Social Exclusion and Crime: A Critical Exploration of Sport and its Role in Crime Reduction among Adults

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Cardiff Metropolitan University UWIC

Maria Galdes

Cardiff School of Sport
Cardiff Metropolitan University UWIC

October 2012
List of Contents

Declaration \hspace{1cm} iv
Acknowledgements \hspace{1cm} v
Abstract \hspace{1cm} vii
Abbreviations \hspace{1cm} viii
Glossary of terms \hspace{1cm} xi
List of figures \hspace{1cm} xiii
List of tables \hspace{1cm} xiv

Chapter 1: Introduction and outline of the thesis \hspace{1cm} 1
  1. Introduction \hspace{1cm} 2

Chapter 2: Policy overview of social exclusion, deprivation \hspace{1cm} 14
  and multiple deprivation
  1. Introduction \hspace{1cm} 15
  2. Social exclusion and social inclusion: an overview \hspace{1cm} 21
  3. Deprivation: domains and indices \hspace{1cm} 31
  4. Policy implementation: area versus individual \hspace{1cm} 48
  5. Summary update of changes in indices \hspace{1cm} 59
  6. Exploring chosen domain 'crime' \hspace{1cm} 62

Chapter 3: Sport and crime – a review of the literature \hspace{1cm} 71
  1. Introduction \hspace{1cm} 72
  2. Sport and crime \hspace{1cm} 77
  3. Summary \hspace{1cm} 138
Chapter 4: Methodology

1. Introduction
2. Location within a research paradigm: ontology and epistemology
3. Theoretical perspective: interpretivism
4. Methodology: qualitative research
5. Ethical considerations
6. Methods of data collection
7. Method design and data analysis
8. Validity and reliability, or rigour, credibility and trustworthiness
9. Summary

Chapter 5: Ex-offender case study

1. Introduction
2. The 'case': an overview
3. The sports-based programme
4. Transition process rehabilitation and reintegration back into the community
5. Summary

Chapter 6: Gatekeeper analysis

1. Introduction
2. Influence of government strategies and plans
3. Criminal behaviour: a general overview of gatekeepers attitudes and beliefs
4. Perceptions and attitudes towards sport as a means of assisting crime reduction
5. Partnership and collaboration
6. Summary 270

Chapter 7: General discussion 274
1. Introduction 275
2. Attitudes, perceptions and experiences towards the use of sport for crime reduction purposes 278
3. Sport-based learning 279
4. The potential for sport 287

Chapter 8: Conclusion 290
1. Introduction 291
2. Implications of the research 298
3. Future directions 300

References

Appendices
Declaration

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed ......................................................................

Date ..........................................................................

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Other correction services have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s).

Other sources are acknowledged by giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed ......................................................................

Date ..........................................................................

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed ......................................................................

Date ...........................................................................
Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have been completed without the continual support and encouragement of my supervisors Dr Nicola Bolton and Dr Bill Davies at Cardiff Metropolitan University, UWIC. Thank you for all your guidance and patience.

The ex-offender, for prolonged continuation and patience with the research programme. Always willing to openly share, and allow an in-depth investigation to be conducted. Your contributions made this research the unique and insightful piece of work I always hoped it might be. I hope that the foundation for “giving you a voice” was achieved through this work and your input suitably articulated. Thank you.

Those gatekeepers willing to speak with me during this research who generously offered their time within very busy schedules and enthusiasm to share their views on the subject matter. For reasons of confidentiality, I am unable to mention them by name. I hope that their input has been suitably voiced and assists in shaping the future of sports-based crime reduction practices.
On a personal level I want to thank my wonderful friends, in particular, Jess, Phillipa, Sally, John and Aidy. Finally, my family for their constant love and support. This would not have been possible without you. To my wonderful daughter, Daisy, who joined this journey in the final stages, you provided both the motivation and inspiration to finally get it ‘off the desk’.
Abstract

Sport has been promoted as having potential to contribute to crime prevention, rehabilitation and reduction (Coalter 2007; Nichols 2007). This rationale was accelerated by ‘New’ Labour Government’s policies (Coalter 2012). The interrelationship between sport, adult crime reduction and social exclusion provide a focus for this thesis. An initial policy review and literature review is followed by two empirical studies which investigate the use of a sports-based programme by an ex-offender (aged 39) and explore the attitudes via semi-structured interviews of gatekeepers (n=21) towards the use of sport for crime reduction purposes with adult populations. Key findings demonstrate that the provision of a sports-based programme for an adult ex-offender has the potential to assist the rehabilitation and resettlement process. There is evidence that the links between sport, career development and employability were particularly important amongst this older age band. There were mixed views from the gatekeepers towards the use of sport for crime reduction, particularly its potential amongst adult delinquents. There were instances where sport was being utilised in crime reduction practices, this was done on an ad hoc basis. Gatekeepers demonstrated concerns over raising expectations of offenders through sports-based qualifications and the public’s negative perceptions of sport as an ‘easy option’ for offenders. It is essential to adopt an holistic approach when examining sports within a crime reduction context, concentrating on those problems experienced by individuals engaged in sports-based programmes as opposed to the intervention itself (Crabbe 2000, 2008; Coalter 2012). Any quest to change behaviour patterns associated with crime will involve complex associations which create a myriad of outcomes (Coalter et al. 2000). In order to understand which approaches work for which subjects in what conditions, there is a need to obtain a deeper understanding of the complexities of participant’s interactions with initiatives (Morris et al. 2003; Coalter 2012).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult offenders</td>
<td>Adult offenders are those people convicted of committing crimes at or over the age of 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>A crime is an act committed or an omission of duty, injurious to the public welfare, for which punishment is prescribed by law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeeper</td>
<td>Individuals directly and/or indirectly responsible for crime reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>Incarceration refers to the process of imprisoning or confining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmate</td>
<td>Inmate refers to a person confined to a correctional institution or otherwise detained in lawful custody or under a custodial sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile offenders</td>
<td>Juvenile offenders are those young people sentenced for crimes which they committed between the ages of 10-17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offender</td>
<td>An offender is a person who has committed a crime. It therefore includes those offenders sentenced by a law court to a custodial sentence and those sentenced to community-based orders or supervision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-release</td>
<td>Post-release refers to the time following custody. Post-release interventions aim to minimise re-offending during this time, by managing risk and promoting rehabilitation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recidivism  A commonly employed outcome measure of intervention or rehabilitation programmes is recidivism, which can be defined by re-offending; re-arrest; reconviction and re-imprisonment.

Re-entry  Re-entry (to the community) refers to a prisoner being (to the community) released from custody.

Rehabilitation  Rehabilitation refers to the process of restoring the offender to the community as a law-abiding person.

Re-integration  Re-integration (to the community) captures the idea of offenders actively participating in their re-entry.

Sport  Sport and leisure includes the provision of additional opportunities for expression of individual and group identities which are potentially linked in cultural, economic and political terms (Henry, 1999)

Transition  Transition refers to the gradual process of moving from custody to independent living in the community.

Young adults  Young adults are people aged between 18 and 20.

Young offenders  Aged between 10 and 17 inclusive
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Introduction and outline of the thesis
Chapter 1
Introduction and outline of the thesis

1. Introduction

Sports development has been the subject of significant policy changes over the years with the most recent and sudden policy shift witnessed in 2008, still under New Labour, from ‘sport for good’ (stressing external benefits to society) to ‘sport for sport’s sake’ (stressing intrinsic benefits to sport) (Collins 2010). Shifting roles and responsibilities reflect the contested nature of sports development (Bramham and Hylton 2008; Collins 2010), with the ‘sport for good’ agenda an approach to sport development that is designed to use sport to address a wide range of issues including health, community development, social cohesion, and crime (Coalter 2007). Conversely the ‘sport for sport’s sake’ agenda emphasises the development of sports skills with the intention of enhancing competitive sport (Houlihan and Green 2011).

At the time of embarking upon this research New Labour were in office demanding a wide range of external economic and social benefits from social programmes including sport. Sport was being closely linked to a number of wider social influences including: adding to social cohesion, improving health, encouraging lifelong learning, combating social exclusion, and assisting with economic and social regeneration (Collins 2010). This approach to sport policy and development was underpinned by the ‘sport for good’ agenda. New Labour adopted a more direct and influential role in sports development, whereby it was recognised that sport was not only a legitimate responsibility of
the government and a potential diplomatic resource (Houlihan 1997), but additionally a vehicle through which wider policy objectives might be achieved (for instance reduce crime, assist combating social exclusion). The interrelationship of these three elements of sport, crime reduction and amelioration of social exclusion provide a focus for the investigation presented in this thesis, a detailed view of the research aims and associated objectives is provided later in this introduction.

Social exclusion attracted much attention in Britain following the election of the Labour Government in 1997. It led to many changes, both in terms of placing poverty close to the core of government thinking and action, but also by adopting a wider definition through introducing the concept of social exclusion (Blunkett 1999). The term ‘wicked issue’ was first adopted by John Stewart (Clarke and Stewart 1997) whilst referring to policy problems that have proved persistent and non acquiescent to straightforward solutions. Social exclusion is a policy area that appears under this ‘wicked issue’ umbrella due to its multi-faceted nature, and as a result the social exclusion unit (SEU) was established by then Prime Minister Tony Blair in 1997.

Initially the SEU formed part of the Cabinet Office but was then realigned in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) in May 2002 (ODPM 2004). It was acknowledged that the remit of the SEU was primarily to coordinate policies across government departments, and between statutory and voluntary agencies. It had no spending budget, however maintained an overall aim to
improve government action to reduce social exclusion by producing ‘joined-up solutions to joined-up problems’ (Levitas 1998; ODPM 2004, p. 2). In 2006 the Social Exclusion Task Force (SETF) was set up and superseded the former SEU. The former SEU had a wider focus, whereas the Task Force sought to tackle the problems experienced by those facing the most entrenched and complex exclusion. Similar to the SEU the SETF did not deliver services itself and had no delivery budget, instead it sought to influence the policies and delivery of other departments and local service providers. The SETF was subsequently abolished in November 2010 with its functions absorbed into the Office for Civil Society (OCS) (Cabinet Office 2011).

In 2001 Henderson and Salmon suggested that there were conflicting signals across government towards social exclusion and the way in which it could be reduced or even eradicated. For instance, they argued that at times an almost social pathology approach had been adopted suggesting more punitive measures to force people to fit into mainstream society, and on other occasions an exhortatory line taken encouraging people to participate in initiatives aimed at tackling social exclusion.

There also appears much debate surrounding the exact meaning of the term ‘social exclusion’ and its usage (SEU 1997, 1998; Levitas 1998; Parkinson 1998; Newman 2001; Long et al. 2002), which is covered in further detail through the policy overview in Chapter two. This said, a general consensus amongst many authors is that exclusion can be experienced by persons or
groups and by places, neighbourhoods and communities (Walker 1995; Lucas 2000). Lucas (2000) further commented that individuals, groups and communities are systematically excluded through the very values, processes and actions of agencies, organisations and institutions operating within society and the policy decisions and practices formulated. As part of this thesis an initial policy review of social exclusion and deprivation was conducted (Chapter 2), the remainder of the thesis then adopts a more precise focus on the notion of crime, and in particular, sports potential as a tool to assist crime reduction amongst an adult population.

An increase in emphasis upon sports’ potential to contribute to wider affairs surfaced through Labour’s reign. Research published in *The Everybody Wins: sport and social inclusion* (CCPR 2002) document, demonstrated some belief among political leaders in the role of sport as a means of at least contributing to social inclusion. Additionally, and earlier to this the Policy Action Team for Sport and the Arts (PAT10) was one of eighteen teams established following the publication of *Bringing Britain Together: a national strategy for neighbourhood renewal* (Cabinet Office 1998), and was specifically developed for the SEU to inform on best practices in utilising art, sport and leisure to engage people in poor neighbourhoods, particularly those that felt excluded (PAT10 1999). PAT10 suggested that sport (alongside arts, cultural and recreational activity) has the potential to impact upon ‘neighbourhood renewal by improving communities’ performance on four key indicators – health, crime, employment and education’ (PAT10 1999, P. 22).
Although much of the research conducted around the area of sport and social inclusion in general is limited in terms of evidence and understanding, some key research has noted that the issue is not simply whether sport participation can contribute positively to both personal and community development and the reduction of social exclusion but rather the actual nature of that contribution (Patriksson 1995; Positive Futures 2003). Further contributors (Long et al. 2002; Morris et al. 2009) noted the complexities associated with the promotion of social inclusion, and the limitations of individualised approaches.

A major component associated with the multi-faceted problems of social exclusion is crime (SEU 1998; Collins et al. 1999; Coalter et al. 2000). Sport has consistently been viewed as possessing the potential to contribute to crime prevention, reduction and recidivism (Coalter 2007; Nichols 2007), however the concept of ‘why’ and ‘how’ an intervention produces specific outcomes has been referred to as the ‘black box’ problem (Pawson and Myhill 2001; Hansen 2005). As with sport and social inclusion, there also appears a lack of substantive evidence (Coalter 1988, 1989; Robins 1990; Mulvey et al. 1993) available on the benefits of sports-based crime reduction programmes, with an over reliance on ‘impressionistic’ and ‘anecdotal’ evidence (Robins 1990; Nichols 1997; Nichols and Crow 2004). Three UK policy reviews namely Collins et al. (1999), PAT10 (1999) and Sport England (1999) argued that sport can make a positive contribution to at least the prevention of youth crime, however studies that have specifically focused on sport and crime are restricted to young people and youth delinquency (Coalter 1988; Nichols...
Many reasons are provided for this prioritisation on children and young people, the main one being that young people are at the formative stage of their life and therefore more acceptable to change, with treatments likely to be more effective and thus successful (Crow 2001).

Evident is a clear neglect in research that specifically focuses on the potential of sport amongst adult delinquency. Even recent publications by Meek (2012) and Meek et al. (2012) which examined the use of sport within the prison system were located within a Young Offenders Institute (YOI) with individuals aged 18-21. Two considerations are drawn from this. Firstly, sport and physical activity based interventions are viewed as having a limited role in crime reduction amongst adults. Secondly, the transitions of sports-based programmes operating within youth delinquency have yet to reach adult offenders. Consequently the results of this research enrich the existing literature surrounding sport and crime reduction whilst also developing a base of literature specifically focusing on adult (21+) offenders/ex-offenders. Therefore, given the lack of research available on this specific age band, the literature existing on youth delinquency and sport has been utilised where appropriate and considered in relation to an adult context. This thesis sought to investigate the use of a sports-based intervention with an adult ex-offender and explore attitudes and perceptions towards the use of sport for crime reduction purposes amongst adult populations. The research objectives of this thesis were as follows and attempted to answer some of the under researched issues within the field:
1. To conduct a policy review between 2004 and 2005 around social exclusion, deprivation and multiple deprivation, specifically focusing on government direction around such concepts (Chapter 2).

2. To conduct an extensive literature review in order to investigate current research linking sport to crime reduction (Chapter 3).

3. To investigate, over an extended period, the use of a sports-based programme by an older ex-offender (39 years) through his rehabilitation within a community context (Chapter 5).

4. To explore different attitudes and perceptions towards the use of sport for crime reduction purposes, specifically with adult populations (Chapters 5 and 6).

5. To explore and reveal any unique features of sports-based programmes specifically targeting adult populations (Chapters 5, 6 and 7).

6. To elicit knowledge around the use of reflection as a specific research tool with (ex)offenders throughout their rehabilitation (Chapter 5), and also as a researcher through the use of a researchers reflective journal.

The elements of this research are complex, inter-related and the general paucity of literature in this area inevitably creates certain difficulties and problems when engaging in a substantive investigation such as this. It is intended that the research provides a greater understanding of the role of sport in adult (ex)offenders’ rehabilitation, raising awareness of its potential and providing practical implications for gatekeepers.
1.1. Guiding the reader through the research: An outline of the thesis

This thesis includes eight specific chapters, Figure 1 illustrates the structure of the thesis whilst highlighting the different stages of the research process:

![Diagram of thesis structure]

**Figure 1: Structure of the thesis**
The current introductory chapter (Chapter 1) introduces the thesis as a whole, provides a general description of current literature in the area, outlines the rationale for the initiation of this particular piece of research, and highlights the key aims and objectives of the project. Given the theoretical underpinning of this research, there were no preconceived hypotheses, rather this research was motivated by the need for further exploration into the research area.

This introduction leads logically into Chapter 2 a policy review of social exclusion and deprivation. This chapter was the starting point of this research and provided the foundation from which the remaining work emerged. The initial focus of this chapter was to acknowledge the contested nature of social exclusion, and provide a review of the key measures utilised across England and Wales when addressing social exclusion and deprivation. The latter part of this chapter begins to integrate the central theme of this thesis which was crime.

Following on from this initial overview, Chapter 3 aligns crime more directly with the focus of this research which was sport and crime. The literature reviewed in this chapter is predominantly focused on sports-based crime reduction programmes aimed at children and adolescents due to the paucity of research available on sport and adult delinquency. As a result this chapter provides an extensive review of the key literature surrounding the use of sport for crime prevention and/or rehabilitation amongst young people. The initial
section of this chapter provides an overview of the research, with key themes applicable to this thesis, further discussed in later sections.

Chapter 4 provides a review of relevant paradigmatic assumptions. A hotly debated topic in the realms of social science research is the issue of positivism and interpretivism, thus it was an aim of this chapter to justify the theoretical underpinning of this research in accordance to the chosen methodologies and the researcher’s own personal view on what constitutes reality. This chapter considers the ontological and epistemological position of the current research and presents the case for each. The researcher provides justification for research decisions and methodological associations, whilst locating herself within the research process via a personal reflective journal. Following this contextualisation, the chapter continues by examining the methods employed for both empirical studies. In particular it discusses the use of interviews as a form of qualitative data collection research strategy. Issues of validity and reliability are then discussed in relation to the interpretive paradigm with attempts to justify choices and recognise the inevitable limitations of the chosen research strategy.

Chapter 5 specifically focuses upon the single case study, the purpose being to discuss the results from the data. This study sought to enhance understandings on the use of sports-based programmes for crime reduction purposes, amongst adults, through the perception of an ex-offender, displaying an individual's journey of rehabilitation through the transition
process from prison confinement to a community context. Here the case study is discussed in relation to the findings across the complete data set over the four staged data collection. However, an emphasis has remained on the precise stage of the data collection to facilitate an examination of any changes in attitudes and behaviour over the 17 months. In addition the Mentor’s interview is discussed in relation to the ex-offender’s data, to allow for further comparison. Findings from the nine interviews conducted with the ex-offender and single interview with the Mentor are discussed at length during this chapter.

