

Family Man

An outline of the theoretical basis of the programme

Document prepared in consultation with Safe Ground by

**James McGuire
Division of Clinical Psychology
University of Liverpool**

January, 2009

Executive summary

Family Man is a structured, drama-based, educational programme designed for use in HM Prisons and has been delivered for several years in a number of prison establishments. The overall objective of the programme is to help maintain links between prisoners and their families during the difficult period of separation. This is designed to meet the needs of prisoners with reference to supporting contact and helping to maintain family unity despite that separation, whilst also seeking to ensure that support will be available after the prisoner is released. That in turn is believed to facilitate rehabilitation and resettlement, contributing to a process whereby risks of re-offending will be reduced. In parallel, the programme is also designed to help support families, by sustaining links between fathers, mothers and children, where possible preserving the parenting process and making a long-term contribution to reducing risk of future delinquency amongst developing children.

The present document provides a proposal for a conceptual or theoretical basis for this work. Setting this out as a formal statement in this manner is considered valuable as an element in the next stage of the programme's development. Family Man has been delivered numerous times in a range of locations and is accompanied by a considerable volume of support materials. However, as yet there is no formal statement of the change processes thought to be activated by the programme, that connect the objectives of the programme with materials and exercises used in its sessions via an identified set of psychological change mechanisms. The present document seeks to delineate those processes and fill that gap.

Family Man is considered to achieve its effects through a combination of several types of mechanism that include:

- ❖ An educational element: grounded in a process of cognitive change, progressively activated by a series of structured learning exercises
- ❖ A personal development element: engendered by the use of drama-based, interactive ingredients that promote individual insight and re-evaluation of attitudes and beliefs concerning families
- ❖ An interactive element: generated through activation of processes of interpersonal dynamics shown to be vital in engagement, and operative in structured groups and allied contexts

It is proposed that the programme's activities and its mode of delivery energize and integrate the above vehicles of change in an interactive, "synergetic" manner in which the separate components of activity reinforce each other in a cumulative, dynamic, multi-layered process. In what follows, those processes are described in some detail, and connections made to background research on family functioning, on dynamic processes in learning groups, and on the reduction of offender recidivism. This is also used to outline in a tentative way how a systematic evaluation of Family Man could be conducted.

Family Man

An outline of the theoretical basis of the programme

Rationale for addressing family issues

There are several interconnected reasons for providing support to prisoners in the area of family relationships. First of all and as a matter of principle, there are firm reasons based on individual rights and on humanitarian grounds for attempting to help prisoners maintain contact with their families whilst in custody. Family life is a crucial area to address in work with offenders, and especially those sentenced to imprisonment, on several levels. Survey evidence suggests that separation from the family is one of the main hardships of imprisonment, causing distress both to prisoners and to family members in the community. Loss of contact with families may worsen prospects of rehabilitation, as family relatives may play a pivotal role in supporting resettlement following release.

Eminent figures in the criminal justice field have emphasized the central position of family relationships in these and other respects. “The disruption of the prisoner's position within the family unit represents one of the most distressing aspects of imprisonment ... Enabling prisoners, so far as possible, to stay in close and meaningful contact with the family is therefore an essential part of humane treatment.” (Woolf Report 2001, cited in Eady, 2007). Similarly Lord Ramsbotham (2005), former Chief Inspector of Prisons, has argued powerfully that enabling prisoners to maintain family contact is one of the core features of a healthy prison. Voluntary organisations working directly with prisoners and their families have forwarded pertinent arguments and evidence to the House of Commons (Select Committee on Home Affairs, 2005). These arguments are endorsed in the Social Exclusion Unit's report on *Reducing Re-offending by Ex-prisoners* (2002) which affirms that “...maintaining family relationships can help to prevent prisoners re-offending and can assist them to successfully settle in the community”.¹

More recently, a report by the Cabinet Office Social Exclusion Task Force (2007) has set out some of the parameters within which the need to address family issues with prisoners must be recognised. They include the information that in England and Wales during 2005, as an example, there were 162,000 children with a parent in prison; amongst imprisoned male young offenders, 25% already are, or about to become fathers; and that children of prisoners have approximately three times the risk for both mental health problems and anti-social or delinquent behaviour compared to their peers. Background research cited in the report also indicates that there is an association between improved resettlement, receiving family visits, and engaged in employment, training and education both during and after imprisonment (Niven and Stewart, 2005a, 2005b). While the latter authors did not themselves carry out a follow-up study, they nevertheless suggested that “opportunities for involving families and/or partners in the resettlement of prisoners should be increased” (2005a, p.1).

¹ It should be noted that several words (*re-offending*, *reconviction*, *recidivism*) are often used interchangeably in criminal justice policy documents, when each in fact has a slightly separate meaning. However, specifying those meanings precisely is hampered by the fact that the words themselves can be defined in different ways: for example recidivism has been defined in different research studies in terms of self-reported re-offending; observed behaviour; re-arrest; appearances in court; or convictions. Space does not allow a full discussion of these complexities, and background documents are discussed here in broader terms as parts of the rationale for providing a programme of this type, and preparing associated documents such as the present one.

