO READ ALL WRITTEN INFORMATION FOR HIM.

C. PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE
1. WORK OUTPUT IS ALWAYS NEAT AND TIDY.
2. WORK OUTPUT IS USUALLY NEAT AND TIDY.
3. WORK OUTPUT IS OCCASSIONALLY NEAT AND TIDY.
4. WORK OUTPUT IS RARELY NEAT AND TIDY.
5. WORK OUTPUT IS NEVER NEAT AND TIDY.

D. DECISION MAKING
1. MAKES ALL DECISIONS REGARDING HIS WORK HIMSELF.
2. MAKES MOST DECISIONS REGARDING HIS WORK HIMSELF.
3. MAKES SOME DECISIONS REGARDING HIS WORK HIMSELF.
4. REQUIRES INSTRUCTOR TO MAKE MOST DECISIONS FOR HIM.
5. REQUIRES INSTRUCTOR TO MAKE ALL DECISIONS FOR HIM.

E. PHYSICAL STRENGTH
1. IS ABLE TO LOAD AND UNLOAD HEAVY LOADS.
2. IS ABLE TO LOAD HEAVY LOADS BUT NEEDS HELP TO UNLOAD.
3. IS ABLE TO LOAD AND UNLOAD MEDIUM LOADS.
4. IS ABLE TO LOAD SOME LOADS BUT IS UNABLE TO UNLOAD THEM.
5. IS UNABLE TO LOAD OR UNLOAD.

F. CO-OPERATION
1. IS ABLE TO WORK IN A TEAM.
2. IS ABLE TO WORK WITH MOST PEOPLE.
3. IS ABLE TO WORK WITH SOME PEOPLE.
4. IS ABLE TO WORK WITH FEW PEOPLE.
5. WORKS ALONE.
SENTENCE MANAGEMENT

Attainments, and RECORDS OF TARGETS - (SM-2)

Instructions:
This form (SM-2) is designed to allow the recording of targets, which should be described in the large box in the centre of the form.
Please mark the boxes in the top section to identify the Prisoner, Prison, Sub-Establishment, Activity, Reporting Point, Task and Checklist codes against which the target will be audited. In the bottom section mark the boxes to indicate the date the target was negotiated, started, etc.
On the reverse side of the form are printed Attainment Areas and Criteria. Please mark the boxes next to those criteria which have been identified as targets for the inmate to achieve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Number</th>
<th>Surname</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INMATE NATIONAL NUMBER</td>
<td>PRISON CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB ESTABLISHMENT CODE</td>
<td>ACTIVITY CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTING POINT CODE</td>
<td>TASK CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHECKLIST CODE</td>
<td>DATE TARGET IDENTIFIED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target contract with inmate:
Short or long term contract:

Target description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE NEGOTIATED WITH INMATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT START DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL START DATE</th>
<th>CONTRACT END DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL END DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Month Year</td>
<td>Day Month Year</td>
<td>Day Month Year</td>
<td>Day Month Year</td>
<td>Day Month Year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inmate signature

Contract negotiated by

Date

Date
**SENTENCE MANAGEMENT**

**Attainments, and RECORDS OF TARGETS - (SM-2)**

**Instructions:**
This form (SM-2) is designed to allow the recording of targets, which should be described in the large box in the centre of the form.

Please mark the boxes in the top section to identify the Prisoner, Prison, Sub-Establishment, Activity, Reporting Point, Task and Checklist codes against which the target will be audited. In the bottom section mark the boxes to indicate the date the target was negotiated, started, etc.

On the reverse side of the form are printed Attainment Areas and Criteria. Please mark the boxes next to those criteria which have been identified as targets for the inmate to achieve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Number</th>
<th>Surname</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RM 1234</td>
<td>Smith J.T.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Target contract with inmate:
- Short or long term contract:

**Target description**
1/ To reach level 2 in co-operation
2/ To reach level 2 in decision making
3/ To reach level 2 in motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE NEGOTIATED</th>
<th>CONTRACT START</th>
<th>ACTUAL START</th>
<th>CONTRACT END</th>
<th>ACTUAL END</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Day</td>
<td>Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/01/92</td>
<td>100/192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inmate signature: [Signature]
Date: 1/1/92

Contract negotiated by: [Signature]
Date: 1/1/92
LAUNDRY

A. MOTIVATION
1. REQUIRES NO INSTRUCTION.
2. REQUIRES LITTLE INSTRUCTION.
3. REQUIRES INTERMITTENT INSTRUCTION.
4. REQUIRES REGULAR INSTRUCTION.
5. REQUIRES CONSTANT INSTRUCTION.