Chapter 6 highlights the key findings from the second empirical study which was the gatekeeper analysis. This study wanted to represent a diverse contribution of views and opinions of individuals operating within organisations that have the potential to influence the life and opportunities of offenders and ex-offenders both positively and/or negatively and directly and/or indirectly. In addition, it sought to determine gatekeeper views and perceptions of sport and its use as a potential tool to assist crime reduction, particularly amongst adults. This study sought to develop understandings of current strategies and approaches being implemented by gatekeepers for crime reduction. This chapter discusses the findings across the complete data set (21 in-depth interviews), identifying where appropriate differences between individuals from different organisations and/or operational roles.
This then leads the reader onto Chapter 7 which provides an overall discussion of the key findings across both empirical studies. This chapter allows for a comparison between the two different standpoints investigated (ex-offender and facilitator/provider), as a means of highlighting any consistencies and/or discrepancies between the two viewpoints on the role of sport within this context (for instance crime reduction).

The final Chapter 8 provides a concluding summary, identifying limitations of the research and suggesting recommendations for future work in this area, whilst also considering implications on future practices.
Chapter 2:
Policy overview of social exclusion, deprivation and multiple deprivation
Chapter 2
Policy overview of social exclusion, deprivation and multiple deprivation

1. Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to review some of the key policies and definitions associated with the terms social exclusion, deprivation and multiple deprivation. Following this chapter there is a shift in focus and attention towards literature specifically relating to sport and crime reduction. This policy review chapter represents the start of the author’s research journey and demonstrates the foundation from which the empirical research was guided.

The initially policy review was undertaken between 2004 and 2005 and was a desk based analysis of the Labour Government’s policy on social exclusion in England and Wales. Its purpose was twofold. Firstly, the review would provide an important comparative analysis of the complex policy framework operating across government departments and administrations (since Wales had separate responsibilities from 1999). Secondly, this review was intended to determine and shape the subsequent empirical research studies undertaken by providing justification for the chosen direction.

The initial desk study research was a far larger and complex task than had originally been envisaged and resulted in voluminous data. The subsequent analysis resulted in a substantive large report which demonstrated the far
reaching nature of social exclusion and of the Labour Government's commitment to achieving cross departmental working. By focusing on the policy context surrounding social exclusion it enabled the researcher to identify and analyse the principal themes that characterised the then Government's direction towards social exclusion. The analysis and original report provided an overview from which the topic of sport and crime was selected as the particular focus for further research. Given this background it is perhaps unsurprising to the reader to sense a difference of style and substance in this opening chapter when compared to the others, especially given the scale of changes that have occurred since 2005. Most notably there has been a change in Government and the current coalition between Conservatives and Liberal Democrats is pursuing a different social and fiscal policy agenda, largely enforced by the economic recession. Nevertheless the inclusion of this chapter which has been significantly edited from the original version is considered important in providing a relevant historical policy context to social exclusion and in shaping the research studies undertaken subsequently.

This chapter is structured around three stages that characterise this initial area of study. These include:

1. Firstly, a brief overview of terms and the emergence of social exclusion as an area of policy focus.
2. Secondly, social exclusion and deprivation, are examined by evaluating the measures utilised by government, and the emphasis given to crime as a key theme.

3. Thirdly, a brief and concise update of current policies surrounding the notion of social exclusion and deprivation, including a brief overview of key changes in the political arena is provided.

1.1 Process for the review

As noted in the introduction this policy overview primarily provided the foundation from which the two principal studies undertaken for this thesis were constructed. Although the intention was to focus the research on Wales, given the Labour Government's commitment to tackle social exclusion, some wider examination within England was required.

The significance of the overview was essentially demonstrated through seeking a typology. As identified by Walker (1995) exclusion can be experienced by persons or groups and by places, neighbourhoods and communities. To assist this process a three dimensional analysis was developed and reports were reviewed according to the following:

- Dimension one: Area – ranked location of socially deprived communities (i) England (ii) Wales
- Dimension two: Groups of people including women, children, older people, lone parents, unemployed

- Dimension three: Themes/joined-up thinking including housing, crime, anti-social behaviour, health, leisure

This approach facilitated a thorough examination of the different approaches that were being utilised at the time for the measurement of social exclusion by various organisations, between departments and between the administrations in England and Wales. Additional support for this method of approach was illustrated by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) (2004) where it asserted that developing a typology can provide a useful illustration of problems experienced by different groups of people within specific areas and how to tackle such difficulties.

The purpose of this policy review was to provide a holistic overview of the existing policy context of social exclusion and deprivation, and in 2012 a brief update was produced. The researcher recognised the need to identify a rationale for the choice of reports that were reviewed, and a two tiered criteria was developed for the purpose of selecting report documents. Firstly the research focused on the most recent available information (at the time of the review between 2004 and 2005), specifically highlighting indicators and measures of social exclusion and disadvantage within England and Wales. Secondly, the review focused on those departments and/or authors whose
work had been widely accepted within the research field by government policy/papers.

Eight specific policy reports drawn from England and Wales were the main focus for this review and these are listed below. It is important to note, however, that this chapter is not exclusively limited to these reports and where appropriate other academic sources have been incorporated to further develop understanding and critique of the subject matter.

**English and UK Dimension:**

Welsh Dimension:


This chapter has been divided into five specific areas of discussion principally emerging from the information available and obtained from the chosen reports. The structure of the chapter considers the following: an overview to social exclusion and social inclusion, deprivation including domains and indices, the implementation of policies (with consideration for areas versus individuals), a summary update of the present situation, and finally a short introduction to the chosen theme of crime.

Thus the overarching aim of this policy review was to undertake an analysis of existing policy literature prepared by various government departments on social exclusion and deprivation. This would provide an important context for the more specific and detailed studies (see Chapters 5 and 6). The objectives of this review were to develop:
- A critical review of available secondary based data between the period of 2000 – 2005 (to obtain the most recent available information at the time of the review in 2005), on the indices and measures used to examine social exclusion along both an English and Welsh dimension.

- An evaluation and identification of key priority communities, groups/themes and geographical locations considered to be experiencing social exclusion and deprivation.

2. Social exclusion and social inclusion: an overview

The term social exclusion is without doubt one which is contested within the realms of academic inquiry. The exact origins of the term remain unclear, with some arguing that it may have originated in France, known as ‘les exclus’. It principally refers to people who slipped through the French social insurance system and includes, disabled people, lone parents, unemployed, disaffected youth and isolated individuals, and more latterly marginalised societal community groups such as rural, ethnic, gender, religious, aged, poor, self-excluding (Hills et al. 2002).

Alternatively it is claimed that the political concept of social inclusion entered British mainstream politics principally as a result of the European Union’s (1996) Lisbon Summit whereby it was committed that member states adopt the promotion of social cohesion and inclusion as a strategic goal. Regardless
of its exact origin what does seem to be clear is that from 1997, the term social exclusion became synonymous with New Labour, as a key government initiative (Malcolm 2008). In particular the Labour Government appeared to adopt the term as a preferred label for discussing disadvantaged groups (Roberts 2009), with social inclusion the cornerstone of New Labour’s social policy agenda and ‘cross cutting’ agenda.

Several Government commissioned reports (including many Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) Reports and 18 Policy Action Teams (PATs)) attempted initial explorations of the significant cross-cutting issues embedded in Britain. The Social Exclusion Unit produced many thought-provoking policy initiatives that focused on the ‘most excluded’ groups, however, as with many other terms social exclusion can be interpreted in several different ways, comprising many different elements. Consequently the purpose of this section is to provide an overview of the term social exclusion highlighting key elements associated with this concept.

Lucas (2000) stated that certain individuals, groups and communities are systematically excluded through the values, processes and actions of agencies, organisations and institutions within a society and the policy decisions and practices formulated. Lucas (2000) also suggested that the responsibility of developing and maintaining greater inclusion and social cohesion principally lies with these agencies, organisations and institutions. This view while interesting presents a rather simplistic and narrow mindset of
blame attribution. The point made here is that the social exclusion agenda is
two-fold, in terms of a practical and moral dilemma. On a practical level
governments are responsible for identifying the most successful interventions
available to ensure that socially disadvantaged groups within society broaden
their participation into inclusion (Lucas 2000). Of course it must be recognised
that the extent to which government intervention and involvement occurs is
linked directly to ideology and party manifestos. Morally there is a type of
behaviour and values that should be recognised within a society, protecting
individuals, groups and communities against certain negative values which
may exclude and/or disadvantage them, for example these may include
racism, sexism, and homophobia to name but a few (Lucas 2000).

The term social exclusion is often used interchangeably with other phrases
such as, social inequalities, social stratification and social divisions, however,
according to Payne (2006) the terms do differ. Put simply ‘social inequalities’
generally refers to people’s access to resources (Jarvie 2006), ‘social
stratification’ is a term that is used to discuss class, power and status in sport
(Jarvie 2006), and ‘social divisions’ is a wider term that encompasses groups
other than class such as race and gender.
In a speech given at Stockwell Park School in December 1997, Tony Blair outlined the government’s plans to tackle the problem of social exclusion. The speech marked the launch of the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) and the Prime Minister defined social exclusion in the following way (Welshman 2007, p. 235):

Social exclusion is about income but it is about more. It is about prospects and networks and life-chances. It’s a very modern problem, and one that is more harmful to the individual, more damaging to self-esteem, more corrosive for society as a whole, more likely to be passed down from generation to generation, than material poverty.

Further government thinking around social exclusion was demonstrated through the SEU definition that stated it is a, ‘shorthand label for what can happen when individuals or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime environments, bad health and family breakdown’ (SEU 1997, p. 1). It is here that it becomes clear that there is some disparity in opinions around social exclusion amongst academics. Long et al. (2002) claimed there may be conceptual difficulties with the SEU’s interpretation of exclusion, since it confuses the symptoms of social exclusion with the issues that cause it. For example, unemployment and poor skills might be recognised as both symptoms as well as causes of individuals being socially excluded. The SEU has had a particularly important role in determining how social exclusion has been defined within the UK. Yet the SEU definition has received extensive criticism for its simplicity and apparent confusion between concepts and
causes (Edwards 2001; Newman 2001; Catney 2002). Newman (2001, p. 152) in particular is of the opinion that, ‘The SEU discourse drew on two different, but interrelated, conceptions of social exclusion: one based on a category of a person (or even an area); another based on social and economic processes of exclusion.’ In agreement with the thoughts of Newman (2001) it seems concepts are not clearly distinguished throughout the SEU definition, which leads to a confused overall definition.

Within the debate surrounding social exclusion there are occasions whereby links are developed between poverty, disadvantage and social exclusion. Schucksmith and Chapman (1998) summarise each of the terms. For them whilst poverty is an inability to participate fully in typical everyday lifestyles of society due to a lack of resources (usually disposable income), deprivation or disadvantage is believed to be a broader concept that addresses the outcomes derived from both lack of resources (more than just financial) and in addition, a range of social and economic conditions. Finally, social exclusion signifies an even broader concept that relates to a breakdown in the social integration of individuals into society and thus the resultant exclusion of those from society. Mandelson (1997, p. 1) is just one author that argues that social exclusion, ‘is about more than poverty and unemployment. It is about being cut off from what the rest of us regard as normal life. It is called social exclusion, what others call the underclass.’ He continued to comment that the excluded are those individuals who are lacking the necessary means and material to participate in activities within Britain today, for example, economic, social, cultural, and political. Mandelson (1997) argued that a permanently
excluded underclass hinders flexibility, but flexibility on its own is not enough. The people that Labour was concerned about are those in danger of missing out on opportunities and becoming disengaged from society, who do not have their long-term problems addressed and resolved through extra monetary benefits. Additionally, Mandelson (1997) suggested personal skills and employment are key to minimising the longer term effects of poverty and thus the broader concept of social exclusion.

Offering a Welsh perspective on defining social exclusion the Welsh Assembly Government ([WAG] and now Welsh Government [WG]) articulate, ‘Social exclusion is a term used to describe the experience of individuals who are unable to play a full part in society because of the range of disadvantages they face…’ (WAG 2003, p. 5). Arguably, certain groups of individuals are more likely to experience problems associated with social exclusion (including ethnic minority groups, people with disabilities), as the barriers to opportunities are greater for them than for others in society. Measures of deprivation are widely utilised to identify neighbourhoods in which residents experience higher levels of ‘poverty’ or socio-economic ‘need’ and as a result are more likely to suffer from social exclusion and deprivation (WAG 2003). Once again such offerings make clear links between deprivation, poverty and social exclusion, often referring to them interchangeably. Furthermore, the WG demonstrated direct recognition and acknowledgement of the importance of social exclusion and deprivation issues through their policies and programmes, most notably the Communities First Programme. Through their Climbing Higher report in 2005 it was noted that people, groups or
communities suffer multiple deprivation, often where low incomes, unemployment, low educational attainment and attendance, poor health, poor housing and physical isolation come together. Social exclusion is frequently characterised by a sense of stigma and hopelessness among those suffering, and often manifested in alcohol and drug misuse, crime, long term sickness or parenting (WAG 2005).

Alternative explanations of social exclusion are offered by Atkinson (1998) who suggested four key elements recur in any discussion of social exclusion and include: multiple deprivation, relativity, agency and dynamics. In his discussion, multiple deprivation implies that social exclusion is not restricted simply to poverty or lack of employment but further determinants such as absence of community or social interactions are also important. Relativity refers to the exclusion where someone can be judged excluded solely by reference to his or her circumstances in isolation. The issue of agency appears when addressing exclusion as an act, implying there are agents who undertake that act. The dynamics element arises from implications that exclusion is not only currently without a job or income but with little prospects for the future. Whilst such offerings provide insight into the complexity of social exclusion, they also highlight the variation in thoughts among academics, politicians and government departments.
Gordon et al. (2000, p. 73) in their study offered an operational definition stating social exclusion is:

A lack or denial of access to the kinds of social relations, social customs and activities in which the great majority of people in British society engage. In current usage, social exclusion is often regarded as a ‘process’ rather than a ‘state’ and this helps in being constructively precise in deciding its relationship to poverty.

Bailey (2005) extends discussions further by highlighting a series of connected dimensions of social inclusion/exclusion that have emerged from the literature (for example, Donnelly 1996; Freiler 2001) namely:

- **Spatial**: social inclusion to proximity and the closing of social and economic distances
- **Relational**: social inclusion is defined in terms of a sense of belonging and acceptance
- **Functional**: social inclusion relates to the enhancement of knowledge, skills and understanding
- **Power**: social inclusion assumes a change in the locus of control.

Whilst some elements of Bailey’s (2005) work are consistent with the thoughts of other authors, most notably is the introduction of the concept of power aligned to the achievement of inclusion. Further discussion of Bailey’s (2005) work is provided in the following chapter specifically relating to sport.
Without delving too far into the debates surrounding the term ‘social exclusion’ it is important to at least identify some of the potential characteristics of the term. It is clear that social exclusion is not a concept easily defined, and as Levitas (1998, p. 2) cautioned, ‘there is no monolithic pan-European definition of social exclusion; rather there is a range of national discourses which use the idea of exclusion in different ways.’ An example of the practical difficulties associated with defining social exclusion can be seen through the bidding system of the Single Regeneration Budget (SRB). The SRB principally aimed to provide targeted support to a clearly defined area. The Labour Government stressed the importance of the SRB and its necessary role within its social exclusion agenda (DETR 1998) by stating that the SRB has the priority of enhancing the quality of life amongst local people in areas of need, by reducing the gap between deprived areas, and between different groups. However, due to the nature of the bidding system of the SRB liability remained on local partnerships to decide what ‘social exclusion’ meant, who it affected, and who the community constituted (Edwards 2001). As highlighted by Catney (2002, p. 18), in view of this the ‘government provides the set of criteria for measuring its inclusionary outputs and the prospective bidders select their bid on the basis of what the respective members choose to define as social exclusion.’ Undoubtedly due to the complex nature of social exclusion, inevitable variation in approaches taken by practitioners is likely.
The significance of this section is that there has been a distinct shift away from terms such as inequality and equality, towards alternatively adopting exclusion and inclusion. Sometimes the shift has included the overt claim that inclusion is more important than equality (Hutton 1996; Giddens 1998; Levitas 1998). In essence, the idea of ‘exclusion’ permits a benign view of society to co-exist with the manifest reality of poverty and deprivation by evasively placing these outside society itself (Levitas 1998). In addition, the significance of these negative phenomena are represented as external to the ‘normal’ society, as opposed to an intrinsic feature of it (Levitas 1998).

It is clear that social exclusion has been the subject of many attempts at definition (For example, SEU 1997, 1998 Parkinson 1998; Long et al. 2002; Roberts. 2009). Policy makers in the UK and beyond, including devolved administrations and European influences have focused much attention on problems associated with social exclusion and the marginalisation of significant numbers of people from mainstream society (Burchardt et al. 1999). At the outset of this review it was thought that a consistent overarching definition would be available for social exclusion. As this section has proved, social exclusion is far more complex. By providing insight into the variation in views amongst academics and government departments, this section has highlighted the multi-faceted nature surrounding social exclusion and confirmed that a single definition is neither available nor appropriate.
3. Deprivation: domains and indices

As noted in the previous section, the terms ‘poverty’ and ‘deprivation’ have often been used interchangeably although, many argue that a clear distinction should be made between them (See the discussion in Nolan and Whelan 1996). When the English Index of Deprivation 2004 (EID2004) and Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation 2005 (WIMD2005) were reviewed, it was apparent that effort had been made to provide explanations on terms such as poverty, deprivation, multiple deprivation, domains and indices.

Firstly, discussion around the term ‘poverty’ within the EID2004 followed the work of Townsend (1979, p. 31) which claimed:

> Individuals, families and groups can be said to be in poverty if they lack the resources to obtain the types of diet, participate in the activities and have the living conditions and amenities which are customary, or at least widely encouraged or approved in the societies to which they belong.

In a similar vein the WIMD2005 noted deprivation as a wider concept than poverty. Poverty was viewed as a means of not having a sufficient amount of money (or other essentials) to get by, whereas deprivation was referred to as the problems caused by a general lack of resources and opportunities (not just financial). It became apparent that both the EID2004 and WIMD2005 concurred on the differences between poverty and deprivation, both arguing that the condition of poverty means not having enough financial resources,
and deprivation referring to unmet need (resources and opportunities) which is not solely restricted to money.

Unsurprisingly, there also appeared similarities in the explanations used both within the EID2004 and WIMD2005 for ‘multiple deprivation’. These reports stated that multiple deprivation was multi-faceted and complex, and a mixture of separate kinds of deprivation, each of which can be measured to some extent, but cannot simply be added together to make an overall index. Reasons given for this were because the different forms of deprivation may interact and have more impact if found in certain conditions. In addition, the EID2004 and WIMD2005 also offer a brief insight into the meaning of additional terms such as, an index, indicators, domain, and are briefly outlined below.