Therefore, there are firm grounds for establishing a systematic approach to addressing the issue of prisoner-family relationships during a prison sentence. From a legal perspective, international, regional and national agreements and statutes firmly indicate the rights of prisoners to be able to maintain contacts with their families as a central component of well-being. Relevant legislation bearing on this issue has recently been summarised (see Lines, 2008). We should bear in mind, from an ethical standpoint, the well-known principle enunciated by John Howard that individuals are sent to prison *as* punishment, not *for* punishment. The sentence of the court is one of deprivation of liberty, and while this inevitably induces discomfort and distress, it is not intended that these should be amplified by enforcing more detachment than is necessary from the community outside. Nor is it the objective of the penal system to cause hardship to family members who have not themselves been convicted of crimes, though this all too often is an inescapable part of the impact of imprisonment. Thus spouses, partners, children, and other relatives may endure collateral hardship as a consequence.

Of course, it is unrealistic to assume that all family relationships are harmonious, supportive and conducive to an ex-offender's resettlement after release. Some relational dynamics are problematic to an extent that a solution is unlikely to be found whilst a family member is in prison; alongside which it has to be recognised that some family relationships may be damaging, and potentially criminogenic. There are circumstances therefore in which minimal or even no contact with families may be the preferable option. In the majority of cases however, prisoners' families are extremely important to them and vice versa. There is a clear necessity, if imprisonment is to entail standards that are decent and humane, for aspects of prisoners' relationships with their families to be addressed.

Rationale for a structured programme

While much work helping to support and maintain family connections will be done on an individual basis by probation services and other agencies, there are reasons why the provision of a structured programme can afford additional benefits. The use of structured programmes is now a firmly embedded practice in prisons both in the United Kingdom and elsewhere, and enjoys wide institutional and managerial support. Under the government's Crime Reduction Programme initiated in 1998, a range of structured programmes focused on the reduction of re-offending has been disseminated through both prison and probation services. Statistics recently published by the Ministry of Justice (2008) show that the national adult re-offending rate for 2006 has fallen by comparison with data for the year 2000:²

- (a) The frequency rate of re-offending fell 22.9% (189.4 → 146.1 offences per 100 offenders);
- (b) the number of offences classified as most serious fell 11.1% (0.78 → 0.69 offences per 100 offenders);
- (c) the proportion of offenders reoffending (actual yes/no rate) decreased by 10.7% (4.7 percentage points = 43.7% → 39.0%); and
- (d) the proportion of offenders who reoffended fell by 10.6% when controlling for changes in offender characteristics.

While it cannot be unequivocally demonstrated from the information available, it seems reasonable to suggest that the delivery of structured programmes to large

² These results "cover adults released from custody or commencing a court order (sentences under probation supervision excluding fines)" (page 3). All measures in the report "summarise data obtained from the Police National Computer (PNC) on whether or not an offender is proven to have reoffended during a one-year follow up period, as well as how many times and the seriousness of reoffences committed" (page 3).

numbers of people in prison and probation has been one element contributing to these results.

Structured group programmes offer a number of advantages in carrying out effective interventions in prison settings. First and most obviously, they increase the number of individuals who can be reached and so maximise the efficiency and economy of educational, training and therapeutic efforts. Group formats can create an internal energy and momentum that instigates and sustains change in their participants, and may help to generate enthusiasm individuals who are initially reluctant to become involved. There are well recognised mechanisms of learning and change that can only be activated in group environments, and which can enhance motivation and provide opportunities that are difficult to access when working on a one-to-one basis. Once a group has become established and is functioning coherently, and those mechanisms have been activated, there is no reason why it cannot induct new members, rendering possible a format of “rolling groups” incorporating a regular flow of new entrants and corresponding departures of those who have completed a training cycle. However, the most cohesive atmosphere is likely to be engendered when there is continuity of attendance amongst a group whose membership remains intact throughout.

Of course, the objectives of any intervention programme are only likely to be met if its objectives are clear; methods and exercises are of a high quality; and staff providers - tutors, teachers or therapists – are well trained, adequately resourced and supported by management. A final aspect is the clear identification of a “model of change” that is thought to be at work when the changes that are the goals of a programme are successfully obtained. This aspect is the focus of the present document.

Within this, there are additional benefits that accrue if a structured programme is supported by learning materials such as a delivery manual and other accompanying documents. Programme “manualisation” is considered to offer a range of advantages (Hollin, 2006; McMurrin and Duggan, 2005). First, the availability of a structured manual provides an invaluable resource for staff training, as it sets of clear explanation of the methods to be applied, and how sessions should be run. The degree of detailed specification within this varies from one manual to another. As already mentioned, with particular reference to group programmes this in turn affords a second, economic advantage, in allowing a larger number of service users or participants to be accessed. Third, by clarifying the nature of the work to be done, a “manualised” approach allows opportunities to monitor integrity of delivery and treatment adherence. Fourth, the preceding reasons then make the process of evaluation considerably easier. Overall, the presence of a manual clarifies the kind of activity in which participants are being engaged, and facilitates communication concerning it.