B. WRITTEN INFORMATION.
1. IS ABLE TO COPE WITH STANDARD WRITTEN INFORMATION WITHOUT ASSISTANCE.
2. REQUIRES LITTLE ASSISTANCE WITH WRITTEN INFORMATION.
3. REQUIRES INTERMITTENT ASSISTANCE WITH WRITTEN INFORMATION.
4. REQUIRES REPEATED ASSISTANCE WITH WRITTEN INFORMATION.
5. REQUIRES SOMEONE TO READ ALL WRITTEN INFORMATION FOR HIM.

C. PHYSICAL PERFORMANCE
1. WORK OUTPUT IS ALWAYS NEAT AND TIDY.
2. WORK OUTPUT IS USUALLY NEAT AND TIDY.
3. WORK OUTPUT IS OCCASIONALLY NEAT AND TIDY.
4. WORK OUTPUT IS RARELY NEAT AND TIDY.
5. WORK OUTPUT IS NEVER NEAT AND TIDY.

D. DECISION MAKING
1. MAKES ALL DECISIONS REGARDING HIS WORK HIMSELF.
2. MAKES MOST DECISIONS REGARDING HIS WORK HIMSELF.
3. MAKES SOME DECISIONS REGARDING HIS WORK HIMSELF.
4. REQUIRES INSTRUCTOR TO MAKE MOST DECISIONS FOR HIM.
5. REQUIRES INSTRUCTOR TO MAKE ALL DECISIONS FOR HIM.

E. PHYSICAL STRENGTH
1. IS ABLE TO LOAD AND UNLOAD HEAVY LOADS.
2. IS ABLE TO LOAD HEAVY LOADS BUT NEEDS HELP TO UNLOAD.
3. IS ABLE TO LOAD AND UNLOAD MEDIUM LOADS.
4. IS ABLE TO LOAD SOME LOADS BUT IS UNABLE TO UNLOAD THEM.
5. IS UNABLE TO LOAD OR UNLOAD.

F. CO-OPERATION
1. IS ABLE TO WORK IN A TEAM.
2. IS ABLE TO WORK WITH MOST PEOPLE.
3. IS ABLE TO WORK WITH SOME PEOPLE.
4. IS ABLE TO WORK WITH FEW PEOPLE.
5. WORKS ALONE.
ANNEX D - Actuarial vs Clinical Judgement

The Sentence Management System outlined in this paper was developed to support the objective management of inmates within the context of Sentence Planning. The objectivity of the system is two-fold.

Firstly, the Sentence Management system is premised on what is deliverable by the establishment in terms of inmate activities, and the daily routines. Attainment Areas and Criteria are defined as part (Function 17) of the contract between the Governor and Area Manager each April. In this way, the demands of activities and routines are standard for all inmates, and can not be changed without the Area Manager’s consent. The system allows staff to assess inmates with respect to the demands of activities and routines, and it is this standardised assessment, facilitated by target setting, that lends the whole system to quantitative audit of both inmate personal development and the establishment’s regime delivery. The fact that Attainment Areas and Criteria are pre-defined means that inmates can be classified and compared with respect to those demands.

Secondly, since attainments can be quantified, in that levels of attainment can be counted, Sentence Management is by design an ‘actuarial’ system. Attainment Areas and Criteria are defined independently of inmates, as clear and public requirements of activities or specific behaviours required for the smooth running of the routines. Attainment Areas and Criteria will allow staff to objectively assess how any particular inmate has behaved relative to these demands, and with reference to other inmates. Furthermore, in being based on publicly observed behaviour, staff will be able to manage the whole process openly.