- **Index** has been deemed a group of separate measurements which are combined into a single number. The way in which this is achieved may vary to some degree between administrations.

- **Indicators** are domain-specific and seek to illustrate direct measures of that form of deprivation (WIMD2005).

- **Domains** model differing dimensions of deprivation, taking into account the assumption that multiple deprivation is based on a combination of different related deprivation attributes. Domains are based on a range of different indicators which means that they are measured in different ways and using different units. Therefore prior to
combining them the measurements have to be transformed to make them compatible (weighting). Decisions about the weighting of domains are based on policy priorities (WIMD2005; EID2004). The EID2004 asserted that the purpose of locating specific domains or what we might refer to as themes, allows for a parsimonious collection of indicators that comprehensively capture the exact deprivation experienced for each domain. Thus the domains and themes emerging through reports are said to provide an insight into dimensions identified as key drivers within policy areas. These became of particular relevance when deciding on the subsequent direction of this research area, for instance the theme of crime.

At the time of this review (2004 – 2005) ‘indices of multiple deprivation’ had become more commonly placed as a unit for measuring deprivation (EID2004; WIMD2005). The rationale behind this approach was to encourage each dimension to be measured independently, and then further developed through the weighting and combining of scores for each domain of deprivation to calculate an aggregated total. This then provides an overall index of multiple deprivation. The WIMD2005 claimed that this approach allows for more straightforward updating of the index, as well as covering a more comprehensive range of aspects of deprivation. Importantly it was believed that this approach enables policy makers and practitioners to focus on a combined approach, reflecting the complexity of social exclusion and addressing multiple factors associated with this area.
One of the challenges in constructing an overall Index of Multiple Deprivation is determining what ‘explicit weight’ needs to be attached to the various components, ‘The weight is the measure of importance that is attached to each component [domain] in the overall composite measure’ (EID2004, p. 45), and ‘Weighting is the adjustment of the contribution of the parts (the domain indexes) make to the whole (the overall index) when combination takes place’ (WIMD2005, p. 12). Recognition of the difficulties associated with weighting domains was expressed by the Local Government Data Unit (LGDU) (2003) where domain weighting was said to be largely an internal decision and difficult to justify statistically. The extent to which an administration acknowledges a particular domain might vary somewhat, based on perspectives and opinions internally. Although there appeared much consistency between definitions of terms amongst England and Wales, there was also some clear differentiation in approaches adopted (this is further explored later in this chapter). Therefore, when reviewing reports in this chapter a comparable element between England and Wales sometimes proved difficult, with unresolved questions about definitions, data and indicators (Harrison and Phillips 2003).

A principal aim of this review was to identify themes of social exclusion and disadvantage, and determine whether there were any significant similarities/differences between those selected by various administrations (particularly concerned with England and Wales). As a process of gaining a clear insight into the contemporary domains and indicators (at the time of this review 2004 – 2005) utilised by government departments a more extensive
review of the EID2004 and WIMD2005 was undertaken by way of the summary Table 1. This Table was constructed by the researcher with the aim of illustrating the indicators and weighting attributed to the domains, to facilitate a comparative understanding of multiple deprivation in England and Wales. The information displayed has been extracted solely from the WIMD2005 and EID2004.
Table 1: Deprivation domains, indicators and weighting in the EID2004 and WIMD2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EID2004</th>
<th>WIMD2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMAINS AND INDICATORS</strong></td>
<td><strong>WEIGHTING OF DOMAINS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income deprivation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adults and children in Income Support households (DWP) for 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adults and children in Income Based Job Seekers Allowance households (DWP) for 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adults and children in Working Families Tax Credit households whose equivalised income (excluding housing benefits) is below 60% of median before housing costs (Inland Revenue and DWP) for 2001</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adults and children in Disabled Person’s Tax Credit households whose equivalised income (excluding housing benefits) is below 60% of median before housing costs (Inland Revenue and DWP) in 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National Asylum Support Service (NASS) supported asylum seekers in England in receipt of subsistence only and accommodation support (Home Office and NASS) for 2002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment deprivation</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unemployment claimant count (JUVOS)of women aged 18-59</td>
<td>- Claimants of Incapacity Benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and men aged 18-64 averaged over 4 quarters (ONS) for 2001</td>
<td>- Severe Disablement Allowance (for women under 60 and men under 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Incapacity Benefit claimants women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64 (DWP) for 2001</td>
<td>- Participants on New Deal for Young People and Intensity Activity Period (for New Deal 25+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Severe Disablement Allowance claimants women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64 (DWP) for 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participants in New Deal for the 18-24s who are not included in the claimant count (DWP) for 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participants in New Deal for 25+ who are not included in the claimant count (DWP) for 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Participants in New Deal for Lone Parents aged 18 and over (DWP) for 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health deprivation and disability</th>
<th>22.5%</th>
<th>13.5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Years of Potential Life Lost (YPLL) (Source: Mortality data from ONS) for 1997 to 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Comparative Illness and Disability Ratio (CIDR) (Source: IS, AA, DLA, SDA, IB from DWP) for 2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Measures of emergency admissions to hospital, derived from Hospital Episode Statistics (Source:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Measures of adults under 60 suffering from mood or anxiety disorders, based on prescribing (Source: Prescribing Pricing Authority) for 2001, Hospital Episode Statistics for 1998/1999 to 2001/2002 (Source: Department of Health), suicides for 1997 to 2001 (Source: ONS) and health benefits data for 1999 (Source: IB and SDA from DWP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education, skills and training deprivation</th>
<th>Education, skills and training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Proportions of working age adults (aged 25-54) in the area with no or low qualifications for 2001 (Source: 2001 Census)</td>
<td>- Key Stage 2, average point scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proportion of young people not staying on in school or non-advanced further education above 16 for 2001 (Child Benefit, Source: DWP)</td>
<td>- Key Stage 3, average point scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proportion of those aged under 21 not entering Higher Education for 1999-2002 (Source: UCAS)</td>
<td>- Key Stage 4, average point scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average points score of pupils at Key Stage 2 (end of primary) for 2002 (Source: Pupil Level Annual School Census (PLASC) and the National Pupil Database (NPD) from the DfES)</td>
<td>- Proportion of adults with low or no qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>- Proportion of 17 and 18 year olds not entering further or higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Secondary school absence rates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Average points score of pupils at Key Stage 3 for 2002 (Source: PLASC and NPD from DfES)
- Average points score of pupils at Key Stage 4 (GSCE/GNVQ – best of eight results) for 2002 (Source: PLASC and NPD from the DfES)
- Secondary school absence rate (Average of 2001 and 2002, Source: DfES school level survey of authorised and unauthorised absences, allocated to the local area via the PLASC data, DfES)

### Barriers to housing and services
- Household overcrowding for 2001 (Source: 2001 Census)
- LA level percentage of households for whom a decision on their application for assistance under the homeless provisions of housing legislation has been made, assigned to the constituent SOAs for 2002 (Source: ODPM)
- Difficulty of Access to owner-occupation for 2002 (calculated based on housing prices and earnings/income)
- Road distance to a Post Office at end of March 2003 (Post Office Ltd)
- Road distance to GP premises at May 2003 (National

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to housing and services</th>
<th>Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household overcrowding for 2001</td>
<td>Lack of central heating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA level percentage of households for whom a decision on their application for assistance under the homeless provisions of housing legislation has been made, assigned to the constituent SOAs for 2002 (Source: ODPM)</td>
<td>Overcrowding (excluding all student households)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty of Access to owner-occupation for 2002 (calculated based on housing prices and earnings/income)</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road distance to a Post Office at end of March 2003 (Post Office Ltd)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road distance to GP premises at May 2003 (National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Service Information Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road distance to a supermarket or convenience store at December 2002 (MapInfo Ltd)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road distance to a primary school for 2001-02 (DfES)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Living environment</th>
<th>Physical environment</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social and private housing in poor condition for 2001 (Source: BRE and ODPM, modelled EHCS)</td>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road traffic accidents involving injury to pedestrians and cyclists for 2000-2002 (Source: DfT, STATS19 (Road Accident Data) smoothed to SOA level)</td>
<td>Living within 1 km of a waste disposal site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality (2001, Source: UK National Air Quality Archive data modelled at SOA level by the Geography Department at Staffordshire University)</td>
<td>Proportion of people living within 1 km of an Environment Agency regulated industrial source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion of people living in an area with a significant risk of flooding</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime and disorder domain</th>
<th>Geographical access to services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burglary (4 recorded crime offence types, Police Force data for April 2002-March 2003, constrained to Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (CDRP) level)</td>
<td>Access to food shop (10 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft (5 recorded crime offence types, Police Force data for April 2002-March 2003, constrained to CDRP level)</td>
<td>Access to GP surgery (15 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal damage (10</td>
<td>Access to primary school (15 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to post office (15 minutes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to public library (15 minutes)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| recorded crime offence types, Police Force data for April 2002-March 2003, constrained to CDRP level | | Access to leisure centre (20 minutes)  
Access to NHS dentist (20 minutes)  
Access to secondary school (30 minutes) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violence (14 recorded crime offence types, Police Force data for April 2002-March 2003, constrained to CDRP level)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Information derived and adapted from EID2004 and WIMD2005)
Evident from the summary table was that the domains and key themes selected by both English and Welsh administrations were similar. There was variation, however, between the numbers of indicators attached to each domain. The indicators for the WIMD2005 totalled 31 whereas for the EID2004 there were 37, and one of the key challenges in selecting indicators was to avoid double counting within each domain. The biggest weighting for both the WIMD2005 and EID2004 was attached to the Income and Employment domain, implying these elements were viewed as the most important, and those presenting the greatest political drive and focus. Interestingly, a new crime domain had been added to the EID2004 alongside an expansion of the former housing domain now named ‘living environment domain’. This was the first indication that ‘crime’ was a key political driver within the realm of social exclusion and deprivation (EID2004). The ‘Crime and disorder’ domain had become a standalone domain for England (EID2004), and although unquestionably only one area out of a number of different avenues that could have been explored it provided strength for further investigation.

The DWP provided an additional perspective on this matter via their annual reports. The indicators used to measure poverty and social exclusion according to the DWP were established in 1999 when the first annual ‘Opportunity for all’ report was published (DWP 2004). The indicators have subsequently been reviewed annually to ensure that there are continual improvements and as explained by the DWP, ‘we review the indicators annually to ensure that they capture our evolving strategy and use the best
available information. Consequently, the original set of indicators has been added to and some definitions have been refined’ (www.dwp.gov.uk/ofa/indicators/). For example at the time of this policy review the latest DWP report (2004) organised 58 indicators according to stages of the lifecycle. Three main stages were identified and therefore provided three main categories of people: children and young people, working-age people and older people. An additional group namely, communities, was also suggested and was of particular interest to this research due to its specific reference to crime as an indicator.

Using information derived from the DWP (2004) report, the researcher has prepared Table 2 that identifies the target groups and the themes that emerged from the indicators. In addition a general illustration of the geographical coverage of the indicators within each group is presented.
Table 2: Target groups, themes and indicators (DWP 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of People</th>
<th>General Themes</th>
<th>Number of Indicators</th>
<th>Geographical Coverage</th>
<th>Trend of Latest Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children and Young People</strong></td>
<td>Living/Home, Environment, Teenage Pregnancy, Education/Learning, Infant Mortality, Serious Unintentional Injury, Smoking, Obesity, Child Protection, Housing/Accomodation</td>
<td>17 Main Indicators, 9 Sub-set Indicators</td>
<td>GB = 4, England Only = 18, England and Wales = 1</td>
<td>Constant Trend/No Significant Movement = 7, Data Moving in Optimum Direction = 10, Data moving in Wrong Direction = 2, Only Baseline Data Available/Insufficient Data = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People of Working Age</strong></td>
<td>Employment, Living Environment, Education/Qualifications, Income Benefits, Smoking, Suicide and Undetermined Injury, Homelessness, Drug Misuse</td>
<td>10 Main Indicators, 10 Sub-set Indicators</td>
<td>GB = 11, England Only = 5, England and Wales = 1</td>
<td>Constant trend/no significant movement = 12, Data moving in optimum direction = 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Older People</strong></td>
<td>Income, Pensions, Life Expectancy, Independent Living, Housing/Accomodation, Crime (fear of)</td>
<td>8 Main Indicators, 5 Sub-set Indicators</td>
<td>GB = 5, UK=1, England Only = 4, England and Wales = 1</td>
<td>Constant trend/no significant movement = 5, Data moving in optimum direction = 5, Only baseline data available or insufficient data = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communities</strong></td>
<td>Employment, Crimes, Housing, Life Expectancy, Education, Road Accident Casualties</td>
<td>7 Main Indicators</td>
<td>GB = 1, England Only = 5, England and Wales = 1</td>
<td>Constant trend/no significant movement = 5, Data moving in optimum direction = 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was not an intention of this research to critique the data and indicators presented, as this is beyond the remit of this thesis, however it was important to acknowledge the approach adopted by the DWP when measuring poverty and social exclusion. Interestingly the DWP’s approach was to target particular themes across different categories of ‘people’. Table 2 indicates that there was variation in the number of indicators attached to any one group and the geographical data available for these indicators also varied. For example, some indicators displayed data on a Great Britain (GB) level and others on an England only basis. Table 2 is useful as a brief summary and highlights the differentiation that occurs.

All member states are required to report on indicators within their National Action Plans. The indicators were established in December 2001 by the Laeken European Council to facilitate a comparable monitoring process to be achieved by member states towards the agreed EU objectives (see the DWP 2003 for further information). The DWP (2003) UK National Action Plan on Social Inclusion 2003-2005 detailed indicators utilised to monitor the UK’s strategy which aimed to promote social inclusion. The indicators were said to capture the many different aspects of social exclusion and poverty that affect people’s lives, in terms of pursuing social inclusion over time and with different groups. The overall set included both indicators common to all member states and additionally UK specific indicators which highlighted areas of specific interest (DWP 2003). These indicators were categorised into three distinct classifications: primary, secondary and tertiary indicators, with the tertiary indicators further assembled according to the objectives they proposed to
monitor. The primary and secondary indicators comprised a set of 18 commonly agreed statistical indicators for social inclusion, with the primary indicators covering the most important aspects of social inclusion and the secondary indicators supporting these by elaborating on the primary indicators or by describing other dimensions of the problem. The data provided for the primary and secondary indicators was via Eurostat, and thus, there remained issues regarding the use of the data and its overall consistency when compared to other official data preferred by both the UK Government and Devolved Administrations (DWP 2003). Reservations were based on the timescale and the length of series the data presented, with tertiary indicators solely restricted to the UK and not synchronised on a European level. Indictors selected by the UK were either for the purpose of expanding on existing indicators (specific strategic priorities) within the primary and secondary sections, or to provide more timely and/or detailed analysis (DWP 2003). This inconsistency between the statistical analysis presented by UK data (tertiary indictors) and EU data (primary and secondary indictors) was clearly evident through the DWP (2003) report.

The LGDU (2003, p. 10) further adds commentary on the difficulties associated with making direct comparisons on a geographical level stating,

Externally, it would not be possible to make direct comparisons between the measures in Wales and those elsewhere in the UK...since the current measures do not incorporate identical indicators and are therefore not directly comparable.
An additional note is that one of the key issues in determining social exclusion has been the spatial scale used to measure deprivation. For example, the EID2004 claimed that as a result of consultation it ‘should be constructed at the smallest practicable spatial scale and that the ideal geography should possess relatively even sized populations’ (p.16). In September 2004 the then Secretary of State for Work and Pensions Alan Johnson declared, ‘Variations in deprivation within regions are often much more pronounced than those between regions. Our improved data means that we can tackle poverty in smaller geographical areas – even on a street by street basis – and ensure that we target help to the areas which need it most.’ One of the standard measures for representing statistical information has taken the form of the electoral ward/division. As with regional analysis there are drawbacks, including the fact that they vary significantly in size and are also subject to regular boundary changes. Analysis by electoral ward/division ‘… is not ideal for nationwide comparisons [and additionally] creates problems when trying to compare datasets from different time periods’ (www.nationalstatistics.gov.uk).

The Office for National Statistics (ONS) had recently (at the time of this review) devised a new layered geography for neighbourhood statistics known as Super Output Areas (SOAs), which were introduced to replace electoral wards. ‘Super Output Areas (SOAs) were a new geography designed to improve the reporting of small area statistics’ (www.nationalstatistics.gov.uk). SOAs are much more consistent in size, and boundaries are not subject to frequent change. This facilitates a more detailed level of analysis where highly deprived pockets can be identified in areas with large ward sizes. Both
England and Wales have been divided into Super Output Areas (SOAs) which operate the same across three distinct levels: Lower Layer (smallest), Middle Layer, and Upper Layer (largest). There are, however, variations in the use of the SOA which undoubtedly exist between administrations.

To summarise, there are clear variations in approaches utilised to measure social exclusion and deprivation amongst administrations. Unsurprisingly there are also differences of opinion as to whether programmes aimed at tackling these issues should be implemented on an area or individual basis. The next section briefly explores the ‘area Vs individual’ debate with regards to policy implementation and more practically programme application.

4. Policy implementation: area versus individual

There are differences of opinion regarding the ‘area Vs individual’ debate (DWP 2004) and this has led to questions regarding the most beneficial approach to adopt with reference to policy making and its overall implementation. The documents reviewed with regards to this debate appeared unclear whether a combination of initiatives was the most optimum approach, or in fact whether anti-deprivation policy should target geographical areas in preference to individual groups. To understand these issues in further detail two key government reports which specifically provide commentary on this matter were reviewed (DWP 2004; ODPM and SU [Strategic Unit] 2005).
When examining deprivation and/or disadvantage experienced by specific geographical areas it is essential that clear definitions are available in order to identify and understand what is actually meant by ‘deprived areas’. A common misconception often held is that all those people living within a deprived area are socially excluded. The DWP (2004) classified area deprivation on two levels. Firstly, referring to the social characteristics of an area including the perception and reputation of an area and the people that live there, and the idea that poor perceptions attached to areas contribute to the further exclusion of those areas. Secondly, on the basis of the physical characteristics of an area including, a lack of facilities or services. Furthermore, liveability encompasses factors that directly impact on the quality of an area for example anti-social behaviour. Thus poor liveability has an explicit impact on residents.