In a report prepared for the US Department of Justice by the Vera Institute, Jeffries, Menghraj and Hairston (2001) reviewed the materials employed in a series of 14 family- and parenting-oriented programmes for prisoners in the USA. At that stage it was not possible to identify any trend that might be considered “best practice”, and given that most investment in programming has been in other directions within criminal justice services, there does not yet appear to be any dominant, evidence-based, “treatment of choice” model that has emerged in this field. While the Vera Institute report provides descriptive information on all of these programmes, for the most part this focuses on practicalities, with the rationale and objectives being taken on prima facie grounds of there being inadequate provision in this area. As the authors noted, “...the principles and conceptual framework guiding the curricula of each of the programs were rarely explicit, though the underlying premises for course content could sometimes be inferred” (Jeffries et al, 2001, pp.44-45). Thus, it does not appear that any of these programmes had at its

basis a clearly articulated conceptual model of the change processes that occur while it is in progress, or a specification of how these were related to the processes involved in its delivery and management. Similarly, other reviews of parenting programmes in prisons, while addressing many pragmatic aspects, also somewhat neglected the underlying theoretical rationale for their design and contents (Loper and Tuerk, 2006).

Research background

To expand the basis of the rationale underpinning the Family Man programme, it is useful to review relevant social science literature focused on family problems in prisoners, their consequences, and how they might be addressed. Several sets of studies have a bearing on this issue.

Separation from families

There is consistent evidence from social science research indicating the difficulties caused by separation of prisoners from their families. This results in distress not only to many prisoners themselves but also to partners and children, and has long-term implications both for the subsequent progress of prisoners and for their close relatives including children affected by parental absence and disruption (Hagan and Dinovitzer, 1999; Naser and Visher, 2006). Considerable amounts have been written on the problem of children with parents in prison, and space does not permit coverage of it here; a selection of literature is listed on the web pages of the Vera Institute (2008). A proportion of those children may be at increased risk of involvement in offending as a result. With regard to these outcomes then, a neglect of family issues whilst prisoners are in custody could be seen as a major counter-productive consequence of imprisonment. It is widely considered vital to address “criminogenic needs” if the re-entry of prisoners to the community is to be made maximally effective (Listwan, Cullen and Latessa, 2006).

Strength of family ties

“Strong ties between prisoners and their families or close friends appear to have a positive impact on postrelease success” (Visher and Travis, 2003, p.99). Hairston (1988) reviewed five studies conducted from 1970 onwards, four of which showed significant associations between the presence of firm ties to families and lower likelihood of criminal recidivism. In their more recent review, Visher and Travis (2003) augmented this with findings from additional studies consistently showing an association between family contacts and the success of rehabilitation efforts. Most of the available data are from USA, but similar trends have been detected in the UK (Ditchfield, 1994; Light, 1993). While the precise causal pathways within this remain unclear, having sustained family ties also appears to be associated with better prospects in relation to accommodation and employment following release (Niven and Stewart, 2005). Laub, Nagin and Sampson (1998) constructed a data-driven model showing a relationship between quality of marital contacts and desistance from crime. This was based on analysis of the life trajectories of a sample of 500 young offenders followed over a 25-year period, and development of a robust statistical model of the factors associated with desistance. Marriages that were “characterized by social cohesiveness led to a growing preventive effect...the effect of a good marriage takes time to appear, and it grows slowly over time until it inhibits crime” (Laub et al., 1998, page 237). This accords with a model of desistance as emerging not from any single factor but from “the perceived strength, quality, and interdependence” of social attachments and interactions (Maruna, 2001, p. 32). Combining this evidence, there is a firm case for interventions designed to maintain good-quality family ties.

Cost-benefit comparisons

Brookes (2005) has adduced evidence suggesting that 45% of prisoners lose family contacts whilst in prison. He analysed data from the National Offender Management Service suggesting an association between this finding and subsequent recidivism. On the basis that each new re-offence following release costs more than £110,000, Brookes makes a case for visitor centres and other family-oriented facilities being a good “return on investment” and thus amply justified on cost-benefit grounds. This accords with evidence from elsewhere that offender programmes can demonstrate respectable, and sometimes excellent, cost-benefit ratios (Aos, Phipps, Barnoski and Lieb, 2001).

Family dynamics and life events

Whilst having a different focus, the work of Zamble and Quinsey (1997) on the dynamics of criminal recidivism may have a close bearing on the usage of a programme such as Family Man. These authors interviewed a series of 300 high-risk, recidivist offenders (with an average of 25 previous convictions) focusing on events in their lives in the period preceding the offence that had led to their most recent incarceration. Family relationship problems, and difficulties that were typically closely connected to them, such as oscillations in mood, substance misuse, coping failures, and other features were strongly associated with new offence incidents.

Benefits of family-oriented work

A few studies have appeared which have shown short-term beneficial effects of working with family-related issues amongst prisoners. Working in a medium-security prison in Alabama, Bayse, Allgood and Van Wyk (1991) evaluated a Family Life Education programme, consisting of just four 2½-hour sessions, and found it reduced levels of narcissism or self-preoccupation (“selfism”), and increased perceptions of family cohesiveness amongst participants as compared with a control sample. In a Utah medium-security prison Klein and Bahr (1996) evaluated a series of ten 1½-hour sessions addressing a range of family-related issues. Prisoners reported finding the programme very helpful in addressing problems and there was evidence that their ability to identify problems, possible solutions, and sources of help increased pre-to-post test, though this study contained no comparison sample.

Given these reported benefits as a result of a programme on a fairly limited scale, there are grounds for expecting larger and farther-reaching effects from Family man. The programme is considerably more complex than that described by Klein and Bahr (1996), is delivered over a period of several weeks, and entails 120 hours of contact time. Given its scope, the programme also employs several types of methods and activates several types of change: hence the need for a document to identify the nature and inter-relationships of such change processes.