Through recording Attainments with respect to the demands of activities and the routines, normative (i.e. standard and comparable) measures of inmate behaviour will be derived, where any one inmate can be profiled with reference to those standards. Furthermore, the accumulation of such measures will provide staff with objective measures of the relationship between attainments in prison and measures of behaviour both prior to sentence, and after release during supervision. Where standard, public, and finite criteria are not available against which to assess and order inmates, judgements will inevitably be of a ‘clinical’ nature. In clinical judgement, the reference class is a private record of the assessor’s experience, which is frequently undocumented. Where an assessor tries to make judgements, or where he tries to predict relationships between an individual’s behaviour in the absence of statistically derived measures of such associations, he is, by definition making a clinical judgement. Overall, the implementation of the Sentence Management system will, as information accumulates, support objective assessment of an inmate’s progress through his sentence and provide a rational context both for informed allocation, and negotiation and contracting of personal targets. Finally, where staff are required to make judgements pertaining to risk the system will provide as objective a record as is possible of an inmate’s behaviour history whilst in custody and, through actuarial comparison, allow staff to state, in probabilistic terms, what class any particular inmate falls into, along with a statement of the likely (frequent) behaviour of inmates who fall into that class.
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ANNEX E - A Technical Note on Predicates (general terms/adjectives) and Constants (singular terms/nouns)

'Surely we all know that the human brain is poor at weighting and computing. When you check out at a supermarket you don't eyeball the heap of purchases and say to the clerk, "well it looks to me as if it's about $17.00 worth, what do you think?" The clerk adds it up. There are no strong arguments...from empirical studies...for believing that human beings can assign optimal weight in equations subjectively or that they apply their own weights consistently.'

P.E. Meehl (1986) - Quoted in Dawes, Faust and Meehl (1989)

A logical framework for the capture and management of behaviour requires little more than a set of predicates, constants and logical connectives. The predicates within the Sentence Management system are 'Attainment Criteria', captured by RM-1s as part of the annual contract process (Function 17). In the definition of RM-1s, the demands of activities and routines are specified as a fixed set of Attainment Areas and Criteria. The constants on the other hand are unique descriptors of inmates, and in the case of the PROBE /Sentence Management System, these are the inmate National Numbers. The logical connectives are basically NOT plus AND (although at times we may use OR plus the material implication (IF-THEN). Logically speaking we can make do with just AND plus NOT to join our predicates to form complex statements about inmates. Within the PROBE (PROfiling and PROgramming BEhaviour) database which is maintained throughout the Maximum Security System, we have additional predicates to Attainment Criteria. Examples are Governor's Reports and Movements. The extension of these predicates is the range of valid values which the predicate can take. Thus, the extension of the predicate 'Governors Report' is one of the 21 paragraphs under Rule 47, this paragraph being true, the others false. Further predicates can be related to these (eg the location, and the date and time of the infraction). All such predicates have a fixed, ie finite set of values (extensions). An inmate will be charged under one or other of the paragraphs of Rule 47, effectively rendering those paragraphs a behaviour checklist. This allows all concerned to be specific and unambiguous when discussing the behaviour. Such precision enables us, in fact, to apply quantifiers to the range of the predicate. In analysing (eg counting) the frequency of the extensions of such predicates (eg the paragraphs of Rule 47 of Governors Reports), we can deduce a measure of unconditional probability (or likelihood) of one class of reports with reference to others. That is, we can deduce the relative count or likelihood of, say, Good Order and Discipline Offences with respect to the frequency of other classes of reports (such as Staff Assaults or Abusive behaviour). In so doing we are always examining the relative frequencies of the extensions of the predicate Governor's Reports, and such analyses provide a measure of the unconditional probability (or likelihood) of one class of infraction in relation to another. Furthermore, by relating this measure to the unconditional probability of other predicates (eg Index Offence, or Number of Preconvictions), we can deduce measures of joint relative frequency (or conditional probability). In this way we can state the likelihood (or frequency) that an inmate classified under the extension of one predicate, (such as type of Index Offence) will also be classified under the extension of another predicate (such as rate of reports, or type of prison offending). Note, that all such analysis is simply descriptive of frequency of class membership. In this way, we are able to produce measures of association by simply counting how often events occur, and we do this using Elementary Logic (the Predicate Calculus - the rules of which can be automated, and if required, computerised using a 'Relational Database'). The role of the human judge is in the initial specification of the predicates (Attainment Areas and Criteria in the case of the Sentence Management system), and in the the routine assessment of inmates with respect to those predicates. Staff in effect apply the predicates to the constants ('constructs' to 'elements') as the assessment process. The extraction of relationships, and the production of profiles is left to an actuarial system, usually with the help of a computer.
Session 9
Developing a Primary Performance Indicator -
Introduction and Overview