Area-based initiatives (ABIs) are targeted streams of funding that are aimed at one or more specified geographical areas (ODPM & SU 2005), this approach directly focuses on areas that have been defined as those experiencing greatest problems and disadvantage through techniques as highlighted in previous sections. The Performance and Innovation Unit (PIU) (2000) identified area based policies as less cost-effective than general anti-deprivation policies that specifically target deprived individuals regardless of their area of residence. In addition, an independent inquiry conducted by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation (JRF) asserted that those individuals experiencing social exclusion in rural areas were dispersed amongst apparent affluence, as opposed to concentrated together in problem areas, suggesting that area-based interventions are not necessarily the most appropriate
method (Gordon et al. 2000; Kleinman 1999). However, certainly at the time of this review there remained a general consensus amongst government agencies towards the continued rationale for area-based interventions. For example the ODPM & SU (2005) report articulated, ‘The existence of “area effects”, meaning that simply living in a deprived area is enough to hinder an individual’s life chances, provides a continuing rationale for area-based interventions’ (ODPM & SU 2005, p. 25).

The DWP (2004) report acknowledged that there are different experiences of social exclusion and in addition these may occur at different points in time. Disadvantage may be experienced on a geographical level where those people living within a particular area experience poverty and social exclusion, and as such area effects of exclusion can operate at different levels, in different ways and to different types of people further accentuating its complexity and difficulties with finalising a ‘one size fits all’ approach (DWP 2004). In addition, individual circumstances and characteristics have an impact on areas and thus policies should focus on improving areas alongside policies focused on individuals. Combining policies which target both disadvantaged people and disadvantaged areas is the most favourable approach (DWP 2004).
Offering a Welsh perspective on this debate the WIMD2005 asserted that a significant issue when examining social exclusion and deprivation is the extent to which individuals and families experiencing deprivation cluster together geographically, as well as the extent to which other individuals and families who could not be considered to be experiencing deprivation are affected by the overall level of deprivation in their area. Therefore a consistent issue is the large gap that appears between deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the country. According to the National Strategy Action Plan (SEU 2001) previous reports produced by the SEU, namely, *Bringing Britain Together* (1998) and the *Consultation Paper for the National Strategy* (2000), illustrated the gap that exists between England’s most deprived neighbourhoods and the rest of the country. The exact development and impact of these ‘area effects’ is understandably difficult to identify, however, the DWP (2004) claimed it was a combination of both the social makeup of an area and the physical characteristics of deprived areas. Specific issues associated with directly living within a deprived area include, lower incomes and poor employment records, a higher proportion of people suffering from a long-term illness and generally a lower life expectancy, more likely to be victims of crime, and poorer transport and accessibility, lower social capital and poorer mobility (DWP 2004).

Some slightly contradictory commentary was provided in an earlier report by the DWP (2003) where it was stated that ‘Many deprived people do not live in deprived areas…Nevertheless, a focus on the area aspects of social exclusion complements other policies’ (p. 14). There was no reference to what
the ‘other’ policies might include, raising the question whether it is in fact more opportune to concentrate attention and implementation on an area basis (into deprived areas) if it is thought that many deprived people are not going to gain benefit from such actions. This said, the ODPM & SU (2005) report asserted that people living in deprived areas are more likely to be worse off than similar people living in more prosperous areas and therefore living in a deprived area adversely affects an individual’s life chances. According to this report area-based deprivation is a result of a combination of drivers which fundamentally form the cycle of decline. The exact importance of each of the individual drivers within the cycle of decline often varies from area to area, perpetuating area-based deprivation. This suggests that it is often difficult to appraise a particular area’s experience of deprivation based upon one single driver, further reinforcing the idea of multiple deprivation (ODPM & SU 2005).

For the purpose of this review it was important to note that the ODPM & SU (2005) report was specifically confined to area based deprivation and those policies designed to improve outcomes for people living within deprived areas, thus it adopted the area-effects analogy. As communicated in the ODPM & SU (2005) report there is an extensive amount of literature and evidence available on the causes of deprivation within an area. The report adopted a collective approach, attempting to engage many of the sources available into a cycle of decline diagram to identify the interlocking causes of deprivation (see Figure 2).
Figure 2: The cycle of decline

(Source: ODPM & SU 2005, p. 39)
The cycle provides a useful mechanism to assess how each cause affects the other, and a more holistic approach to understanding area decline whilst defining interlocking aspects of individual issues. This ‘whole’ approach is said to facilitate a clearer understanding that, ‘tackling just one aspect of the cycle of decline will not be successful in regenerating an area and improving the outcomes of the residents who live there’ (ODPM & SU 2005, p. 40). Importantly the drivers of the cycle of decline vary according to areas, and thus elements of the cycle may be more or less important depending on local circumstances (ODPM & SU 2005).

A simplified version of the drivers of area decline was developed within the report where the complex interacting elements were simplified into three distinct categories of drivers (Figure 3).

Figure 3: Overview of the cycle of decline (Source: ODPM & SU 2005, p. 42)
This overview provided a far more simplistic version of the complex nature of the subject, without jeopardising the key influencing elements, including: weak local economies; public services and delivery system; poor housing and local environment; and unstable communities. The ODPM & SU (2005) report also provided a breakdown of ABIs in accordance to their distribution by a particular theme of social exclusion and disadvantage. Eleven specific themes emerged: access to job opportunities, public space, crime/ASB (anti-social behaviour), education/lifelong learning, aspirations, social capital, poor health, families (including teenage pregnancies), access to suppliers, poor transport, and poor housing. The first three themes were deemed the most important at the time and this included the topic of crime and ASB.

At an ‘individual’ level approaches comprised two elements, age and groups. The first aspect addressed social exclusion through the lifecycle approach, thus categorising individual people based upon their age at a specific time period. Additionally individuals were categorised as social groups which were identified as those considered to be the most excluded, for example women, ethnic minorities, offenders, older people, and disabled people. In the same way as not all people living in certain areas are socially excluded, not everyone within these groups necessarily experiences social exclusion.
The DWP (2004) report focused on the lifecycle approach for social exclusion covering child poverty, people of working age, and older people. The DWP (2004) report alleged that there was a need to understand poverty both in terms of the individual and in addition the compounding impact that is experienced as a direct result of living within a deprived area. Hence, this approach combined policies into targeting both disadvantaged people and areas. Produced by the researcher Table 3 identifies the frequency of themes/groups as key target areas within the reports reviewed when tackling social exclusion and deprivation.

Table 3: Summary of report focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT</th>
<th>GROUP/APPROACH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EID2004</strong></td>
<td>Based upon geographical location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WIMD2000 and Proposed Updated WIMD</strong></td>
<td>Based upon geographical location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DWP (2003) UK National Action Plan</strong></td>
<td>Identifies five main groups; Children, Large Families, People from Ethnic Minorities, Disabled People, and Older People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ODPM &amp; SU (2005) Improving the prospects of people living in areas of multiple deprivation in England</strong></td>
<td>Crime and Anti-social Behaviour; Young People (specifically crime and anti-social behaviour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A New Commitment to Neighbourhood Renewal (2001)</strong></td>
<td>Ethnic minorities; the retired; Under16 age band and Disability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DWP(2004) 'Opportunity for All' report</strong></td>
<td>Minority ethnic groups; Crime and Anti-social Behaviour; Older People; Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WAG (2003) Third Annual Report</strong></td>
<td>Children and Young People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of those themes/groups identified within the review process children featured in five of the reports as a key area of interest. The consistency of the groups and/or themes within reports suggested that these were viewed as particularly vulnerable agents within the topic area (social exclusion and deprivation). The risk of inter-generational transmission of poverty is noteworthy as it identifies the fact that there is a continuous cycle to deprivation, where poor prospects in childhood can often continue into adulthood and potentially transmit to their own children, hence continuing the cycle. The DWP (2003) report, argued that children growing up in low income families and unemployment affirm the cycle and increase the likelihood of them becoming economically inactive in young adulthood. Thus ‘children’ and in particular child poverty are dimensions of huge interest to government departments both nationally and internationally with a need to break ongoing cycles of deprivation (the source of this information was obtained from a research report by the Institute for Social and Economic Research in 2001).

Of interest to this thesis was the theme crime, disorder and poor liveability which received government recognition as one of the main drivers and key indicators of area-based deprivation (ODPM & SU 2005). Crime and anti-social behaviour can often cause instability within deprived areas, as the issue simply exacerbates local problems that already exist thereby affecting the quality of an area and its desirability for residents. The ODPM & SU (2005) report noted that certain areas were more likely to suffer crime and antisocial behaviour, including areas of low housing demand and those living in social housing estates, with them five times more likely to experience the problem
The theme of crime and antisocial behaviour can be analysed from two particular perspectives when it came to social exclusion (ODPM & SU 2005). Firstly, those individuals labelled as offenders/delinquents can themselves be categorised as a group that are socially excluded. Secondly deprived areas are said to have higher crime rates (source Neighbourhood Renewal Unit/Office for National Statistics), thus disorder is far worse in deprived areas particularly in council estates and low income areas with 39% perceiving high level of disorder (source: British Crime Survey 2002/3). Furthermore according to the ODPM & SU (2005) report there was a concern that living in a deprived area was high risk for young people offending. One response to this was that each local authority area established a local crime and disorder reduction partnership within England involving various representatives from key agencies and organisations, including the local police, local authorities and the probation service (DWP 2004).

In summary ‘no single “area effect” exists’, and when examined alone area effects can appear low particularly in direct comparison to personal characteristics; thus area effects are ‘not as significant as individuals’ personal circumstances’ (Home Office 2004; ODPM & SU 2005, p. 35). On reflection there remain unresolved questions and confusion within and
between government reports regarding the relative importance of area versus individual approaches. This said, at the very least through the management of reports within this review it is evident that there is inconsistency in government thinking on the most opportune approach that should be taken on a practical level.

5. **Summary update of changes in indices**

Since this policy review was undertaken a number of significant changes have occurred within the UK, most notably a change in government from New Labour to the Coalition Government. This section provides a brief summary of the key changes that have taken place with regards to social exclusion and deprivation. The Coalition Government is implementing a series of wide-ranging policy reforms across all major departments underpinned by a set of key principles which mark the departure of Labour Government.

As noted earlier in Chapter 1, 2006 saw the SEU replaced by the SETF, and more recently (2010) the SETF abolished with its functions absorbed into the OCS (Cabinet Office 2011). Following this restructuring the Office for the Third Sector and SETF are now based within the OCS and operate across government departments to translate the Big Society agenda into practical policies, providing support to voluntary and community organisations and is responsible for delivering a number of key Big Society programmes. The Government recognises that supporting the most disadvantaged is a key part of Big Society, with issues of multiple disadvantage underlined in a number of
publications most notably the *State of the Nation report: Poverty, worklessness and welfare dependency in the UK* (HM Government 2010). Lead responsibility for issues of multiple disadvantage now sits within the DWP. The Coalition Government’s strategy for social justice is concerned with giving individuals and families facing multiple disadvantages the support and tools they need to turn their lives around (DWP 2012). In summary the key principles informing the Coalition Government’s approach to social justice include: (i) a focus on prevention and early intervention (ii) where problems arise, concentrating on recovery and independence not maintenance (iii) promoting work (iv) recognition that the most effective solutions will often be both designed and delivered at a local level (v) ensuring interventions provide a fair deal for the taxpayer (DWP 2012).

The most recent indices available across both England (EID2010) and Wales (WIMD2010) reveal some differences compared to the indices utilised in this review (EID2004 and WIMD2005). Table 4 provides a comparable update between the indices used in this review and the latest versions.
Table 4: Summary update of domains and weighting (based on most recent indices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Indices of Deprivation</th>
<th>Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EID2004</strong></td>
<td><strong>EID2010</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOMAINS AND WEIGHTING</strong></td>
<td><strong>DOMAINS AND WEIGHTING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income deprivation (22.5%)</td>
<td>Income deprivation (22.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment deprivation (22.5%)</td>
<td>Employment deprivation (22.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health deprivation and disability (13.5%)</td>
<td>Health deprivation and disability (13.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, skills and training deprivation (13.5%)</td>
<td>Education, skills and training deprivation (13.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to housing and services (9.3%)</td>
<td>Barriers to housing and services (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living environment (9.3%)</td>
<td>Living environment (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime and disorder domain (9.3%)</td>
<td>Crime and disorder domain (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: EID2004; WIMD2005; EID2010; WIMD2010)

When reviewing the English dimension the domains and the subsequent weighting of those domains have remained consistent between 2004 and 2010. Conversely, the Welsh dimension revealed some minor changes with regards to the percentage weightings of some of the domains, and most significantly the additional inclusion of a community safety domain. Such
additions further support the importance of the central theme of this research which was based around crime, and is integrated during the following section.

6. Exploring the chosen domain: ‘crime’

When examining the key aspects relating to social exclusion through this review, it was always an intention of this research to inevitably focus on one fundamental theme which would then produce the thread of future work undertaken. When attempting to identify specific themes surrounding the term social exclusion, the notion of crime was an area receiving considerable attention. For example the English Index of Deprivation (2004) viewed it as a key domain with 9.3% weighting. Additionally the potential link between sport, crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) has developed as a relevant subject for research. The apparent financial implications of crime and subsequent costs of impacting upon criminal behaviour, although difficult to quantify exactly, clearly signifies a burden on society (MacDonald 2002) and one that remains ongoing regardless of government changes and policy shifts. As a result from here on this thesis adopts a more focused emphasis on crime and later sports potential within crime reduction.

Through research the notion that ‘nothing works’ (Cullen and Gendreau 2000; Uggen et al. 2005) has been proven as incorrect, with certain approaches to reducing crime likely to be more effective than others (Sherman et al. 1997). According to Goldblatt and Lewis (1998) criminal events are those which occur when individuals with a propensity to engage in criminal behaviour find
themselves in situations which encourage or facilitate such behaviour. Thus, it is important to identify how this propensity is developed, interventions that might reduce criminal behaviour opportunities, and how to reduce the overall vulnerability of individuals to crime through new products, environments and policies.

Ekblom (2002) stated that crime reduction knowledge and best practice can be characterised into three dimensions the ‘know-about’, ‘know-what’, and ‘know-how’. Know-about includes existing knowledge and theories about crime problems, patterns and trends in criminality, empirical risk and protective factors and theories of causation. Know-what incorporates knowledge of what works in prevention, in what context and through what mechanism and Know-how refers to the knowledge and skills of practical processes, the extent and limits of legal powers and duties to intervene, and research and evaluation methodologies. The next chapter (Chapter 3) and subsequent empirical studies (Chapters 5 and 6) explore the position and potential of sport for crime reduction purposes across those dimensions identified by Ekblom (2002).

As with social exclusion and the difficulties apparent with a single definition of the term, it is also not uncommon for theories of crime to assume different definitions and overall explanations of both crime and offenders. As suggested by Young (2003) the significant variability in the definitions of crime have led to questioning amongst criminologists over the appropriateness for a
single definition and all-encompassing theory to explain all levels of criminal activity. It is however, important to note at this point some brief definitions of specific concepts that are used interchangeably throughout this review, including: crime prevention, crime reduction and community safety. Ekblom (2001) defines crime prevention as an intervention into the causes of criminal events to reduce the risk of their occurrence and potential severity. This definition is particularly useful due to its broad and encompassing nature. It covers all causes, and hence all theories of causation and approaches to prevention of crime, irrespective of whether these may be situational or offender orientated. Crime reduction which Ekblom (2004) claims is closely related to crime prevention is an even broader and simpler concept which is currently favoured in the UK. It refers to action that reduces the frequency and seriousness of criminal events, this might include future-orientated prevention or present orientated aspects. The final concept in use in the UK and one which requires definition in this review is community safety. According to Ekblom (2001) this focuses less on individual criminal events and more on the consequences of crime as a whole, hence the overall goal being harm reduction and the delivery of a range of social benefits rather than merely lowering crime rates.

The literature relating to treatment for offenders appears to differ considerably and there is much debate surrounding what actually works in reducing offending and overall recidivism. Early work conducted by Gendreau and Ross (1979) entailed a review of 95 programmes between 1973 and 1978. This review revealed several key conclusions. For example studies that
adopted a mixture of techniques were said to be more successful than those using a single treatment method. It was also felt that a variety of outcomes need consideration with recidivism being only one, and there is a need to think about the interaction of treatment settings and the individual differences that exist. Furthermore, there appeared to be fewer resources devoted to the treatment aspect of crime and a lack of coordination amongst key agencies working within the field.

In April 1999, the government embarked on an ambitious programme for tackling crime in England and Wales, attempting to turn 25 years of accumulated crime research and experience into the development and implementation of a three-year £400 million cross-government Crime Reduction Programme (CRP) (Homel et al. 2004). The CRP had three primary goals. Firstly, to achieve a sustained reduction in crime, secondly to improve mainstream knowledge and best practice and thirdly, to maximise the implementation of cost-effective crime reduction activity. During the early period of the CRP, crime was estimated at a cost of £50 billion per year for the UK economy (Home Office 1999). According to Homel et al. (2004), these costs reflected the effects of crime on business, the health and welfare systems, and a widening of inequalities in wealth and other general social amenities. Adding to this debate is Meek et al. (2012) who stated that the annual cost of re-offending equates to the same cost as hosting the 2012 Olympics. Irrespective of exact figures it is clear that the cost of crime on the UK economy is of huge significance.
Although first developed in 1999 and thus a little dated, the CRP remains the single most concerted effort by government to tackle crime. As such it is appropriate to review briefly the CRP. The CRP was said to be designed to assist in achieving specific aspects of the Home Office’s Public Service Agreement (PSA) objectives on crime, in addition to other crime reduction concerns and agendas. There were 20 specific crime reduction initiatives of varying scale organised around five broad themes: working with families, children and schools to prevent offending by young people in the future; tackling crime within communities, in particular high volume crime (for example, domestic burglary); developing products and systems that are resistant to crime; more effective sentencing practices; and working with offenders to ensure that they do not re-offend (Home Office 1999). Beyond the CRP’s own specific initiatives it was also seeking to connect with other government initiatives on social exclusion, school performance, drug-related crime, economic regeneration and promoting family life. It is believed that this approach reflected the Government’s expectation to reach across departments and public sector boundaries (Homel et al. 2004).