Thus, review and evaluation studies of Family Man itself, and of its companion programme *Fathers Inside*, provide initially very promising results. Preliminary material from a follow-up study of Family Man graduates by Boswell and Poland (2008) suggests the presence of an impact in reducing subsequent adjudications for those in prison, and potentially in reducing re-offending amongst those released.

While aspects of family dynamics such as cohesiveness are not easy to assess, specialised scales have been developed and successfully validated for doing so. They include for example the *Family Environment Scale* (FES-3; Moos and Moos, 2002) and the *Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scale-II* (FACES-II; Olson, Bell and Portner, 1982). Potentially, scales such as these could be employed in evaluative research on family-oriented programmes used in prison settings.

Family impact on child behaviour

The family has consistently been identified as a primary influence in the genesis of the types of problem behaviour and allied difficulties that are associated developmentally with the emergence of juvenile delinquency, and subsequent adult criminality (Farrington, 1995, 2007). While it is not an objective of Family Man to address these issues directly, it is not unreasonable to propose that in working with prisoners and seeking to enhance their relationships with their families, there is an implication that this may have beneficial effects for their children who, on the basis of the criminological literature, may be at an elevated risk of future involvement in offending behaviour (Murray, 2007; Murray and Farrington, 2005; Murray, Janson and Farrington, 2007; Salmon, 2005).

Family-based interventions and offender recidivism

Associated with this, there are four meta-analytic reviews of family-based interventions with offenders (Dowden and Andrews, 2003; Farrington and Welsh, 2003; Latimer, 2001; Woolfenden, Williams and Peat, 2002). However, all the studies subsumed within these are focused on young offenders, for whom there is a clear basis for work with families to address issues that may be associated with the onset and maintenance of delinquency. This work may be only tangentially relevant to the type of work undertaken in Family Man. Nevertheless it is worth noting that the mean effect sizes reported in all of these reviews are positive and statistically significant; and that some of the largest effect sizes reported to date in the treatment-outcome literature on offender recidivism are based on multi-faceted family-oriented programmes such as *Multi-Systemic Therapy*, *Functional Family Therapy* and *Parenting Wisely* (McGuire, 2004). All of these approaches have some common features in that they address, through direct training, how members of families can interact with each other in more constructive ways, to reduce conflict and increase mutual understanding and support.

Thus there is a wide consensus on the importance of family dysfunction in relation to an individual's involvement in crime, and of the intactness and integrity of families in supporting individuals released from prison. Arguably, the convergence of evidence here leaves it virtually unquestionable that this is an important and yet neglected area of provision for prisoners, and that if such work can be done well it should yield both individual and societal benefits. But in addition, on the basis of available empirical research, there are reasonable grounds for proposing that an intervention programme focused on improving family relationships whilst simultaneously increasing literacy and communication skills holds out the prospect of yielding benefits with respect to desistance from crime.

Education and skills elements

However, alongside its family-oriented focus, Family Man also contains other core components of a quite different kind. These focus on education and on prisoners' needs in the areas of literacy and other basic educational skills. Concerning this, there is ample evidence of marked needs in this area amongst many prisoners. This has been shown in the extensive report of the Social Exclusion Unit (2002) and also in studies of initiatives such as basic skills education in prisons (Stewart, 2005) and the outcomes of the probation service's Basic Skills Pathfinder (McMahon, Hall, Hayward, Hudson & Roberts, 2004).

With respect to relevant evaluation research, education and vocational training have been shown to be associated with positive outcomes in terms of rates of subsequent re-offending. Wilson, Gallagher and MacKenzie (2000) reported a meta-analytic review of 33 studies yielding 53 tests of the impact of education, vocational training, and allied programmes with adult offenders. The mean effects

size corresponded to recidivism rates for intervention and comparison groups of 37% and 50% respectively. This indicates that activities in this area can effectively contribute to delivering the vision set out in the government's proposals for employment and skills training as components of a strategy to reduce re-offending (HM Government 2005). Acquiring basic skills and competencies that are transferrable enhances the general life opportunities of adult learners. But more specifically, it can enable them, amongst other goals, to find a place in the employment market. This reflects the position of offenders as a priority group for the Learning and Skills Council (2005). That is, the integration of objectives and methods in a multiple-subject approach, as incorporated in Family Man, which combines a literacy skills element with family-oriented work, goes a considerable way towards operationalising these objectives in a single programme.

Use of drama-based methods

As a solution to the problem of combing quite disparate components – addressing family and interpersonal issues, whilst also providing basic literacy education – the Family Man programme adopts an approach grounded in the use of drama, within a broad context that might loosely be called “arts-based”. This is designed to facilitate engagement, to make learning enjoyable, to foster group cohesion, and to bring to participants’ attention complex and subtle issues which many might find difficult to articulate in more formal educational contexts. This is not dissimilar to a number of projects that have been carried out in prisons using theatre either in the form of presentation followed by discussion or as active, participatory exercises. This also has some similarities to the tradition of work emanating from psychodrama. However in the case of family man these are augmented by the use of explicitly educational and other family-oriented ingredients. It is crucial to emphasize that this does not constitute therapy *per se*. While drawing some of its ingredients from work done in therapeutic contexts, the design and contents of the Family Man programme make it unequivocally *educational* in its orientation.