A performance indicator (PI) is a statistic that can be used as an index of the performance in some specified area. A primary performance indicator (PPI) is a statistic that is basic to several different functions from which appropriate PIs may be derived for these functions. This derivation may be made directly (through aggregation or summation of the PPI for example) or through combining the PPI with other statistics. The Regime Monitoring system provides one example; a simple statistic showing the hours that any particular activity was available each day can be used variously to show:

- hours of education delivered per year
- average activity hours per inmate per week
- activity hours delivered per prison officer employed, and so on.

In the final session it was proposed that systematic recording of the attainments of inmates in particular activities would constitute a PPI for the Directorate of Inmate Programmes. The potential advantages included:

☐ attainments may be set over the whole range of activities within the prison, including treatment, regime activities and prison routines

☐ attainments are amenable to computerisation

☐ collated records of attainments may serve as a PPI for
  - sentence plans
  - regime delivery
  - regime integration and regime balance
  - activity-costs

☐ collecting records of attainments make more visible the role of the activity providers and the HIA, the general manager under Fresh Start of those activities

☐ the records of attainments may ultimately provide PIs for imprisonment itself as a rehabilitative process when these records are used in conjunction with the predicted risk for each prisoner at point of entry and their subsequent reconviction history.
SESSION IX

Developing a Primary Performance Indicator (PPI)

Mark Williams

Introduction

The major points in the presentations so far may be listed as follows.

- Delinquency extends beyond offending; the problems of the delinquents are reflected in their schooling, their work, their relationships, and are sustained over long periods.

- Offence Specific Prison Programmes have marginal (but reliable) impact on reconviction. This may well be because the interaction of the other elements - schooling, work, relationships - have the effect of reducing the impact of any programme designed to meet any single one of these features.

- Imprisonment entails all kinds of activities including education, work, routines and relationships; these could themselves be run as programmes.

- Evidence exists that the organisation of the regime and the control problems are interrelated.

- Evidence also exists that the organisation of the regime can affect reconviction rates adversely.

- Obviously, in practical terms, work and education dominate activities.

Taken together these six points highlight the necessity to break down the conceptual barrier between offence specific programmes and other programmes (such as in work or education). It is highly likely that the psychological deficits that contribute to the genesis of delinquency will, as research reveals them, prove to be helpful in designing specific regimes for prisoners. But even with our existing knowledge, we may be reasonably sure that any particular programme should take account of the impulsivity, poor attention span, and the sensation seeking of delinquents in general. In addition, there will probably be an element of lack of empathy. These characteristics or deficits may not only need to be addressed by programmes; they may also influence the design of programmes, (for example, educational courses may take account of poor attention span by use of short lessons).
A further element to this, in the Directorate of Inmate Programmes, is the information requirement. We need to measure programmes such as work, education, offence related programmes, routines, and the elements of daily life in prison - (such as getting up). The reasons for these information requirements include:

- there is a need to manage information, to facilitate decision making,
- there is a need to integrate information, making it accessible,
- there is a need for quality control, to ensure regime delivery,
- there is a need for continuity, and above all,
- there is a need to evaluate.