Table 5 has been derived by the researcher using information from Homel et al. (2004, p. 8), and illustrates a summary of the major initiatives identified through the CRP and those which display a diverse range of approaches to deal with broad-based issues of community concern. It is important to at least gain some insight into the array and spectrum of mechanisms and approaches that are to some extent still being suggested by the UK government as areas where crime reduction should be targeted. How and
why sport and recreation might be incorporated into or alongside such strategies is unclear and a principal aim of this research.
Table 5: Crime reduction programme – major initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reducing Burglary</td>
<td>A programme targeting neighbourhoods in England and Wales with high burglary rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting Policing</td>
<td>These programmes are aimed at helping the police to develop and implement a problem-orientated approach to crime incidents and reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>Children and Families at Risk: ‘On Track’ is a long term initiative aimed at children at risk of getting involved in crime. Innovation fund: funding available for stimulating, promising and innovative ideas from all sectors of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of Offenders</td>
<td>A range of initiatives to develop effective practice in working with offenders, both inside and outside of prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Arrest Referrals</td>
<td>A programme to develop face-to-face arrest referral schemes that aim to impact upon drug-related offending in England and Wales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention Work in Schools</td>
<td>An initiative aiming to integrate approaches to improving schools’ management of pupils’ behaviour and reducing truancy and exclusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lock for Pensioners</td>
<td>An initiative aimed at improving home security for pensioners living in low-income households in neighbourhoods suffering high domestic burglary rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Violence and Violence Against Women</td>
<td>Funding for local agencies/multi-agency partnerships to develop and implement local strategies for reducing two types of violence experienced by women: domestic violence, and rape and sexual assault by known perpetrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Licensing</td>
<td>An initiative to improve vehicle licensing and registration systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Inclusion</td>
<td>Multiple interventions aimed at the most at risk 13-16 year olds in approximately 70 deprived neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentencing</td>
<td>Aimed to develop the evidence base for sentencing and enforcement practices with the objective of maximising the impact on crime reduction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Wardens</td>
<td>Aimed at providing a reassuring presence in local areas, promoting community safety, tackling graffiti, vandalism and low level disorder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Against Crime</td>
<td>Aimed at encouraging designers and companies to examine the crime-resistance of their designs, products and systems before being marketed and finding their way to general use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTV Initiative</td>
<td>Funding for new and extended public area CCTV schemes in England and Wales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tackling Prostitution</td>
<td>Funding for local organisations working within a multi-agency context to implement local strategies for reducing prostitution-related crime and disorder.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table derived by the author, source: Homel et al. 2004, p. 8).
Ekblom (2003) referred to the 5I's of the problem solving approach which has been influential namely, intelligence, intervention, implementation, involvement, and impact. Literature on the ‘problem orientated’ approach to policing stresses that developing a clear understanding of the causes, manifestations and extent of crime problems in a given locality is an essential approach to adopt when seeking to resolve those problems (see Read and Oldfield 1995; Leigh et al. 1996, 1998). Thus gatekeepers must be aware of, and responsive to, a number of key issues when adopting the problem orientated approach. According to Eck and Clarke (2003) this awareness also extends to asking questions as to whether problems are simply one-off or part of a cluster of recurring incidents. Addressing the latter is said to be what underpins systematic and effective problem solving (Clarke and Eck 2005).

It appears the opinion of some authors (Goldblatt and Lewis 1998; Homel et al. 2004) that, there is a reluctance to invest more heavily in the conventional tools of crime reduction, without a more improved evidence base regarding programme effectiveness upon which to build future crime reduction strategies and investment. It is clearly apparent from the review of the material available that good scientific evidence on what works in preventing criminality is scarce, with evaluations lacking the required detail and reliable assessment (Goldblatt and Lewis 1998), ultimately providing difficulties when developing evidence-based policy programmes (EBPP).
Chapter 3: Sport, social inclusion and crime
1. Introduction

The emphasis on sports’ potential to contribute to wider affairs, as well as recognition of personal enjoyment and fulfilment was important under New Labour. For example, the Policy Action Team 10 (PAT10) report produced for the SEU in the first term of the New Labour Government suggested that sport (alongside arts, cultural and recreational activity) had the potential to impact upon ‘neighbourhood renewal by improving communities’ performance on four key indicators – health, crime, employment and education’ (PAT10 1999, p. 22). PAT10 addressed nine key principles fundamental to the exploitation of sport in regeneration communities, these included: valuing diversity, embedding local control, supporting local commitment, promoting equitable partnerships, defining common objectives in relation to actual needs, working flexibly with change, securing sustainability, pursuing quality across the spectrum, and connecting with the mainstream of art and sport activities (PAT10 1999). The UK government launched a series of initiatives primarily aimed to challenge social exclusion and promote social inclusion, particularly amongst young people. These included examples such as: Sure Start, an early intervention programme; Connexions, a programme for school leavers; Education Action Zones and Positive Futures, all of which focus on youth problems.
As discussed in the previous chapter ‘social inclusion’ and ‘social exclusion’ are contested concepts (Room 1995; Burchardt et al. 2002; Levitas et al. 2007), and it is important to note a shift in language from the term social exclusion to social inclusion from the outset of this chapter. Although both terms are often used interchangeably, this particular chapter concentrates on the positive influence sport might have in promoting the benefits of social inclusion (and ultimately crime reduction). Social inclusion developed conceptually alongside social exclusion and although certain commentators (for example Donnelly and Coakley 2002) argue that social inclusion should not be viewed simply as a response to social exclusion but alternatively have value on its own as both a process and a goal. In the context of UK government policy, the term social inclusion signifies the reversal of factors considered responsible for social exclusion (Tacon 2007). Thus in this thesis both terms are used interchangeably social inclusion signifying the reversal of social exclusion and vice versa.

Within the UK, sporting bodies (Central Council of Physical Recreation [CCPR] 2002; Sport England [SE] 2005) and government departments (Department for Culture Media and Sport [DCMS] 1999; Office of the Deputy Prime Minister [ODPM] 2004) have demonstrated support towards sports’ contribution to ‘social inclusion’ strategies and more specifically youth crime reduction. On an international level the International Olympic Committee [IOC] (2000) and European Commission [EC] (2007) expressed enthusiasm for the idea that sport can be utilised to promote ‘social inclusion’. Sport has been promoted as a positive activity within mainstream policy for children and young people (HM Treasury 2007), specifically utilised as part of targeted social exclusion prevention strategies, for example within Children’s
Fund Partnerships (Morris et al. 2009). Engagement in sporting activity was considered to ‘open up a channel for young people to obtain advice and information on a wide range of health, social, education and employment issues’ (Sport England 2005, p. 9). However, the complexities associated with the promotion of social inclusion, and the limitations of individualised approaches have also been acknowledged (Long et al. 2002; Morris et al. 2009).

An early review conducted in the United States by Driver et al. (1991) examined the theoretical benefits of sport and leisure and included the development of primary group relationships, improvements in physical health and the opportunity to acquire leadership skills. The work of Bailey (2005) proposed that participation in sport is well placed to at least contribute to the process of inclusion. Referring to four dimensions of social exclusion, Bailey (2005) specifically applied them to the context of sport and social inclusion. These four dimensions include: ‘Spatial’ – where sport has the capacity to bring individuals from a variety of social and economic backgrounds through a shared interest; ‘Relational’ – where sport offers a sense of belonging (to a team, club, or programme); ‘Functional’ – sport provides opportunities for the development of valued capabilities and competencies; and ‘Power’ – it increases community capital by extending social networks and increasing community cohesion and civic pride. However, as noted by Bailey (2005) there is a need for greater empirical research in order for the relationship between sport and social inclusion to become more than a theoretical proposition.
Long et al. (2002) reviewed a set of programmes designed to reduce social exclusion, an aspect of which, was to examine evidence for crime prevention. Their general conclusion was that ‘...there is little effective evaluation against social exclusion outcomes’ (p.81) and, with specific reference to crime reduction: ‘despite the pressure to demonstrate success, evidence from the 14 projects is extremely limited’ (p.45). However Coalter (2001) acknowledged that sport is able to play a positive role as a key ingredient in wider ranging issues and can be part of the solution if used effectively.

A recent paper produced by Kelly (2010) examined the processes through which sports-based interventions might promote social inclusion. Drawing upon a total of eighty-eight semi-structured interviews, research was conducted in three main Positive Futures sites based in England, between September 2005 and December 2006. Four main themes emerged from the interview data collected in this study, namely: ‘sport for all’, ‘social cohesion’, ‘a pathway to work’, and ‘giving voice’. The latter two themes are of particular relevance to the research conducted in this thesis, given the focus on adult (ex)offenders. The connection between programmes and work based opportunities is discussed later in this chapter in section 2.4, and the notion of ‘giving a voice’ to participants is one that was central to the single case study in Chapter 5. In summary, Kelly’s (2010) findings revealed that the research sites achieved varying degrees of ‘success’ as a method of social inclusion in relation to the four main themes, and therefore the claim that sports-based interventions have the ability to promote social inclusion remains questionable. Kelly (2010) argued that inclusionary policies should engage with the socio-structural aspects of exclusion as the measurement of selected ‘outcomes’ is unlikely to
capture the complex nature and processes involved in intervention programmes (Smith 2006). It is feasible that programmes may in fact benefit individuals in unexpected or unmeasured ways but this has yet to be clearly and consistently demonstrated (Kelly 2010).

The remainder of this chapter focuses specifically on the central theme of this thesis which was ‘sport and crime’. Sport has been viewed as having potential to contribute to crime prevention, reduction and recidivism (Coalter 2007; Nichols 2007), however the concept of ‘why’ and ‘how’ an intervention produces specific outcomes has been referred to as the ‘black box’ problem (Pawson and Myhill 2001; Hansen 2005). For example policy interventions are believed to address and trigger certain social and behavioural responses among people and organisations, however in reality this is difficult to determine. Further discussion of this can be seen throughout this chapter.

This chapter firstly provides a detailed overview of key research on the use of sports-based interventions for both crime prevention and crime rehabilitation. The research undertaken in this thesis aimed to explore the use of sport in a less traditional context with adult offenders in a rehabilitative capacity. Due to the lack of literature and research available on this particular age band, this initial section has drawn upon the research currently available on children and adolescents and considered its application within this new realm of enquiry. Some traditional rationales for sport are then highlighted along with some consideration of criminology theory on risk and
protective factors. The remaining sections then focus on consistent themes emerging from the literature that are most relevant to the unique approach of this thesis.

2. Sport and crime

Crime prevention is not the primary objective of sport and physical activity but it might be an extremely positive by-product.

(Cameron and MacDougall 2000, p. 1).

The widespread belief that sport can make a positive contribution to youth crime has received attention. Some commentators emphasise the need to move beyond enhancing participation in leisure for its own sake, to contributing to wider societal problems via a problem solving mandate (Witt and Crompton 1996). In the early period of the Labour Government, UK policy reviews considered the potential social value of sport (Collins et al. 1999, PAT10 1999, and Sport England 1999). The political prominence of the ‘problem’ of youth crime and the combined search for a solution, led to an increase in policy initiatives (Pitts 2003), and has been positioned within central government’s general social inclusion agenda (PAT 10 1999). Sport England admitted that it would be naive to believe and claim that sport alone can diminish levels of youth crime, although evidence suggests sport has a key part to play in preventing crime (1999).
The behaviours implied by terms such as ‘anti-social’ and ‘delinquent’ are wide ranging, as are the range of causes associated with such behaviours (from environmental determinism to individual pathology), and an array of activities covered by the generic term ‘sport’ (Coalter 1996). Therefore in circumstances where the potential ‘therapeutic’ impact of a wide range of sporting activities on a wide range of behaviours and causes occurs, a degree of conceptual precision is required (Coalter 1996).

As noted much of the literature and research available on sport for crime reduction has focused on initiatives aimed at youth (see for example, Coalter 1989, 1996; Witt and Crompton 1996; Nichols, 1997, 1999a, 1999b, 2007; Taylor et al. 1999; West and Crompton 2001; Nichols and Crow 2004). The concurrent prioritisation of children and young people for sports-based social inclusion and crime reduction programmes can be understood in terms of young people being valued for their status as future adults and portrayed as an investment in the future (Lister 2005). In addition, young people are seen to be at the formative stage in their life where they are more susceptible to change with treatments likely to be more effective (Crow 2001). Gordon et al. (1999) argued that value judgements of politicians, practitioners and public opinion is more influential on work with young people because the work of the youth courts is distinguished from work with adult offenders. The need to provide a balance between retribution and prevention is guided by the welfare principle of considering what is best for the long-term development of a young person.
Attention has been directed towards sport and its ability as a diversion and/or preventative mechanism through which the risk of re-offending or involvement in anti-social behaviour amongst young people might be reduced. Witt and Crompton (1996) highlighted that action plans usually embrace the prevention approach designed to lower the number engaging in undesirable behaviours in the future, as opposed to intervention which changes attitudes, behaviour and the ‘life-course’ of individuals already involved in crime. Thoughts offered for the prevention over rehabilitation intervention rationale revolve around the fact that due to limited resources recreation agencies have to make choices, with prevention seeking to pro-actively change the behaviour of at-risk individuals rather than reactively working with individuals already involved in the legal system. Thus, preventative programmes are viewed as more feasible to implement compared to rehabilitation/treatment intervention programmes which typically require more resources and expertise. Nonetheless there have been studies that have focused on the rehabilitation of offenders which considered sports’ potential to help change behaviour (Robins 1990; Twitchen 1995; Coalter 1996; Nichols and Taylor 1996; Taylor et al. 1999; Meek 2012; Meek et al. 2012).

The debate surrounding the relationship between sports participation and anti-social behaviour and crime is two-fold in nature, embracing on the one hand deterrence and on the other hand rehabilitation (Mason and Wilson 1988). The view of delinquency as being opportunistic and as a result of boredom (Mason and Wilson 1988; Sport England 1999; Coalter et al. 2000; Crabbe 2000) is often associated with the preventative orientation of sports-based schemes, aimed at ‘filling time’ especially during the school holiday periods (Coalter 1996). This is consistent with
research which has found that providing an activity, where previously there has been none, is more important than the type of activity provided (Catalano et al. 1998). The prevention rationale increasingly underpins large-scale sports-based programmes targeted at specific areas and has become an important element in urban regeneration projects aimed at reducing youth crime, by encouraging the positive use of leisure time and capitalising upon the supposed socio-psychological outcomes of participating in sport (Bailey 2005). More generally, Robins (1990) referred to a number of preventative sports-based schemes whose principal features are said to be open access policies with a notable lack of rigid organisation.

Rehabilitation schemes tend to be part of intermediate treatment programmes whereby sports are just some of the activities available (Coalter 1996). The rehabilitative approach concentrates specifically on offenders, often involving intensive counselling to determine the needs of offenders and to provide appropriate and adequate provision of programmes. The notion of rehabilitation is often associated with prison time and its restorative effects (Mathiesen 1990). Over time the term appears to have developed into symbolising a broad range of processes, with the primary purpose of adjusting individuals back to an orderly function. Mathiesen (1990) also acknowledged the origin of the ideology of rehabilitation highlighting the fact that the main components have remained surprisingly constant over time and include: work, school, morality and discipline as key areas of thinking. He noted that the successful rehabilitation of a prisoner restores them to their old form, that being the form before they committed a crime, where dignity and privileges are restored. A potential problem with this view is the assumption that the individual is returning to a status that was positive and accepted by society before a crime was
committed, and therefore the individual has the foundation and knowledge of an orderly functioning lifestyle. Mathiesen (1990) also suggested that rehabilitation is the primary responsibility of the prisoners themselves.

Crow (2001) provided a summary of the potential concepts for treating and rehabilitating offenders including: those that are medical in nature (for example psychiatric treatment), those involving casework (for example counselling techniques), group work (for example role play), skills involving the development of and promotion of certain activities (for example motor projects, arts projects and projects featuring physical activity and sports), treatment directed at offences and offending, and social re-integration of offenders (including schemes concentrating on offender’s accommodation, education, training, and employment). These types of interventions are ultimately concerned with rehabilitation and resettlement, however, Crow (2001) emphasises that the approaches mentioned are not mutually exclusive, and thus can sometimes overlap, resulting in duplication and confusion.

Brantingham and Faust (1976) offered a more detailed means of categorising programmes via primary, secondary, or tertiary prevention, according to the mechanism by which the intervention is likely to work (Pawson and Tilley 1997). ‘Primary’ reduction refers to those programmes directed at the modification of the criminological conditions that are likely to promote offending behaviour. Primary type sports programmes would operate at the level of attempting to improve a community and reduce neighbourhood disadvantage as a risk factor. ‘Secondary’ reduction programmes focus upon the early identification and intervention in the lives of those
individuals who are in circumstances likely to lead to a criminal lifestyle. Sports programmes operating on this level would try to target ‘at risk’ groups of people. Finally ‘tertiary’ programmes are directed at those individuals who have already been convicted of a crime, identified as offenders, and thus they seek to prevent recidivism. These sports programmes are likely to take referrals from criminal justice agencies.

Some programmes may not fall neatly into one category. For example the Summit Project (Nichols 2004), revealed a large proportion of people were on their ‘final warning’ and would have been sent to court if they committed another offence, yet had not been convicted of one. Participants were not, therefore, in the ‘tertiary’ category, even though they had offended, as they had not been convicted. Due to the difficulties of placing a programme into one of the Brantingham and Faust (1976) categories, they can more realistically be seen as points on a scale (Nichols and Crow 2004). Alternatively the value of the categorisation might be in its implied theorisation that there is a continuum between programmes that function directly with high risk offenders to those that work to reduce the probability of offending occurring (Nichols 2004).

...the use of such a conceptual model helps to clarify current crime prevention efforts, suggests fruitful directions for future research...and may ultimately prove helpful in addressing the seemingly endless debate between advocates of ‘punishment’ and advocates of ‘treatment.

(Brantingham and Faust 1976, p. 284).
For the purpose of this thesis the categories are viewed as a guideline or tool for discussion. It was not the intention to provide a detailed review of the categorisation, but rather recognise that the single case study research in this thesis focused on tertiary reduction amongst an older known offender, who had been convicted of crimes, as a means of preventing recidivism. Although a little dated Brantingham and Faust’s (1976) categorisation is still widely acknowledged within this area as a means of determining current crime reduction efforts, whilst also suggesting fruitful directions for future research.

2.1 Sports-based interventions: An overview (1990-2012)

This section provides a review of some of the key research conducted on the use of sport for crime reduction purposes, which due to the availability of research undertaken specifically relates to young people. Following this overview, specific themes identified as most applicable to an older age band are further explored through the remaining sections. While earlier studies conducted to investigate the effectiveness of leisure, recreation and sports-based programmes as a means of preventing crime and rehabilitating young delinquents (see for example, Sugden and Yiannakis 1982; Segrave 1983; Segrave and Hastad 1984; Mason and Wilson 1988; Coalter 1989; DeBusk and Hellison 1989;), the focus of this section is to provide a review of work between 1990 and 2012.
Robins (1990) considered eleven major schemes in the UK designed specifically to utilise sport as a means of diverting young people away from involvement in crime (both the onset and continuation), including a wide variety of schemes from community development schemes, police schemes and rehabilitative schemes. Robins (1990) identified that none of the programmes surveyed included a process of follow-up or aftercare in their objectives, and in instances where information about re-offending patterns was available (those schemes targeting convicted offenders) it was generally limited and vague. Importantly, although the evaluation referred to trouble-free records and reduced re-offending rates by almost half of the clients, the causal connection between attendances at the project was not clear and thus other more significant reasons why such changes occurred may have been apparent.