While some of the original work of J. L. Moreno (the founder of psychodrama) was carried out in a U.S. reformatory, the primary focus was on prisoner allocation and on improving interpersonal relationships within the residential setting. A review some time ago by Schramski and Harvey (1983) indicated “cautious optimism” concerning the use of psychodrama and role-play methods in prisons and young offender institutions. These authors found two experimental and five quasi-experimental studies which “generally yielded positive, though not consistently significant results” (p.246) with respect to attitude change and other variables. They also reported an additional study of their own which demonstrated similar positive effects in relation to offenders’ attitudes to imprisonment. A recent review by Kipper and Ritchie (2003) of the effectiveness of psychodrama techniques has provided positive evidence specifically regarding the effectiveness of “role-reversal” and “doubling” techniques, but this work was undertaken in the field of mental health and none of the studies reviewed included an offender sample.

In practical delivery within the sessions of Family Man, the usage of these methods is essentially similar to the role-playing exercises employed in prison-based offending behaviour programmes. The sequences of action in the latter are typically shorter, and it is customary to place more emphasis on behaviour, skills, action and exchange rather than on emotions and self-discovery as would happen when using psychodrama.

Model of change

The formulation of a core “model of change” which Family Man is designed to employ and to activate will enable practitioners to clarify the future direction of the

programme's development and perhaps also inform some aspects of its day-to-day delivery. The programme could of course continue to be run on a solely pragmatic basis. However having an agreed conceptual model would be advantageous when defining the programme relative to others of its type, and for guiding reflection on any new or different developments.

Family Man is an attempt to address several sets of needs that do not fit easily together. One core objective is to act as a kind of remedial adult education programme focusing on literacy and allied basic skills. The other is to enable and support participants to address some of the feelings they have concerning their families, their current predicament, and aspects of their relationships with partners and children. Most sessions and many specific exercises are in effect composite results of seeking to fuse these objectives together. In addition, by being delivered to groups of 15-20 prisoners at a time, the programme also capitalises on the interpersonal dynamics that are generated in conjoint group-based learning. There are important differences between the processes operating in such an environment, as opposed to individual tuition, or teaching in a classroom setting using a didactic approach, even where that would involve some group discussion.

Aspects of the programme format

The programme format for Family Man is designed for adult males (i.e. over the age of 18), working in mixed ability groups to avoid exclusion in custodial settings. It is intended to encompass a wide ability range, including participants with learning disability. Therefore all the exercises and materials use accessible methods with flexible modes of delivery. The activities are not addressed uniquely towards any specific type of participant. Nor is the ethos directly driven by the concept of "deficit" as an underlying cause of problems an individual may be facing, as is the case with several other programmes. Prisoners themselves, working in groups, played a pivotal part in the programme's development and in specifying the major themes on which it focused and the ground to be covered in its content. In this respect the programme is avowedly "client centred". Given that much of the impetus for this came from prisoners themselves, the emphasis was practical and action-oriented; hence the underlying mechanisms that might accomplish the desired goals were not explicitly recognised or discussed. Prisoners felt a need for an organised activity, designed with a practical focus, arising from an experienced urge to address family issues. But understandably, this was not initially articulated in abstract or theoretical terms.

As stated, the approach integrates several elements that do not, on first consideration, appear to be easily assembled into a coherent framework. They include (a) education for adult learning and personal development, (b) arts and drama-based, action-oriented activities and (c) use of a participatory group context. The family focused element of the programme is both an end in itself, and also a means to the end of education. The programme contents are designed to foster experiential learning and immediacy of impact. In addition to educational elements, the participant group is a motivator, a vehicle for promoting learning, enabling each member to learn from exposure to multiple perspectives on any given issue that is raised. This achieves a certain level of momentum, bringing individuals forward but at the same time, given the group size, allowing a certain scope and a degree of anonymity that can ensure a sense of safety, even if covering intricate and delicate issues. Working with a group with 15-20 participants ensures that there is virtually always a contribution that can be obtained to enable the group to remain active and vibrant, while simultaneously diffusing any sense that one individual will become an extended focus of attention. The optimal delivery of the programme achieves is one that strikes the best combination of the momentum of learning alongside a sense that no individual is disproportionately the focus of attention.

A taxonomic model of programme objectives and processes

The central proposal of the present document is that the core model of change that informs Family Man can be cast in terms of the *taxonomy of educational objectives* developed by Benjamin Bloom. Originating in the 1950s, this has been developed by his colleagues in a series of books now extending back approximately 50 years. The present proposal draws on a recent version of this work (Anderson, Krathwohl, Airasian, Cruikshank, Mayer, Raths and Wittrock, 2001).

Bloom's original taxonomy divided learning objectives into three domains: cognitive, affective, and psychomotor. The first corresponds to the types of academically based learning familiar in most classrooms, focused on the acquisition of knowledge, understanding, and ability to engage in and apply a range of cognitive operations whether in the intellectual or practical sphere. The second focuses more on the development of a set of attitudes, beliefs, values and patterns of feeling concerning both self and others. It has close affinities with the kinds of activities that are activated during successful therapy, and it also has affiliations with the types of change that are being sought through the use of drama-based educational methods, that will help to promote insight, emotional understanding, and appreciation. Some aspects of this are also sometimes called "values enhancement". The third is concerned with the learning of skills, not only in the practical (impersonal) domain in manipulation of objects but also in the interpersonal one through the exercise of self-expression, communication and social exchange.