The notion that the conceptual barriers between offence related programmes and normal activities should be broken down, is not an impractical nor even an unusual suggestion. After all, if you accept the notion of using cognitive behavioural methods for sex offenders, then there is no reason why the cognitive behavioural methods should not be used for work. It is notorious in prisons that prisoners are reluctant to work, and there is very little attempt made, systematically, to address this problem of their motivation (apart of course from changing the nature of the work, or increasing the pay). Many delegates, during the course of this seminar, have mentioned prison specific activities. Malcolm Denton, for example, talked about physical education/gym for the mentally handicapped within prison walls. Graham Utteridge has mentioned job search. But most fundamental are the routines: areas requiring prisoners to behave well, such as work in reception, the kitchens or the gardens. The fact is that within prison there is potentially just as much illegal activity as outside prison. This, in a sense, is a challenge to organise the regime in such a way as to address that very offending behaviour. It introduces a managerial dimension to rehabilitation but devolved around the notion of inducing obedience and controlling disobedience on the wings. This gives added emphasis to the role of the landing officer and stresses the social skills of both parties. These general considerations lead directly to the necessity for a management information system based around performance in activities, as well as the indices capturing regime delivery.
Developing a Primary Performance Indicator (PPI)

The first step in the derivation of a primary performance indicator for the Directorate of Inmate Programmes is to consider what was referred to in Session 8 as sentence management. In that earlier session, David Longley presented a model for sentence management which described a five step cycle. This cycle will be briefly described as a preliminary to considering the PPI.

**Prisoners are observed under natural conditions of activities.**

The starting point is that sentence management has to be based on observations extended over much longer periods, and in more varied prison settings, than the conventional half hour interview. The prison sentence is spent in training prisons in a variety of activities, and it is on these activities that sentence management should centre and sentence planning evolve, since these activities are the substance of the plan. The activities referred to here are not restricted to work, education, and VTC. There should be little or no distinction between these and treatment programmes, once the conceptual barrier is removed. People are observed during the whole of the working day and the result should be made explicit. That would include periods of ‘treatment’ and periods of domestic activity, as well as periods of normal work.

But what is to be observed? At some point in this system, each prison activity has to provide explicit definitions of the attainments that normal supervision requires in normal (and good) work. Once these attainments have been defined for each particular work or activity area, the process of observation (and sentence management) can begin.

**Observed attainments are recorded.**

The central problems in reporting on the behaviour of prisoners in a wide variety of contexts, are the subjectivity of the judgements, the inconsistency in application, and the idiosyncratic attribution of the results. This should come as no surprise; we all are familiar with the school report which is the archetype of the problem - after a year of contact, often extending to three or four hours a week, the result is typified by comments such as 'could do better if he only concentrated more'. What our research showed was that although many middle managers stressed the problems of collecting information in the way proposed, supervisory staff recognised very quickly how it captured so much of what supervision is all about. It was explicitly making them expert in the field for which they were accountable. We believe that effective supervision of prison activities (whether it be work, education or treatment) is essentially the ability to create conditions for achieving attainments; attainments, that is, relevant to the activity being carried out.
Profiles of attainments are collated, and form the basis of discussion with the prisoner.

Here again, the move forward is the provision of something concrete to base a negotiated sentence on. Once we are receiving systematic observations over activities, profiles of prisoner attainments can be produced in a consistent way. Not only this, the profiles will be sufficiently objective to enable comparisons to be made across the prisoner population. Open reporting is clearly going to require that this kind of observational stance is the norm. Built into this system is not just the existence of explicit criteria, but also the fact that prisoners will be actively involved in discussions about their targets, and the attainments that they have reached.

Prisoners are set targets based on attainments.

This would emerge in all sorts of ways, and is probably the most important practical element in the derivation of sentence plans. As soon as attainments start to be achieved, recorded and collated across activities, sentence plans should emerge. Clearly, an initial plan may be set up on traditional lines from initial discussions with the prisoner collated across a varied selection of members of staff. The importance of the routine monitoring of attainments is that it enables a much more rapid check to be made on any kind of initial sentence plan, and even more crucially, it enables changes to evolve as the reality of attainments is set against the earlier aspirations.

Thus, the first four steps of the cycle are completed, and if successful will lead back to step one again for more advanced or ambitious sentence plans.

Elements of problem behaviour are addressed by appropriate allocation.

The intimate relationship between problem behaviour and the running of the regime has been stressed. What this system promises is a much more detailed record of what constitutes the problem behaviour since attainments set, and the performance in relation to them, will be added to the already existing record of delinquent or disruptive behaviour. The five stage cycle embraces every area of the prison - segregation unit staff will, and indeed have, set attainments and recorded the achievement (or otherwise) of the people in their care. The problem behaviour will surely be more amenable to analysis if attainment information is set along side normal discipline records.
Attainment records as a primary performance indicator.