A study by Twitchen (1995) highlighted four key aspects for preventing recidivism through sports-based programmes and these included: (i) activities need to be flexibly and simply organised to ensure they are appropriate to the participant and situation; (ii) a client centred approach needs to be practised and implemented whereby individuals are able to decide on the types of activities they participate in; (iii) commitment to the programme where individuals feel attached and empowered to continue; and (iv) a sphere of influence in which the exposure to sport and physical activity will represent only one experience in that person’s life and therefore any positive benefits of participation in such activities may be outweighed by negative experiences elsewhere. The idea that ‘sport’ should be viewed away from a traditional context of participation and competitive activities is central to this thesis, and reflects the changing and emerging nature of sports development and how it differs from traditional conceptions of sport.
Tsuchiya (1996) adopted a case study approach by conducting interviews with four different schemes in the UK which were specifically established or supported by local probation services. In summary certain common issues arose from the four schemes: (i) cost analysis (ii) type of participation (iii) commitment to leisure and recreation programmes, a non-custodial option (iv) public acceptance and awareness. When comparing the cost of the different schemes investigated, the average weekly cost was £40.72, with the weekly cost of youth custody centres estimated at the time as £311 (Home Office 1990), implying that custodial orders to youths were almost 800% more expensive than non-custodial options. The research failed to conclude whether voluntary or compulsory participation was more effective and noted that creating a comfortable, friendly, and trustworthy environment were key factors for any successful programme. Commitment from programme staff was deemed essential and acceptance in the community of both the clients and programme was viewed as extremely important.

In an attempt to provide some evidence between sports participation and reduction in anti-social behaviour Nichols and Taylor (1996) produced an independent evaluation report of the West Yorkshire Sports Counselling (WYSC) programme. This programme comprised sports activities, one-to-one sessions, and participant-centred work by sports leaders. The key underlying principle of this project was that if participants had a commitment to sports activity, then potentially the continuation of this positive experience in their lives would detract them away from the mindset in which re-offending is likely to occur. Crabbe in his paper in 2000 discusses the idea that it might be more appropriate to ‘decentre’ sport from initiatives in order to understand its significance for community development interventions. His work
implied that prevention of criminal behaviour and drug use through diversionary activities needs to address more than simply the provision of alternative leisure activities. For example jobs, housing, education and training all need to feature as basic essentials, aside from the provision of a positive use of leisure. Based on research on Leyton Orient Community Sports Programme (LOCSP), Crabbe (2000) usefully discussed the use of sport within a more holistic framework of community development interventions in preference to punitive diversionary measures. He argued that in contrast to conventional approaches this specific example views sport as a means of making connections within excluded communities, generating peer pressure based around healthy lifestyles and introducing alternative training and employment options. In a later paper Crabbe (2008) referred to such initiatives as ‘cultural intermediates’, identifying the need to consider concepts centrally concerned with the specific dynamics of human relations in a way that supports and contributes to the design of a programme.

The importance of the duration of the programme and contact with programme staff is a consistent theme covered in the reviews undertaken of programmes. For example Nichols and Taylor (1996) used a control group and found that those participants who completed a total of eight weeks or more of the 12 week programme were said to be significantly less likely to have been reconvicted than the members of the control group. Conversely, those participants who failed to complete eight weeks or more on the programme were not less likely to have been reconvicted than their control group.
Through their work Nichols and Taylor (1996) discussed the idea that sport can provide ‘exit routes’, with the most effective ‘exit routes’ acknowledged as those that involved some form of training, qualification, and/or work. This is discussed later in this chapter.

A Home Office (1996) review conducted by Davis and Dawson, raised concerns over financial motivations surrounding sports-based crime reduction programmes, evidencing that some projects simply attached a drug component to an existing venture for purely a financial motivation to secure Drugs Prevention Team (DPT) funding. These projects were regarded as unconvincing in terms of an educational capacity and due to the pressure to secure funding for youth work, project managers cast their net too widely. Furthermore, the Davis and Dawson (1996) highlighted the weakness of short-term initiatives, stating that short term summer projects were unconvincing with regards to conveying messages effectively. There was recognition for the importance of offering a core activity that was attractive in its own right - and although based on very limited observation – they also suggested that there needs to be some potential for the activity in question to feature permanently in a participants life (for example through employment). Interestingly, the project staff were viewed as key factors in the success or failure of a project, with the specific personalities of staff addressed as important.
Taylor et al. (1999) wrote a report on physical activity programmes used directly by the Probation Service in England and Wales for young offenders. The research used a mixed method approach and identified that 54 ‘demanding physical activity’ programmes in 34 areas were operating at the time. Taylor et al. (1999) suggested key characteristics required in order for a programme to be successful, which included: a clear rationale, activities which offer either a life-changing experience and/or sustained opportunities for continued participation, sufficient time on the programme for personal and social objectives to be attained, a high speed of referral and then entry onto a programme to reduce the drop-out rate, high quality staff delivering the programme, assistance with transport when likely to be a constraint, commitment by referring officers, explicit acknowledgement of achievements by participants, clear communication between the probation service and organisations running programmes, an explicit review process, continuity for the participants following the completion of a programme, post-programme opportunities for participants, and monitoring to a minimum standard compatible with Home Office requirements. This might include: the number of referrals, starts and completions, costs of programme provision, measures of self-esteem, self-efficacy and locus of control, post-programme case reports, alongside reconviction rates. As identified in section 2.5 there appears very little compliance with such standards.

Of particular interest is that following the publication of this Home Office report (Taylor et al. 1999) public opinion reacted strongly against the idea that programmes for known offenders appeared to be rewarding offending behaviour. The press on 19 October 1999, (Nichols 2007) the day after the publication of the research report, included the following headlines: ‘no evidence that action holidays cure offenders’
(Daily Telegraph), ‘Report questions value of holidays for hooligans’ (Independent), ‘Offenders’ course could be a waste’ (London Metro), and ‘Course for tearaways may be a waste’ (Sheffield Star). In addition, the reliability of responses to surveys has come under scrutiny (Nichols and Booth 1999; Taylor et al. 1999) with an over-estimation on the impact of crime reduction programmes.

Providing an Australian perspective on this topic are Cameron and MacDougall (2000) and Morris et al. (2003). Notwithstanding the cultural differences between the United Kingdom and Australia, a brief discussion of these papers and its conclusions helps to further situate this current thesis within existing research. The early paper provided by Cameron and MacDougall (2000) examined a variety of sporting activities that appeared to have had some beneficial impact in helping young people avoid criminal behaviour. Cameron and MacDougall (2000) drew a number of key conclusions through their review, asserting that sport and physical activity can reduce crime by providing accessible, appropriate activities in a supportive social context, which is positively connected within the social fabric of groups and communities. There is the need for sport and physical activity to be combined and implemented in collaboration with a range of other strategies, sectors and interventions seeking to reduce crime, as the scope of such practices are limited without it.
Cameron and MacDougall (2000) argued that the cases reviewed in their work support the value of community development approaches that tailor programmes to specific needs. Cameron and MacDougall (2000) asserted that sports programmes for the explicit purpose of crime prevention should be subject to rigorous evaluation, however little further detail is provided on the process, methods, or approach one should take to conduct such evaluations. Morris et al. (2003) produced a paper for the AIC that sought to identify and describe programmes that utilised sporting activities to reduce anti-social behaviour among youth across Australia. In total 175 organisations replied to a postal survey seeking information regarding their programmes out of a total of 606 programmes operating at the time (approximately a 29% response rate). Interestingly the analysis suggested that providing an activity where previously there was none was more important than the type of activity being provided, claiming that the activity in itself is a mechanism for diverting youth away from anti-social behaviour (Catalano et al. 1998).

Morris et al. (2003) acknowledge that the rarity of in-depth evaluations and long-term outcome evaluations by programmes themselves exacerbates the difficulties in determining the most important components of effective programmes. This said three themes emerged from the work conducted by Morris et al. (2003) regarding programme structuring and development. Firstly programmes should involve and consult the youth in programme development, decisions and delivery, whilst providing opportunities for leadership. Secondly, programmes should create an atmosphere that is safe and engaging and facilitates a positive rapport with staff members. Finally, there is a need for follow-up care and the continuation of pro-social activities once the programme has been completed. The authors were
cautious in their final conclusions largely because the assessment was based on a limited number of evaluations that were of variable quality.

The use of outdoor adventure programmes as part of crime reduction provides an additional dimension to the research contributions in this area. Therefore whilst it was not an intention to provide detail on the evolution of adventure programmes a brief overview is relevant. Outdoor adventure programmes are based upon experiential learning from the belief that learning or behaviour change can be affected by including direct experience in the growth process (Gass 1993). Kraft and Sakofs (1985) identified five characteristics that define experiential learning, and although a little dated still offer insight and application to the ex-offender case study within this thesis. The five elements include: (i) The learner is a participant rather than a spectator (ii) The learning activities require personal motivation in the form of energy, involvement and responsibility (iii) The learning activities are real and meaningful in terms of their consequences for the learner (iv) Reflection is a critical element of the learning process and (v) Learning must have both present and future relevance for the learner and the society of which they are a member.

There have been strong links made between outdoor recreation programmes (also referred to as outdoor adventure programmes, wilderness experience programmes, or wilderness adventure therapy), and their ability to prevent juvenile delinquency. As some authors (Cason and Gillis 1994; West and Crompton 2001) have noted it is both the physical and mental challenge of these experiential programmes that can influence a change in behaviour. West and Crompton (2001) conducted a review on
the empirical findings that had been reported within the literature regarding the use of outdoor adventure recreation programmes for the instrumental purpose of alleviating negative youth behaviour. The research provided two categories: those studies that measured the recidivism rates of juvenile delinquents, and those that assessed the psychological benefits of participation on self-concept. In conclusion the review offered some support for the claims that outdoor adventure programmes can be an effective intervention for alleviating negative behaviours of at-risk youth, acknowledging that participants’ self-concept was enhanced and recidivism rates lowered for those on the programmes.

This said the objectives pursued in the review provided by West and Crompton (2001) only addressed self-concept or a similar social-psychological construct. Since this review a comprehensive set of protective factors or assets that are said to be key to individuals avoiding involvement in deviant behaviour have emerged (see section 2.3), and therefore given the full range of risk and protective factors available, the findings of the self-concept recidivism link are likely to be viewed as simplistic today.

Nichols (2004) considered the role of sports-based programmes seeking to reduce youth crime, through a case study of the Summit Project in Easttown, West Yorkshire in 2004. This work examined the relevance of a theoretical framework for understanding the mechanism of crime reduction through value directed personal development using triangulation (Nichols 2004). The paper argued that, with regard to crime reduction, the programme had a limited diversion effect, both for the
duration of the programme and afterwards. Evidence of value directed personal
development was also limited with the research finding that clients of the programme
gained some benefits consistent with those likely to reduce offending, but these were
largely an incidental by-product of the achievement of broader sports development
objectives. Earlier work by Nichols (1999a) that looked at higher risk clients on the
WYSCP concluded a greater sense of achievement could be gained from
participating on a sports based programme. This could be because completion of the
programme represented a more significant contrast with their greater experience of
failure for those participants (Nichols 2004). In similar vein, the Merseyside Probation
Service Programme (MPSP) (Nichols 1999b) was developed for long term
rehabilitation clients, and found that the achievement of 'success' was again
relatively more significant for them. As suggested by Nichols (2004) a reason for this
could be due to participants having more experience of being labelled negatively by
society and therefore the value of the programme possessing greater meaning.

Astbury et al. (2005) developed a paper which sought to contribute to the
understanding of ‘what works and why’ in sports and leisure based programmes
designed specifically to reduce youth crime. This paper provided an illustration of a
theory of change approach to evaluation. The research presented in this review was
based on Fairbridge (a charity in the UK providing personal development
programmes for disadvantaged and disaffected young people). According to Astbury
et al. (2005) the principal aims of Fairbridge were to develop young people’s
personal and social skills, building confidence, and ultimately assist them to change
or at least adapt their lives in the long-term. Referrals could be made by any agency
and young people were also able to refer themselves. It is important to note that
participation on a Fairbridge programme was voluntary, and following the initial common week on the programme, the remainder was tailored to the needs of participants, who had the potential of continuing for up to a year. Although based around young people, the review adopted an extended age band (14-25) which ties their work more directly into this research.

The final report (Astbury and Knight 2003) stated the purpose was to inform and influence practice as opposed to relating findings back to theory. The belief behind the theory of change approach is to understand what and why things changed, recognising programme staff as key stakeholders in the evaluation (Weiss 1998; Astbury et al. 2005). The Fairbridge case demonstrated clear attempts to link to the theory of change around how and why programmes might have an impact on long-term behavioural change. Following the use of an extensive array of methods (see Astbury et al. 2005 for further details), the authors acknowledged the difficulties in disentangling on the one hand the impact of a programme and on the other hand the personal attributes and attitudes that a participant brings to it.
More recent offerings have emerged from authors Meek (2012), Meek et al. (2012) and Coalter (2012). Firstly the work of Meek (2012) focused on the 2nd Chance Project, a two year initiative at HMP YOI Portland which used sport (football and rugby academy) as a way of engaging with young adult male prisoners in identifying and meeting resettlement needs and facilitating the transition from custody to community. A total of eighty-one offenders participated over a two year period, and a combination of both quantitative and qualitative data was collected for this evaluation. Although once again aimed at young people the work of Meek (2012) and Meek et al. (2012) is of significance as it focused on the rehabilitation of (ex)offenders with a specific emphasis on the transition process from prison to a community setting. Coming from a psychology background Meek (2012) utilised a variety of methods including: reconviction rate analysis, a series of psychometric measures over extended periods, qualitative methods in the form of individual interviews, focus groups, individual sets of written feedback and observations. Staff members were also interviewed and written feedback submitted on their experiences and observations of the academies. Further to this, individual interviews were also conducted post-release from custody. The key results from this evaluation indicated that of the fifty participants released over the period, nine had reoffended or been recalled to prison, representing an 18% reconviction rate (compared to a prison average of 48% after one year). Statistically significant improvements were claimed in specific measures of conflict resolution, aggression, impulsivity, and overall attitudes towards offending. Furthermore, the initiative claimed to develop positive mentoring relationships between staff and prisoners (Meek 2012). Uniquely the 2nd Chance Project’s resettlement pathway provided specialist help tailored to individual needs, whereby offenders were able to maintain positive support relationships.
across the critical transition from custody into the community. The resettlement provision broadly reflected the seven resettlement pathways namely: accommodation; education training and employment; health; finance, benefits and debts; children and families; attitudes, thinking and behaviour. According to the Home Office (2004) the seven resettlement pathways define the actual and practical support required for reducing further offending, and is further explored within the gatekeeper analysis study of this thesis. Uggen et al. (2005) supported the need to assess the timing of a programme claiming, that programmes aimed at custodial offenders should be phased according to their approaching release date, and thus continuity between prison programmes and community opportunities are vital.

The recent findings from Meek (2012) are supportive towards the use of sport within the prison system as a means of reducing recidivism. Some might be cautious of the results derived by Meek (2012) as a control group was not utilised as a means of comparing findings, however, the findings are insightful and at the very least provide thoughts for further exploration. Meek et al. (2012) supports claims (Coalter 2007; Nichols 2007) that sport alone cannot diminish reoffending, however, argues that it offers a valuable alternative when seeking to motivate and inspire offenders particularly those individuals who are difficult to engage through traditional routes.

Coalter’s (2012) paper focused on the effectiveness of sports-based interventions that sought to address specific issues of gang membership, racism, at risk youth, and ‘conflict’, amongst young people. In a similar vein to the research conducted within this thesis Coalter (2012) reported on a series of in-depth interviews with
participants in four programmes. It should be noted that once again this work was located around ‘at risk’ youth and therefore not directly applicable to the age focused in this thesis although the findings are of interest. Before and after semi-structured interviews were conducted with 37 participants aged between 14 and 21 years and Coalter (2012, p. 14) claimed that in cases where change occurred in attitudes and behaviour, it was most likely to occur via systems of social relationships. He argued that,

...given the diversity of participants, programmes, processes, relationships and desired outcomes it is not possible to develop a definitive or prescriptive programme theory – each programme requires its own programme theory to reflect its context.

All forms of social intervention, both the nature and extent of impacts and outcomes, all depend on the interaction of a range of different factors and therefore care needs to be taken when attributing simple cause-and-effect relationships between participation and strategic outcomes (Coalter 2012). Figure 4 places sport-for-development programmes on a continuum that illustrates the complexity of different factors and relationships that occur depending on the type of programme being implemented.
Figure 4. Example of programme theory (Coalter 2012, p. 15)
The vertical columns are perceived as containing potential programme elements, with the hierarchical elements listed from relatively superficial components to those deemed more fundamental aspects (Coalter 2012). Coalter (2012) remained cautious when drawing conclusions, tentatively noting that it is not a definitive programme theory but a useful template for those designing and delivering programmes. There were undoubtedly limitations to this work, and although a series of ‘successes’ associated with programmes were identified, the data was restricted to the interview data of participants on the programme with no interviews conducted with individuals who dropped out of the programme. In addition there were no records of post-attendance behaviour which would have provided further insight into the continuation of positive behaviours following the completion of the programme.

An overview of the key research surrounding this topic area has been provided and the remainder of this chapter concentrates on those themes most relevant to this particular thesis. The researcher experienced difficulties utilising existing research on this area due to its location with children and adolescents, and therefore the reader should note that whilst its application is with young people, this thesis is considering its relevance to an older age band.
2.2 Some traditional rationales for sport

As noted by Crabbe (2000), there is a need to recognise the range of experiences that people search for through sport to determine the degree to which sport can influence different forms of behaviour – is it emotional satisfaction, exhilaration, confrontation, financial reward, the overcoming fear and joy of celebration? This view may seem rather simplistic, however, it does begin to raise the fundamental issue of whether sport is a suitable tool for altering behaviour patterns. Theoretical justifications for the use of sport are often connected to the development of personal skills and relationships (Nichols 1997, 1998). Counter views claim that, at best, sport participation is neutral and, at worst, it may have a negative impact (Critcher 2000). For example those playing and leading a sport may not promote pro-social values and a sense of fair play, additionally the absence of criminal associations is not always the case in all sports (Utting 1996; Critcher 2000). Therefore, some critics argue the efficiency of such programmes remains unproven (Coalter 1995).