This tripartite division of learning goals is not dissimilar to the sub-division of processes identified in the behavioural and cognitive therapies – cognition, affect, behaviour (or knowing, feeling, doing) – and potentially could allow a mapping exercise to be undertaken between Family Man and the models employed in the majority of cognitive-behavioural offence-focused programmes used elsewhere in HM prison service. These are derived from the conceptual framework known as *cognitive social learning theory* which has been extensively applied in the development and application of offending behaviour programmes (McGuire, 2004).

With reference to Family Man, it is therefore hypothesized that the following processes are those that are activated by the component materials and exercises and which drive change during, and as a result of, the programme sessions. They are separated into three domains – cognitive, affective, and psychomotor – but in practice this is somewhat artificial and change occurs as a fusion of all three.

Cognitive domain

The basic skill or educational component of Family Man is designed to promote similar kinds of cognitive change to those that occur in most classroom and college settings. This refers to the activities of acquiring new information, increasing comprehension, being able to apply knowledge, being able to both analyse and synthesize information to solve problems, and to evaluate and make judgments on outcomes. As a major focus is literacy and language/communication skills, portions of this may be at an elementary level in some cases. Cognitive learning occurs through clear definition of material, development of clear categories for assimilating new information, repetition through exercise and usage, reinforcement of success.

All of the direct literacy education and associated aspects of the programme initiate and sustain cognitive learning. This includes the extensive feedback that is given on cell-based assignments. Other exercises where information is imparted, where group discussion focuses on expanding individuals' perspectives, or where ideas are generated that will bring additional aspects of a situation to participants' attention, will work by promoting cognitive-level change. An exercise such as the

exposition of SMART goals (Lesson 20 Session 2) illustrates a combination of partly didactic, partly Socratic procedures that will jointly activate cognitive change.

Affective domain

Change objectives in this domain are centred on how individuals respond to their experiences on an emotional level, and therefore deals with feelings, values, appreciation, enthusiasm, interest, motivation and attitude. By their nature the family oriented components are in some respects difficult to capture and articulate in a precisely defined way, but are likely to entail realisations that arise from listening to others, from group discussion, from making contributions and having others respond to them. Emotional reactions (even of a low intensity) that occur due to role-taking (and its variants such as doubling or role-reversal) can also create changes along similar lines.

At one level, the action-oriented elements of drama and performance, games, and other structured exercises that compose Family Man serve initially as techniques of engagement. They are designed to capture attention, put participants at ease, create an accepting atmosphere, raise energy levels, and so maximise motivation and thereby retention. As that occurs, a second process is activated which centres on the development within participants of openness to hearing other individuals' ideas, and being increasingly willing to express one's own. This drives a third level of change process, which is the fostering of insight and understanding of perspectives on the issues under discussion or which are the focus of activities and tasks. Collectively, these lead to affective or emotional or attitudinal change, concentrated on aspects of relationships with families but having broader effects on self-perceptions and self-evaluations.

These processes can be illustrated with reference to exercises such as the use of the assessment worksheet *My needs and my family's needs*. Having first considered this in relation to a fictional character ('Pete'), in Lesson 20 Session 3 participants then consider this in relation to themselves. This entails focusing on emotional, relational, and attitudinal aspects of family life, and develops appreciation and assimilation of experience at an emotional level.

Psychomotor domain

This sphere was initially given less attention by Bloom and his colleagues and until recently was less clearly specified. However, it is familiar to many educators in association with the process of writing "behavioural objectives" which are used in many educational and training contexts. It entails the use of interactive skill-training exercises that typically involve activities such as role-play, feedback and discussion, though these could be allied to some instruction. In addition to the Bloom framework, there are parallel background sources for this approach. One is psychodrama, where as previously noted there is good outcome evidence concerning the effectiveness of "role-reversal" and "doubling" methods of work (Kipper and Ritchie, 2003). The other is the incorporation of modelling, role-play, role-reversal, behavioural rehearsal or other social skills training methods within the current generation of "multimodal" cognitive skills/offending behaviour programmes. These are derived from the tradition of applied behaviour analysis and social learning theory in clinical psychology rather than from psychodrama. As a result they tend to be targetted on the acquisition or enhancement of skill sets or "repertoires" for deployment in specific interpersonal encounters, such as resisting pressure, learning assertion in place of aggression, or negotiating conflict (see McGuire, 2004, 2006).

An illustrative skill set addressed by the programme is that developed through the exercise on *Speaking to What Next Agencies* in Lesson 20 Session 5. This requires psychomotor skills in communication, though as with other

applications, effective use of them involves cognitive processes of understanding, and some attitudinal ingredients in conjunction with behavioural skill. Note that the brief illustrative materials cited here and above are taken from closely contiguous sections of the programme. In sequence, they exemplify the ongoing “fusion” of ingredients that occurs in the majority of sessions, helping to achieve additional momentum through their “synergetic” effects upon each other.

Group factors

However, there is a fourth element to be added to those above. This derives from the experiential peer-learning processes activated in a participatory group. There are similarities with a body of research and clinical literature on group therapy and with the study of the social influence processes that are activated in such settings, and the internal, psychological change processes that are thereby activated within each individual. None of this of course occurs in an even or simultaneous pattern within all participants, but extensive research on both therapeutic and other learning groups has identified a series of “therapeutic factors” that are hypothesized to cause change.