A primary performance indicator is a statistic that is fundamental to a wide range of management responsibilities and can, through aggregation or recording over time, be used in a variety of ways. The system proposed here has two immediate advantages. First, it is amenable to the whole set of activities within the prison boundary. It is just as easy for teachers to set targets in classes, as it is for wing staff to set targets for the normal prison routines. Mention has already been made that at one segregation unit the staff have already been able to set out their attainment areas for people within the unit and break them down into manageable and observable criteria. The second advantage is that it is inherently computable - the problems of integrating a mass of hand-written and completely un-structured reports is eliminated.

Obviously the first advantage is the most immediate, and probably the effect with the greatest impact will be in providing reports on individual prisoners. Once a set of attainments is established in any particular activity, and once prisoners start to be monitored and their performance recorded, the step from there to creating a formal report is a very short one.

The second major application is in sentence planning. The problem with sentence planning is to integrate the daily activities that will happen whatever, with the aspirations and goals set out in the original plan. Measuring and recording attainments is the obvious and efficient way to combine the goals of the individual plan with the reality of daily life in prison. One crucial point is the fact that information across the whole range of prisoner activities (including offender programmes and other courses) can be compared and integrated under the general sentence planning heading.

Sentence management, in the straightforward sense of handling prisoners, is obviously strengthened by access to information about every individual that is sufficiently consistent to allow comparisons between different prisoners.

All of the applications mentioned so far have drawn on the fact that the information is based on particular individuals and can be used to make decisions about individuals. But, because the information is standardised, it can be aggregated across activity areas, across establishments, across areas and across types of institution. Regime monitoring suddenly becomes a qualitative as well as a quantitative exercise. Not only are the numbers of attainments now accessible, but also the quality of those attainments can be judged. Every prison governor will have a digest of all the possible attainments that can be achieved in his particular prison.
Clearly this will have implications for regime balance and regime integration. As soon as the attainments are made explicit, one can see the relationships between certain kinds of work and certain kinds of education and certain kinds of prisoner routines. Furthermore, as attainments are achieved, or not achieved, so the design of the regime may be amended.

Finally, of course, are NVQs. The system of attainment recording is potentially a very useful part of the NVQ process.

In the context of Fresh Start and the Reorganisation.

Recording attainments and properly processing the information has all kinds of benefits. One of the most important, in our view, is the way it gives officers and specialists more explicit and visible roles in activities. In all the prisons we visited we found that prison officers, instructors and teachers made records of what was going on in their area of responsibility. Very little use, however, was made of that information, outside of their immediate concern. Sentence planning, for example, or sentence reviews were, in general, made up from simple requests for some kind of summary at the end of six months, a year or even longer. There was little sense of management seeking what they thought was important in assessment, nor in utilising their obvious expertise as supervisors.

A second, important element, is giving effective information technology to the HIA. The role and function of the HIA remains ambiguous; and it is difficult to see how they can manage, given the present set-up.

As the information is aggregated and goes up the line, so headquarters, and DIP in particular, will have an effective basis for integrating operations and policy. Questions about what is actually happening in prisons will no longer be problematic. Information will be provided - however much it is aggregated - about the nature and quality of regime activities. This, we believe, is the proper basis for policy development. Finally, the potential of the information in longer term assessment of imprisonment as a process is immense. Now that the reconviction prediction scale has been updated, and scores are systematically calculated and recorded, as also are reconvictions subsequent to prison sentences, we have a situation in which three sources of information (the likelihood of re-offending calculated prior to sentence, attainments during sentence, over the whole range of offender programmes as well as activities, and reconvictions subsequent to release) may be systematically integrated to demonstrate the long term efficacy of regimes and regime elements. This would truly be a radical management information system.
Points Raised in Discussion:

Mr Emes led the discussion by suggesting we now had an effective basis for integrating operations and policy. There were several options available: primarily, in order to consolidate the impact of the seminar, it was important to set ourselves various tasks. The information presented over the last three days demanded action and change. This information needed to be passed on and ought to inform what we ourselves and others in the prison service are doing.