An early contribution by Schafer in 1969 provided a typology which combined the interrelated issues and theories of the causes of delinquency, and theories about the potential nature of sports contributions to reducing or changing such causes. Five elements were outlined, underpinning the therapeutic potential of sport, and are based primarily around broad theories about causes of delinquency: (i) boredom; (ii) peer group affiliations and differential association: (iii) educational failure, blocked aspirations and low self-esteem (iv) lack of discipline (v) lack of adolescent development needs. As a starting point offerings by Shafer (1969) attempted to make distinct links between the causes of delinquency and the potential rationale for
utilising sport in such a capacity. It should be noted that this work was specifically related to anti-social behaviour and therefore although not directly related to this research it provides some early context around sport’s potential within this environment (crime). Since this early work in 1969 several other authors have attempted to explore some rationales for the use of sport within the arena of crime reduction.

There is support for the idea that sport offers an antidote to boredom by providing a positive activity for the potential offender to participate in during their leisure time (Shafer 1969; Mason and Wilson 1988; Coalter 1996; Sport England 1999; Coalter et al. 2000; Crabbe 2000; Morris et al. 2003; Nichols 2004) and this is particularly with reference to young people. There is also the presumption that sport can provide a context in which significant others (coaches, teachers, participants) provide appropriate role models by promoting conventional norms, values and conformist behaviour (Davis and Dawson 1996; Nichols and Taylor 1996; Audit Commission 2009). Some authors (Davis and Dawson 1996; Nichols and Taylor 1996; Taylor et al. 1999) have considered that the length of contact between the role model and participant an important factor, along with the overall intensity of the contact. Nichols and Taylor (1996) acknowledged, for example, that such programmes offer an opportunity for delinquent individuals to meet a new (positive) peer group which could assist them with changing their lifestyle and disassociating away from old habits and behaviours. However Nichols and Taylor (1996) cautioned that ‘you can’t get a person to drop all their friends’ (p. 69).
In particular, Nichols (1997) identified traditional rationales underlying sport for crime prevention purposes including: (i) reducing the ability to take part in crime (distraction) (ii) meeting a need for excitement (iii) improving physical fitness (iv) increasing self-esteem and sense of control over one’s life (v) the development of cognitive competencies (vi) the importance of role models and (vii) the importance of employment (Nichols 1997). However, as Nichols noted these traditional rationales have been developed in a rather ad hoc manner with limited theoretical development and their interaction with each other not clearly articulated (1997). Nichols (2001) argue that if sports programmes have an impact on crime, then it is reasonable to raise the question ‘what exactly it is about sports programmes that causes such change in criminal behaviour?’ Several possibilities are suggested by Nichols (2001) and included the idea of distraction whereby a programme quite simply would occupy young people at a time when they might otherwise be getting into mischief. Programmes might also offer young people more positive options; contact with non-offending peers, or with a sports leader who acts as a role model; enhanced self esteem in a positive way so that they no longer need to boost their self image through anti-social behaviour; and links to experiences and qualifications that might increase their chances of getting a worthwhile job.

More recent offerings by Nichols (2007) highlighted traditional rationales which varied in two ways, namely, sport as a hook to gain involvement, and the negative role of sport. The idea that sport could be used as a ‘hook’ to get participants involved and engaging with non-sport related assistance (for instance training and counselling) is one which is closely related to the research in this thesis given the older age band and rehabilitative nature investigated in this particular work. In
addition sport could be an opportunity for workers to build a rapport with clients/participants in a less traditional setting and then provide the opportunity for further work to be undertaken (Taylor et al. 1999). The negative role of sport reflects the unequal participation between gender, age, class, ethnic group and those with different levels of education (DCMS and SU 2002). Importantly, Coalter (1996) acknowledges the need to recognise the differing impacts of sport, and the fact that some sports can lead to increased aggression and delinquent behaviour (see Trulson 1986 for further information). This is not an area that is further explored here but recognition of such offerings is important to note.

When exploring the traditional rationales for sport offered by Nichols (1997, 2007) it was clear there are similarities to Shafer’s work (1969). Nonetheless in relation to this thesis there appeared opportunities to specifically examine the employment rationale. Arguably adult offenders, more so than young offenders, might require an involvement in sport which goes beyond the physical and focuses on the importance of qualifications, work experience and employment prospects. This seemed a topic that should be investigated further and an extended discussion of this can be found in section 2.4.

Nichols and Crow (2004) asserted that in their broadest sense sports programmes can be viewed as falling into three main types which include: a) diversion b) deterrence and c) pro-social development. All three elements are discussed briefly. Firstly, within diversionary programmes the main intervention mechanism involves diverting the person away from a place or a time when they might be involved in
crime. Boredom might feature closely within diversionary programmes, for example, ‘Summer Splash’ programmes run in the school holidays when boredom might be high. The second mechanism of deterrence is utilised when a person believes they are more likely to be caught if they commit an offence. This mechanism is place and time specific, for example if a programme was run on school premises people are less likely to damage them when you are actually there (Nichols and Crow 2004).

The third mechanism and the aspect that links most closely to this thesis is the notion of pro-social development. According to Nichols and Crow (2004) this mechanism combines both the theory on risk and protection factors (Catalano and Hawkins 1996), with a model of self-development, assisted by parallel increases in self-esteem, locus of control, and cognitive skills, all of which are directed by pro-social values (Nichols 2004).

To summarise, Nichols (2004) highlighted a set of characteristics that he noted are important for a programme to have long term impact which included:

- An activity that is attractive and appeals to participants for initial engagement;
- The flexibility of a programme to meet the needs of individual participants;
- Using rewards for achievements, which are said to increase self esteem;
- The abilities and sensitivity of staff members to match a progression of activities to participant needs and development requirements;
The formation of good relationships between staff members, activity leaders and participants;

Those leaders within the programme developing a relationship of trust as a ‘significant other’ by adopting a mentoring role;

The ability to provide participants with long term follow-up and viable exit routes, that will enable further opportunities and independent development following the original programme;

Sharing activity with pro-social peers; and

A set of values that is associated with the activity leaders and overall ethos of the programme.

In conclusion sport and physical activity programmes can provide an important vehicle through which personal and social development may occur and positively impact upon behaviour. Equally this section has acknowledged the complexities involved and that these programmes alone are unlikely to impact on reducing anti-social and offending behaviour, unless part of a broader strategy (Morris et al. 2003).

2.3 Risk and protective factors contributing to criminal behaviour

It is difficult to establish unambiguously the causes of offending, however, key developments in criminology in the 1990s focused on identifying correlates, predictors or ‘risk factors’ for offending (Farrington 2001). This is often referred to as
the ‘risk factors paradigm’ (Farrington 2000), whereby interventions should be designed to counteract identified risk factors for youth offending. Knowledge regarding criminal careers is important as a fundamental basis of awareness about offending and thus for evidence-based policy (Farrington 2001). Key issues included, the prevalence and frequency of offending, ages of onset and desistance, career duration, continuity, specialization, escalation, co-offending, motives and development sequences (Farrington 1992, 1997). In its broadest capacity, risk factors to offending can be defined as anything that increases the probability of an individual engaging in offending behaviour (Shader 2002).

Community norms favourable to those behaviours, neighbourhood disorganisation, extreme economic deprivation, family history of drug abuse or crime, poor family management practices, family conflict, low family bonding, parental permissiveness, early and persistent problem behaviours, academic failure, peer rejection in elementary grades, association with drug-using or delinquent peers or adults, alienation and rebelliousness, attitudes favourable to drug use and crime, and early onset of criminal behaviour.


The above quotation encapsulates an extensive list of factors which are often closely associated with individuals heading towards delinquency and drug abuse, and provides a starting point to identify a statistical relationship between potential ‘causes’ of offending behaviour and drug abuse. Recognition is given to its limitations by failing to explain the process by which such factors might interrelate, however, an accurate prediction of which individual will become an offender on the basis of the level of risk to which they are exposed is unfeasible.
Risk factors are said to be linked to a general pattern of childhood anti-social behaviour (Home Office 1987; Graham and Bowling 1995; Capaldi and Patterson 1996; Farrington 2000) and often differ very little from those risk factors associated with other youthful deviant behaviour (Dryfoos 1990; Hawkins and Catalano 1992). Thus according to Goldblatt and Lewis (1998) programmes seeking to prevent criminality can be part of wider programmes to address a range of problematic outcomes for young people, and can be categorised into three main areas; family-based, school-based and peer group-based interventions.

Key offerings to this debate come from Farrington (2006) who referred to a longitudinal examination in which risk factors were deduced from their correlation with an onset of offending. He highlighted that due to the interrelated nature of social problems it remains difficult to conclude if any given risk factor is an indicator (symptom) or a possible cause of offending (Farrington 2006). A criticism of Farrington’s (1996) work was highlighted by Nichols (2003) who argued that the weighting had been distributed to the impact of circumstances, and none to agency, and thus the ability of the individual to react to such circumstances.

The ‘Communities that Care’ [CtC] programme ‘is a risk-and-protection-based system that enables local communities to engage in multi-level, multi-sectoral prevention planning and implement evidence-based programs’ (Flynn 2008, p. 84). It is used with adolescents aged between 11 and 18 (Arthur et al. 2002) and is an assessment tool that enables communities to identify risk and protective profiles, implement evidence-based prevention programmes and thus target specific risk and
protection factors (Flynn 2008). As shown in Table 6, the CtC-YS measures 23 risk factors and 10 protective factors targeting certain problem behaviours which included the use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs, delinquency, gang involvement, and other problem behaviours. Authors in support of this approach include Glaser et al. (2005) who believe that it demonstrates good psychometric quality, such as reliability and validity, across a range of populations.
Table 6: Risk and protective factors assessed with the CtC-YS (Flynn 2008, p. 88)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Risk Factors</th>
<th>Community Protective Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low neighbourhood attachment</td>
<td>Community opportunity for prosocial involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community disorganization</td>
<td>Community rewards for prosocial involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitions and mobility</td>
<td>Laws and norms favourable to drug use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived availability of drugs</td>
<td>Perceived availability of handguns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Risk Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor family management</td>
<td>Family attachment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family conflict</td>
<td>Family opportunity for prosocial involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family history of antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>Family rewards for prosocial involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental attitudes favourable towards drug use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental attitudes favourable to antisocial Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Risk Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic failure</td>
<td>School opportunity for prosocial involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low commitment to school</td>
<td>School rewards for prosocial involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peer/Individual Risk Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebelliousness</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early initiation of antisocial behaviour</td>
<td>Social skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early initiation of drug use</td>
<td>Belief in the moral order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable attitudes towards antisocial behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favourable attitudes towards drug use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low perceived risks of drug use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with antisocial peers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends’ use of drugs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation seeking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards for antisocial involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shiner et al. (2004) reflected on the fact that there is now well-established empirical evidence available suggesting that ‘...there are a number of readily identifiable “risk factors” in childhood and adolescence that heighten the likelihood of problems later in life’ (p. 13). Some argue that programmes should not target anti-social behaviours in isolation rather they should attempt to address problem behaviours and underlying risk factors as part of a package. For example, it may be difficult to address one specific anti-social behaviour without impacting upon other behaviours (Morris et al. 2003), thereby supporting the belief that risk factors are not mutually exclusive but a complex web of interrelated issues.

Both Farrington (1996) and Catalano and Hawkins (1996) present behavioural models of how individuals become involved in crime. However, their understandings are largely based upon quantitative analysis which fails to explore individuals’ perceptions of their situation, and how such perceptions might change over time. This is an area of interest to this research and by using a single case study, will be information rich and enable an exploration of relevant issues. Nichols (2003) suggests the approach taken by Farrington (1996) and Catalano and Hawkins (1996) is reflective of ‘an ontological position of deministic causality – an emphasis on a single direction of causality from the environment to the individual, rather than understanding a dynamic interaction’ (p. 30). This implies the need to explore, in more detail, the conditions within which the individual operates, and more specifically, the individual’s attitudes and perceptions of their situation. Risk factors vary depending on the context in which they exist, and thus behaviours are influenced by the nature, timing and length of exposure to such factors (McCarthy et al. 2004). From a sports-based perspective, Sandford et al. (2006) agreed with such
propositions stating that interventions need to consider the wider social context of the individual, a long-term solution, not a short term fix (Coalter 2002).

Developmental criminology is concerned with three main issues; the development of offending and anti-social behaviour, risk factors at different ages, and the effects of life events on the course of development (Loeber and LeBlanc 1990; LeBlanc and Loeber 1998; Farrington 2006). Vassallo et al. (2002) in their report on patterns and precursors of adolescent behaviour suggested that the critical years to implement interventions, to influence risk and protection factors and overall behaviour, are during the primary school years, when the pathways to anti-social adolescent behaviour first come into being. Others (Homel et al. 1999; Farrington 2002) noted preventative measures could be introduced during the very early stages of infancy especially for children from broken homes or those from low socio-economic status, as these children are more at risk of developing antisocial behaviour later in life.

When acknowledging the risk factors involved in individual behaviour patterns it is important to look at the theory that explains why risk factors have a differential impact, thus why not all those subjected to them become involved in crime. Catalano and Hawkins (1996, p. 153) provide this explanation via the notion of protective factors, to explain why some individuals appear to be more resistant to risk factors imposed upon them:
(1) Individual characteristics, including resilient temperament, positive social orientation and intelligence;

(2) Family cohesion and warmth or bonding during childhood; and

(3) External social supports to reinforce the individuals’ competencies and commitments and provide a belief system by which to live.

Although Catalano and Hawkins (1996) provided these protective factor explanations they also acknowledge the limited evidence supporting them in comparison to that endorsing the risk factors. There is a definite need through further research to develop understanding on the mechanisms by which protective and risk factors interact. A ‘social development’ model is proposed by Catalano and Hawkins (1996) to describe the process by which the individual is socialised into norms of behaviour. There are four main stages, the first being the individual perceives opportunities available to them for involvement and interaction in ‘socialising units’ within school, family, community institutions and peers. Secondly they make proactive steps to become involved in these and develop the skills to do this. Thirdly their behaviour is reinforced via the socialising unit(s) in the role chosen by the individual. Fourthly this leads to a strong bond with the unit, identification with its norms and values, which in turn become internalised acting as a control mechanism over the individual’s behaviour. Whilst the model attempted to explain socialisation into pro-social or anti-social norms, it failed to highlight the influence and constraints of social structure on the individual. There was little strength attached to personal agency, that being the extent to which the individual might freely choose which ‘social units’ they interact and identify with. It also failed to recognise the different circumstances with which the
balance between agency and structure could change, for example age related. McCarthy et al. (2004) supported the idea that individuals might respond differently to risks imposed on them, suggesting variation in risk response where two people might have identical risk factors, but their behavioural outcomes may be completely different.

In summary risk factors can be defined as triggers that augment delinquent behaviour, in contrast to protection factors which should facilitate the reduction of delinquent and problematic behaviour. These factors might be considered on a continuum from high risk to high protection, whereby the greater the protection ratio, the lower the likelihood of delinquent behaviour occurring. The impact of the original risk factors and resultant behaviour, to an extent can be determined by the number and type of risk factors and the number and type of intervening protection (Campbell and Harrington 2000). Although useful for referencing purposes it is acknowledged that problematic behaviour is likely to be much more complex than the suggestion that the number of risk factors present equates to the chance of offending.

It is important to note at this stage that the majority of research surrounding risk and protective factors has been examined amongst children and adolescents (Gottfriedson and Hirschi 1990; Sampson and Laub 1992; Farrington 1996, 2000), with less attention given to investigating these processes in adult populations. Nevertheless an appreciation of some of the literature surrounding the ‘causes’ of anti-social/criminal behaviour is relevant. This understanding of risk and protective factors and their contribution to resultant criminal behaviour is particularly important
to the single case study within this thesis, if only as a reference point to contextualise background behaviour.

2.4 Pro-social personal development: education, training and employment

With the exception of Witt and Cromptons’ (2003) work in the U.S the theoretical understanding of crime reduction through the process of value directed personal development is said to have derived from examining programmes with relatively high-risk participants (Nichols 2004). Theoretical work in the area suggests sport is a device for recruiting and retaining at-risk/ex-offenders, a ‘hook’ as it were, where effectiveness focuses on individual programme participants, relies on non sport elements, and requires intensive collaboration and engagement with a range of preventative measures (Correira 1997; Witt and Crompton, 1997; Baldwin 2000; Coakley 2002; Hartmann and Wheelock 2002; Hartmann 2003; Hartmann and Depro 2006). Robins (1990) in particular outlined an integrated model for the use of sport specifically for rehabilitative purposes (with young people), suggesting that all schemes should include the following three elements. Firstly, educational development prospects with the obtaining of transferable social and occupational skills. Secondly, training for employment in sport and recreation, for example the opportunities to obtain coaching qualifications and work experience within the field to increase overall employment prospects. Thirdly, a community development perspective that seeks to integrate the work of the specific programme within the community. This could involve using community facilities, organising community events, obtaining work placements in sports centres and so on.
The relationship between work and crime is believed to vary over the life course, where the mechanisms that reduce offending behaviour in later adulthood include the quality and strength of an individual's attachment to work (Greenberg 1985; Sampson and Laub 1990, 1993, 1996; Bachman and Schulenberg 1993; Steinberg 1996). Attachments to the workplace are viewed as turning points that redirect behaviour throughout the life course and this logic would imply that criminal justice policy should in fact be sensitive to age-graded effects with older offenders more likely to benefit from work-based programmes (Uggen and Staff 2001). This rationale claims that paid employment among adults is likely to reduce crime via a reduction in economic need, increased formal social controls, and the development of a conforming rather than deviant self-concept (Bachman and Schulenberg 1993). Gill (1997) found that offenders themselves considered assistance with gaining employment as a critical aspect in reducing recidivism.

Wadsworth (2001) noted similar effects whereby those with higher levels of education, those who are employed, and those working in higher quality jobs, commit less crimes. A Home Office research study (2006) revealed the corollary with deficits in education, training and employment identified as the strongest factors associated with persistent offending. Although the research methods used have been criticised research by Motiuk and Nafekh (1998) in Canada also found employment, vocational training and financial needs to be the strongest determining factors amongst adult offenders.
A successful programme is one able to reshape the perceptions that offenders hold about themselves and a key avenue to achieving this is through employment (Uggen et al. 2005). Ex-offenders face enormous barriers in this area, due to the stigma attached to a criminal record (Holzer 2000; Hagan 1993; Sullivan 1989), the lack of job skills and education often associated with this group, and a disassociation from the job world particularly if the offender has served a custodial sentence. These barriers must be challenged by programmes that seek to reconnect ex-offenders (especially adults) into the job market and this issue is explored further in Chapter 5 as part of the single case study undertaken within this thesis.