Therapeutic factors have been delineated primarily on the basis of observational and interview-based research on psychotherapeutic groups focused on a wide range of purposes (Burlingame, MacKenzie, and Strauss, 2004). A therapeutic factor is defined as an element of the group process which exerts a beneficial effect on group members. For this to occur, there must be *conditions of change*, defined as states of group functioning that are necessary for therapeutic factors to operate. These do not have intrinsic therapeutic effects, but if they are not present there is unlikely to be benefit. An example is simply a condition that participants will listen to each other, and each individual’s voice will be heard. Studies in this area have isolated a series of ten factors, with the extent to which each is activated within a group being a function of the objectives, duration and other structural features of the sessions. Group therapists or tutors use *techniques*, devices which do not by themselves exert therapeutic effects but which are employed to promote the operation of therapeutic factors.

These factors are considered to be independent of the specific intervention methods employed in groups (e.g. whether behavioural, cognitive, psychodynamic, or experiential/humanist) and play a similar role in group therapy to the familiar “Rogerian conditions” (warmth, empathy, and positive regard), considered to be necessary for effective counselling. For Family Man, the therapeutic group factors that appear to be activated for participating male prisoners are likely to be:

- *acceptance*: each participant feels a sense of belonging and of being valued, allowing the group to become cohesive.
- *universality*: the individual discovers he is not unique in experiencing the problem (e.g. of feeling distant from his family, etc.).
- *altruism*: the individual learns he can help other group members, possibly as much as the tutor and potentially more.
- *instillation of hope*: the individual gains a sense of optimism about change and ability to benefit from the group experience.
- *guidance*: the individual receives useful information, advice, instruction, explanation, both from tutors and peers.
- *vicarious learning*: the individual learns by observation of effective action, or descriptions of it, by others.
- *self-understanding*: the individual learns something important about himself; developing personal insight.
- *learning from interpersonal action*: the individual learns from relating adaptively to the group.

Synthesis

In one sense, all the sessions of Family Man are focused on learning skills and applying them in new contexts. It is likely that the programme's effects result from a fusion of several change processes occurring synchronously and having a cumulative "synergetic" effect. It may only rarely be possible to differentiate the extent of contribution of activities from the cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains, or to separate them from the roles of therapeutic group factors. Thus the domains are overlapping and converged in a manner than can be described as "symbiosis" as each strengthens the others, resulting in further learning gains. There is a progressively widening circle of skill areas encompassed as the programme proceeds. There are some similarities to "problem solving" models of change and with further analysis it may be feasible to describe a convergence between the two models. However as it stands at present the model of change appears distinctive and may be unique. The flowchart below represents in outline form the core processes hypothesized to be involved in the model.



The task of delivering family man and of achieving a balance between the different kinds of activities involved in it is a very demanding one. The skills required for doing this successfully are of a very high level, necessitating awareness of multiple processes in parallel, with different channels of communication occurring simultaneously.

For these reasons, the processes of change that are engendered by participating in the programme are complex, and it needs to be borne in mind that the different aspects of them identified here are in a continuous state of interaction and inter-dependence. Nevertheless, identifying those separate aspects and how they are inter-connected may be an important stage in enabling the next stage of the programme's development.

References

- Anderson, L. W., Krathwohl, D. R., Airasian, P. W., Cruikshank, K. A., Mayer, R. E., Pintrish, P. R., Raths, J. & Wittrock, M. C. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: a Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York, NY: Merrill.
- Aos, S., Phipps, P., Barnoski, R. & Lieb, R. (2001). *The Comparative Costs and Benefits of Programs to Reduce Crime*. Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Bayse, D. J., Allgood, S. M. & Van Wyk, P. H. (1991). Family life education: An effective tool for prisoner rehabilitation. *Family Relations*, 40, 254-257.
- Boswell, G. & Poland, F. (2008). *Developments in the HM Prison Service and Safe Ground Family Man programme, and the Safe Ground network during 2007-8*. Norwich: School of Allied Health Professions, University of East Anglia.
- Brookes, M. (2005). Investing in family ties: Reoffending and family visits to prisoners. *New Philanthropy Capital Research Insight*.
- Burlingame, G. M., MacKenzie, K. R. & Strauss, B. (2004). Small-group treatment: Evidence for effectiveness and mechanisms of change. In M. J. Lambert (ed) *Bergin and Garfield's Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*. 5th edition. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cabinet Office Social Exclusion Task Force (2007). *Reaching out: Think Family: Analysis and Themes from the Families at Risk Review*. London: Cabinet Office.
- Codd, H. (2007). Prisoners' families and resettlement: A critical analysis. *The Howard Journal*, 46, 255-263.
- Ditchfield, J. (1994). Family ties and recidivism. *Home Office Research Bulletin*, 36.
- Dowden, C. & Andrews, D. A. (2003). Does family intervention work for delinquents? Results of a meta-analysis. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 45, 327-342.
- Eady, D. (2007). Prisoners' rights since the Woolf Report: Progress or procrastination? *The Howard Journal*, 46, 264-275.
- Farrington, D. P. & Welsh, B. C. (2003). Family-based prevention of offending: A meta-analysis. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 36, 127-151.
- Hagan, J. & Donovan, R. (1999). Collateral consequences of imprisonment for children, communities, and prisoners. *Crime and Justice*, 26, 121-162.
- Hairston, C. F. (1988). Family ties during imprisonment: Do they influence future criminal activity? *Federal Probation*, 48, 48-52.
- Halsey, K., Ashworth, M. & Harland, J. (2002). *Made for prisoners by prisoners. A summary of NFER's evaluation of the Safe Ground family relationships and parenting programme*. Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Halsey, K., Johnson, A., Kaur, S. & Harland, J. (2004). *A World Apart? Evaluation of Family Learning Programmes in Prison: Summary of Key Findings*. Slough: National Foundation for Educational Research.
- Hollin, C. R. (2006). Offending behaviour programmes and contention: Evidence-based practice, manuals, and programme evaluation. In C. R. Hollin & E. J. Palmer (eds), *Offending Behaviour Programmes: Development, Application, and Controversies*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Jeffries, J. J., Menghraj, S. & Hairston, C. F. (2001). *Serving incarcerated and ex-offender fathers and their families*. New York, NY: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Kipper, D. A. & Ritchie, T. D. (2003). The effectiveness of psychodramatic techniques: A meta-analysis. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 7, 13-25.
- Klein, S. R. & Bahr, S. J. (1996). An evaluation of a family-centered cognitive skills program for prison inmates. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 40, 334-346.
- Latimer, J. (2001). A meta-analytic examination of youth delinquency, family treatment, and recidivism. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 43, 237-253.
- Laub, J. H., Nagin, D. S. & Sampson, R. J. (1998). Trajectories of change in criminal offending: Good marriages and the desistance process. *American Sociological Review*, 63, 225-238.
- Light, R. (1993). Why support prisoners' family-tie groups? *The Howard Journal*, 32, 322-329.