The implications were that the day-to-day routines in prison (work, education, PE) were not just stocking-fillers, but were all significant with respect to rehabilitation. The way activities are integrated needed to be examined. One important task would be to produce a paper translating the proceedings of the last few days into a practical and philosophical account of the way forward.

Miss McCormick pointed out that one of the arguments for monitoring work in the regime was that it had been recognised that it should have a useful role. There was now a need to go further, and examine the actual nature of the work being offered. Mr Emes agreed that what had been highlighted was that the process of work was the important factor, as opposed to the output.

Mr Guy raised a note of caution, suggesting that we should guard against going to the opposite extreme of the ‘nothing works’ syndrome by putting too much emphasis on promoting rehabilitation at the cost of all else. It was not illegitimate to ask prisoners to contribute something to the cost of the prison service, and there would always be some need for work which was not of immediate benefit to a prisoner in rehabilitation terms. Mr Emes pointed out that we could nevertheless encourage prisoners to use their time usefully while in prison. Many current activities in the prison context could be treated with more respect.

Mr Williams pointed out that catering was a good example of the way in which a necessary part of prison work could be used constructively to provide prisoners with a real skill. Yet there was a trend towards using outside caterers. The advantages of utilising the NVQ course in prison kitchens was discussed. If prisoners only worked in the kitchen for the ‘perks’ (because the pay was good, it was warm, it was easy to steal extra food), then you might simply be rewarding ‘successful delinquency’. It was better to provide them with real skills and qualifications. There was a need for greater co-operation between teachers and kitchen staff in this respect. Mr Rudgard felt there was no better vehicle for breaking down the barriers between kitchen/industrial staff and education departments than initiatives like the NVQ.

Mr Guy pointed out that it was important not to produce a different message from that being reflected in the Prisons Board papers which were aimed at providing guidelines for governors on how to balance the regimes. It was necessary to send clear and unequivocal messages to governors about what their priorities should be. Mrs Grimsey felt that what had been discussed fitted in well with the Prisons Board papers. The emphasis was on the ‘quality and relevance’ of what we do with prisoners. It was agreed that Mrs Grimsey should re-examine
the criteria being put forward in the Prisons Board papers to ascertain how this fitted in with the implications for policy arising from this seminar.

Dr McDougall agreed that the conclusions arrived at as a result of the seminar did not conflict with the Prisons Board papers. She felt it important to set out all the points arising in the form of clear guidelines. Mr Emes agreed that nothing incompatible with the Prisons Board papers had been raised, but the Prisons Board papers had been written from a different starting point, focusing on a human rights position. Mrs Grimsey wanted to point out that the issues were not simply about human rights, but also about preparing for release.

Miss McCormick suggested there was a need for a wider distribution, such as an article in the Prison Service Journal or Prison Service News. This idea was discussed, and it was generally agreed that it might be more useful to give information directly to Governors. It was also agreed that information should be given to the training organisation as well.

It was agreed that DIP2 would have responsibility for producing a first draft of the paper, which should then be circulated to those present for comment. The paper should summarise research and provide guidelines for action.

Mr Guy asked whether there was a need to inform ministers and the Prisons Board, and Mr Emes suggested a further paper should be prepared for that purpose. Mr Guy pointed out that the issue of the role of work in the regime needed careful consideration in presentation to ministers.

Mr Emes suggested that there was a need to discuss some of these issues with PSIF. The whole process of disseminating the information involved consultation with other directorates.

Mr Wheatley pointed out that the seminar had not been solely concerned with the role of work in rehabilitation, but that there were other important issues concerned with specialised programmes. These programmes were already running in establishments and it was important to give staff running them the information they needed to run them successfully.

The action decided upon was as follows:

- A report of the proceedings (DIP2/RR&D)
- A paper summarising the conclusions and pointing out the implications, translating the proceedings into broad guidelines which might be made available to other directorates and governors.
- Lessons gleaned from the paper proposed above to be drawn into Submissions to Ministers.
- A Sentence Management Steering Group to be set up involving area managers and governors. (Mr Guy and Mrs Grimsey)