- Lines, R. (2008). The right to health of prisoners in international human rights law. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, 4, 3-53.
- Listwan, S. J., Cullen, F. T. & Latessa, E. J. (2006). How to prevent prisoner re-entry programs from failing: insights from evidence-based corrections. *Federal Probation*, 70, 19-25.
- Loper, A. B. & Tuerk, E. H. (2006). Parenting programs for incarcerated parents, current research and future directions. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 17, 407-427.
- Maruna, S. (2001) *Making Good: How Ex-convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- McGuire, J. (2004). *Understanding Psychology and Crime: Perspectives on Theory and Action*. Buckingham: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill Education.
- McGuire, J. (2006). General offending behaviour programmes. In C. R. Hollin & E. J. Palmer (eds), *Offending Behaviour Programmes: Development, Application, and Controversies*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- McMahon, G., Hall, A., Hayward, G., Hudson, C. & Roberts, C. (2004). *Basic skills programmes in the probation service: an evaluation of the basic skills pathfinder*. Findings 203. London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- McMurrin, M., & Duggan, C. (2005). The manualisation of a treatment programme for personality disorder. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, 15, 17-27.
- Ministry of Justice (2008). *Reoffending of adults: results from the 2006 cohort*. Ministry of Justice Statistics Bulletin. London: Ministry of Justice.
- Moos, R. H., & Moos, B. S. (2002). *Family Environment Scale manual*. Menlo Park, CA: Mind Garden.
- Murray, J. (2007). The cycle of punishment: social exclusion of prisoners and their children. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 7, 55-81.
- Murray, J. & Farrington, D. P (2005). Parental imprisonment: effects on boys' antisocial behaviour and delinquency through the life-course. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46, 1269-1278.
- Murray, J., Janson, C.-G. & Farrington, D. P. (2007). Crime in adult offspring of prisoners: a comparison of two longitudinal samples. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 34, 133-149.
- Naser, R. L. & Visser, C. A. (2006). Family members' experiences with incarceration and reentry. *Western Criminology Review*, 7, 20-31.
- Niven, S. & Stewart, D. (2005a). *Resettlement outcomes on release from prison in 2003*. Findings 248. London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Niven, S. & Stewart, D. (2005b). The role of family and friends in successful resettlement. *Prison Service Journal*, 159.
- Olson, D. H., Bell, R. Q. & Portner, J. (1982). *FACES II: Family adaptability and cohesion evaluation scales*. St. Paul, MN: Family Social Science.
- Salmon, S. (2005). Prisoners' children matter. *Prison Service Journal*, 159.
- Schramski, T. G. & Harvey, D. R. (1983). The impact of psychodrama and role playing in the correctional environment. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 27, 243-254.
- Select Committee on Home Affairs (2005). *Memorandum submitted by Action for Prisoners' Families*. Written Evidence to the House of Commons Home Affairs Select Committee, 7 January 2005.
- Social Exclusion Unit (2002). *Reducing Re-offending by Ex-prisoners*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.
- Stewart, D. (2005). *An evaluation of basic skills training for prisoners*. Findings 260. London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Visser, C. A. & Travis, J. (2003). Transitions from prison to community: Understanding individual pathways. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 29, 89-113.
- Wilson, D. B., Gallagher, C. A. & MacKenzie, D. L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 37, 568-581.
- Woolfenden, S. R., Williams, K. & Peat J. K. (2002). Family and parenting interventions for conduct disorder and delinquency: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 86, 251-256.
- Zamble, E. & Quinsey, V. L. (1997). *The Criminal Recidivism Process*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.