Mentoring is a further aspect within the criminal justice system that can reduce offending behaviour and impact positively on life outcomes (O’Donnell et al. 1979; Grossman and Tierney 1998; Newburn and Shiner 2005). Programmes which incorporate mentoring relationships have demonstrated a significant influence on guiding participants through critical career transitions (Craine and Coles 1995; Nichols and Taylor 1996; Nichols 1999b). Interestingly some research has found that sports-based activities have provided a catalyst for the development of strong mentor relationships with staff (Nichols 2004). As identified earlier in this chapter, research has acknowledged the importance of programme staff (Astbury et al. 2005), in particular their overall ability to provide a mentor role. Further support from previous studies is provided by Taylor et al. (1999), Nichols (1999b), Nichols and Taylor (1996), and Nichols (2004) who all stressed the importance of the mentor role in programme staff. Davis and Dawson via a Home Office report (1996) suggested that programme staff should have ‘authority’ in the eyes of the participants but more importantly not be seen as authority figures. Their authority should be portrayed
through relevant knowledge and expertise (Coalter 2001; McCormack 2001; Collins and Kay 2003; Ramella 2004). Some argue that programmes at the tertiary end of the Brantingham and Faust (1976) scale have more scope for developing a mentoring relationship between programme staff and participants, since it is often more intense and longer in duration (Nichols and Taylor 1996; Nichols 1999b, 2004). There is concern however, over the fact that programme staff are often not trained for a mentoring role, and that their time might be over used in this capacity rather than actually running the programme, the role in which they are being paid to complete (Nichols 2004).

Kelly (2010) noted, within the context of sport and social inclusion, that providing opportunities for education and employment may be where programmes can make the most significant impact. There is significant support for sport being viewed as an ‘exit route’ whereby links to education, training and ultimately employment are explicit elements of a programme (Robins 1990; Coalter 1996, 2012; Nichols and Taylor 1996; Taylor et al. 1999; Crabbe 2000). Meek et al. (2012) demonstrated that for a significant amount of prisoners, sports-based learning offered a meaningful and rewarding pathway into employment. This incorporated engagement into basic skills through to degree level studies. Importantly, and particularly relevant to this thesis, sports-based learning was believed to have the potential of contributing to the broader resettlement agenda, which promotes physical and psychological health, addresses offending behaviour, rebuilds family relationships, provides opportunities to ‘give back’ to society, and encourages the uptake of pro-social identities (Meek et al. 2012).
If the belief that education, training and employment are key ingredients to reduce offending behaviour, particularly amongst adult offenders, is to be assumed then it is important to consider some of the barriers that ex-offenders might face when seeking to access these opportunities. The next section briefly looks at an overview of some of the barriers associated with ex-offenders gaining successful employment.

It should be noted that this literature is not sport specific due to the lack of available material, and therefore provides a more general discussion.

2.4.1 Barriers to employment for ex-offenders

Various initiatives have been implemented to increase employment amongst offenders/ex-offenders, including the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act (1974), which for most jobs allows certain convictions (based on sentencing) to become ‘spent’ after a certain period of time. With a third of all men and a proportion of women possessing a conviction for a criminal offence, ex-offenders are not a small minority of people (nacro 1999). In 1999 nacro conducted a survey of 101 people with criminal records (PwCRs) that were in contact with the probation service, regarding their perceptions of barriers to employment. The main barriers identified by respondents were insufficient qualifications, possessing a criminal record and homelessness. Although the response rate was very small for this study (13 per cent) and therefore cannot be generalised to all PwCRs under the probation service supervision, it does provide some initial insight from an ex-offenders’ perspective.
Literature suggests the barriers to re-integration into employment for ex-offenders, exist across a number of domains including; personal, social, physical, attitudinal and systematic (May 1999; Rolfe 2001; Webster et al. 2001). When looking at each element in a little more detail the personal domain includes an individual’s physical and mental health, drug and alcohol use, education level, life skills, self-esteem and financial resources. The social environment incorporates family, friends, workforce participation and training and social networks. The physical domain relates to place and access to appropriate and secure housing and transport, and the systematic context is concerned with the criminal justice system, local government and other authorities.

Some further contributions made by Albright and Denq (1996), Fletcher and Taylor (2001) and Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD) (2002) indicated that there is an apparent reluctance by employers to hire individuals who disclose a criminal record, often due to their own personal beliefs about ex-offenders. Albright and Denq’s (1996) research followed by Fletcher and Taylor’s (2001), revealed employer discrimination as the most common labour market disadvantage. Fletcher and Taylor’s (2001) work provided a further dimension noting that a lack of educational and/or vocational qualifications and low self esteem were further disadvantages. To a lesser extent drug and alcohol related issues, health problems, poor work discipline, and low pay were also identified as additional barriers to employment for this particular group. A survey of employers (CIPD 2002), highlighted a number of concerns regarding the recruitment of ex/offenders. One concern was a belief that ex-offenders presented a high risk strategy for employers, suggesting such individuals are untrustworthy and hold intentions to re-offend.
against the organisation and employees within it. A second concern was that offenders were perceived to lack motivation and enthusiasm, qualities which employers deemed essential in their employees. Often offenders were perceived to experience a variety of personal and behavioural problems linking to factors such as drug and alcohol misuse, and that there was a lack of basic education, communication and presentation skills amongst offenders that are necessary for many employment areas. Offenders were not viewed as ‘good value for money’ as they require a greater level of supervision than other employees and in the interest of other employees working with offenders would make them feel uncomfortable. Although some caution is required when interpreting the research (CIPD 2002) it does provide insight into the difficulties ex-offenders could face when seeking entry into the employment sector. Problems associated with adjusting to the routine of work have also been reported as a potential barrier to employment (Visher and Travis 2003).

Importantly, prisons provide opportunities for employment, with almost two in five offenders working within prison workshops (Home Office 2001) although there are questions over the suitability of these jobs to the outside community environment and opportunities available upon release. The jobs provided within prisons are often viewed as low-skilled activities which are unlikely to develop the necessary social skills (communication, teamwork and reliability) sought by employers. Many prisons appeared to be seeking opportunities by combining National Vocational Qualifications (NVQs) with paid contractual work and staff training as this supported results in an improvement in participation and confidence amongst prisoners (Uggen and Staff 2001). However, both formal and informal restrictions can make it
extremely difficult for the provision of employment assistance and support to ex-offenders (Taxman et al. 2002), as there are often exclusive barriers to this particular population which are not easily dealt with by mainstream employment services (Graffam and Hardcastle 2007).

The next section looks at difficulties surrounding monitoring and evaluating sports potential within a crime reduction context. In particular it aims to highlight consistencies and variations amongst authors on the most suitable means of developing ‘evidence’ on this topic area.

2.5 The ‘evidence’ - monitoring and evaluating

A traditional justification for public subsidy of leisure services has often included crime reduction, and more generally a decline in anti-social behaviour (Nichols 2003). Such attention is usually channelled through local government and public subsidy via sport and leisure opportunities for young people. Critics argue that it is unrealistic to simply measure outcomes of such programmes and initiatives and assume they are ‘sport effects’ (Coalter 2001). Sport has the potential to assist aspects of crime reduction, be that through a preventative or rehabilitative capacity. However the difficulty is that there is a lack of substantive evidence (Coalter 1989; Robins 1990; Mulvey et al. 1993) and instead an over reliance on ‘impressionistic’ and ‘anecdotal’ evidence that it is beneficial (Robins 1990; Nichols 1997, 2004). A number of factors contribute to the difficulties of making specific conclusions which include: the complexity of the area of investigation; inconsistency amongst policy
makers, practitioners and researchers within the field; a shortage of long-term high quality research; unclear aims and objectives; and a misplaced emphasis on ‘outcomes’ as opposed to ‘mechanisms’ through which change might occur (Coalter 2012).

The complexity of the area, and variations in key terms such as ‘sport’, ‘anti-social behaviour’, ‘crime’ and ultimately the causes of behaviour provides significant difficulties when trying to determine a definitive theory on how and why sport ‘works’ within this specific context. There is considerable variation in the ‘processes’ utilised through a programme, from individual to team activities. Moreover the contribution of sport to social, more recently sports-based learning (Meek et al. 2012) and psychological processes amongst delinquent individuals extremely difficult to determine (Coalter 1996). There is both a lack of acknowledgement and inconsistency amongst researchers, policy-makers, and practitioners about what actually constitutes ‘success’ and thus what might be deemed a successful programme.

Some academics (Pawson and Tilley 1997; Pitts 2003; Nichols 2005) assert that a more opportune way of viewing this area of investigation is through the ‘generative causality’ of scientific realism, that is, ‘it is not programs that work, but the generative mechanisms that they release by way of providing reasons and resources to change behaviour’ (Pawson and Tilley 1997, p. 79). Causality has to be viewed as both a combination of human agency and its reaction to new opportunities and resources. It
is not about a programme having an impact on a participant, but about the interaction between the programme and participant, the structure and agency.

As expressed by Pitts (2003, p. 92) in support of Pawson and Tilley’s view:

A critical component in behavioural change is the motivation and predisposition of offenders. In opposition to the implicit assumptions within Reasoning and Rehabilitation that programs work “on” individuals, they argue that programs work “through” individuals.

If this view is correct then the focus needs to be around understanding and exploring the interaction between the participant and the programme as a series of choices: whether to attend, to cooperate once there, to continue participation following the introductory stage, to apply learning from the course, and so on (Astbury et al. 2005). Each choice is developed as a result of a participant’s changing perspective as he or she develops skills, confidence, attitudes and relationships, and ultimately becomes more aware of new opportunities available to them. For example, adopting the perspective of Pawson and Tilley (1997), Pitts (2003) and Nichols (2005), whereby the interaction between the programme and participant is explored, might explain why those young people who have a more positive initial disposition toward a programme, and who were experiencing fewer ‘risk factors’, may be expected to have the most positive outcomes by building upon their initial advantages.
Theorists Pawson and Tilley (1997, 1998) note that evaluation is a matter of context, mechanism and outcome, where the outcome (for example desistance from offending) is dependent on both the context (for example offenders area of residence, financial stability) and specific mechanisms (trust, respect, motivation, self-efficacy). They argue that change (outcome) is brought about not by interventions but by people, embedded in their context who (when exposed to programmes) do something to activate given mechanisms that facilitate change (Pawson and Tilley 1997, 1998; Pawson 2002). Here it is assumed that people are an integral part of the theory behind social exclusion (and criminal behaviour patterns) and therefore the overall extent to which an intervention is able to facilitate change, is dependent upon the individuals it engages. In order to develop an understanding of ‘why’ and ‘how’ interventions work, it is imperative to consider the context within which they take place (Pawson and Tilley 1997, 1998; Pawson 2002; Blamey and Mackenzie 2007). There is not a single initiative that will work for all subjects in all circumstances (Pawson and Myhill 2001), and therefore different interventions should be considered as individual and distinct case studies, each offering a different context and different set of mechanisms responsible for the same overall outcome (Pawson and Tilley 1998). In relation to sports-based interventions, different mechanisms potentially lead to different outcomes (for example short term diversion or long-term rehabilitative behaviour change amongst offenders), and outcomes will only occur under certain conditions (for example, if subjects are enthusiastic and motivated by the activity they are involved in). It can be argued that change can only occur within this context if individuals already have a positive attitude towards sport, and therefore believe it can assist them positively in some
way. Overall expectations of a programme may vary considerably from participant to participant and can impact upon the overall outcome of a programme.

Additionally, a shortage of high quality long-term research means that it is difficult to fully determine the impact of sport on crime reduction over a sustained amount of time. If we recap some of the findings from key studies within this area Robins (1990) noted that there was a lack of clarification around the aims and objectives of programmes with limited underlying rationales for the development of crime reduction programmes: ‘in the UK, evidence of effectiveness of sports provision in terms of reductions in, or changing patterns of, recidivism rates is sparse’ (p. 94). An apparent difficulty of evaluations is that often programmes supported by leisure departments do not have an exclusive objective of crime reduction (Nichols and Booth 1999a), with objectives often unclear, overlapping, and the relative importance of crime reduction varying over time in response to funding opportunities (McCormack 2001). A national survey and review of 38 case studies conducted in the USA also revealed similar findings with programmes possessing unclear objectives (Witt and Crompton 1996). Nichols (2003) noted that often crime reduction has been viewed as an ‘add on’ objective used as part of a rationale for a programme to attract public, official and financial support, and therefore once funding is secured the strength and focus of objectives can somewhat alter over time. An example of this is demonstrated through the comments expressed by a programme manager: ‘the money is basically there to make some sort of impact on reducing anti-social behaviour in the area, we manipulate that objective to get sports development out of it. Everybody is reasonably happy’ (Nichols and Booth 1999b, p. 231).
Furthermore areas targeted owing to high levels of social deprivation are often labelled as contributing to aspects of crime reduction and are used to try and secure resources (Nichols and Booth 1999b). These ambiguous and multi-faceted objectives can contribute to the difficulties in the evaluative process of any programme, sport and/or non-sport related, that seeks to target social exclusion, deprivation and in particular crime reduction.

When referring to policy implications Morris et al. (2003) interestingly concluded that sport and physical activity, has a position within the wider context of personal and social development. However, alone these programmes cannot impact directly on reducing anti-social behaviour and should be incorporated into a broader strategy. Hartmann (2003) reinforced such viewpoints by claiming that any sports-based social intervention programme is principally attributed to its non-sport components and should be viewed as part of a whole package of resources. Sport England (1999) acknowledged that although there is a limited amount of research evidence available to support claims on the effectiveness of sport in reducing criminality due to a lack of systematic evaluation, this deficiency is surpassed by the strong base of experiential evidence that exists.

Nichols (1997) suggested that despite many years of funding for schemes aimed at sport for crime prevention purposes (particularly aimed at young people) the rationale for its use is limited. Nichols (1997) argued that firstly there remains no clear evidence that such programmes do indeed reduce crime. Secondly, poorly developed rationales exist which are needed in order to measure specific outcomes
of the programme with reference to their impact on crime reduction. Thirdly, a clear rationale is required to inform the design of programmes and to allow the individual needs of the participants to be matched to specific programmes. Others argue that it is the financial cost and resources required to produce rigorous evaluations on crime reduction programmes that are a key setback (Witt and Crompton 1996; Long et al. 2002), particularly for those programmes that receive finite short-term funding that covers running costs but rarely leaves any excess for evaluations or the development of monitoring practices (Morris et al. 2003). Further compounding this situation are suggestions that programme staff might lack the resources and expertise to implement formal strategies to monitor and evaluate their programme (Morris et al. 2003).

In 2009 the Audit Commission reported on the role of sport and leisure activities in preventing anti-social behaviour in young people aged 8-19 years. The study aimed to assist councils and their partners to get the best outcomes from their sports-based activities for young people at risk of anti-social behaviour. In their report they noted that sport and leisure had an important role in preventing anti-social behaviour, but there was little evidence of comprehensive area-based approaches. The lack of data on costs and performance was said to be a significant constraint on further effective commissioning. For example as demonstrated in Figure 5 (produced by the Audit Commission, 2009, p. 65), few projects could prove their overall efficacy.
The Audit Commission (2009) report focused on ‘outcomes’ over ‘mechanisms’ with only 41% of the projects in the research possessing outcome measures linked to their objectives. A focus on an outcome based approach has more recently been contended by researchers who have advocated consideration of mechanisms (Nichols 2007; Coalter 2012). Coalter (2012) in particular argues that given the diversity of this area of investigation (participants, programmes, processes, relationships, and desired outcomes) it is impossible to develop a definitive and prescriptive programme theory. Programmes should develop their own theory based on the context in which it resides. Furthermore analysis should shift from the programme per se to the mechanisms (processes, relationships and experiences) that might achieve desired outcomes.
The general consensus amongst more critical observers is that despite the large number of sports-based crime reduction schemes currently in operation in the UK and elsewhere, there is a lack of robust research, and hence very little evidence for their effectiveness in reducing crime, anti-social behaviour and drug use among young people (Nichols and Taylor, 1996; Nichols 1997, 1999a, 1999b, 2007; Crabbe 2000; Hartmann 2001; Long and Sanderson, 2001; Collins and Kay 2003; Nichols and Crow, 2004; Hartmann and Depro 2006; Coalter 2007).

Nichols and Crow (2004) were particularly concerned with the inadequacies of research undertaken, and whilst it is not an intention of this thesis to examine evaluation methods in detail a brief overview is pertinent. Some authors claim that the only valid form of evaluation is one that conforms to the random controlled trial (Farrington and Jolliffe 2002), whilst others argue for a methodology based on scientific realism rather than positivism (Pawson and Tilley 1997; Nichols 2001). Some have suggested a ‘theories of change’ approach to evaluation based on studying not only what the programme is expected to achieve but also how it anticipates to achieve it (Weiss 1998). Nichols and Crow (2004) incorporated elements of each of the above, arguing that in order to assess whether something ‘works’ you have to have a clearly defined and measurable outcome criteria. In addition, Nichols and Crow (2004) acknowledged through their paper that programmes and initiatives can take many different forms, and therefore evaluation needs to be sensitive to this.
In summary, the evidence relating to crime reduction programmes is limited due to the lack of consistency and rigour of many evaluations undertaken (West and Crompton 2001; Coalter 2007) together with the inherent methodological difficulties in measuring the impact of programmes (Taylor et al. 1999; Nichols and Crow 2004; Coalter 2007; Nichols 2007). There has also been a shift in the focus of evaluations away from focusing entirely on ‘outcomes’ towards considering the ‘mechanisms’ through which sport can impact on individuals. The next section discusses the concept of joined-up working specifically in relation to crime reduction and this is particularly relevant to the gatekeeper analysis within this thesis.

2.6 Joined-up thinking and a partnership approach

A multi-agency model, where government and other agencies work together to fund and support sport and physical activity programs, is critical for successful implementation. It is important that there are links with health, welfare, education, employment and leisure services as such agencies can benefit from these types of programmes.

(Morris et al. 2003, p. 4).

The election of a Labour Government in 1997 prompted the desire for joined-up thinking and partnership working to tackle ‘cross-cutting agendas’ in terms of health, regeneration and crime (Martin and Sanderson 1999; Barnes et al. 2005; Blamey and Mackenzie 2007). Crawford and Matassa (2000) claimed strong arguments in favour of the multi-agency partnership approach to crime and disorder reduction and community safety. They noted that there was a consensus in the UK that the most effective form of crime prevention requires structures that are local, include a broad
focus upon wider social problems, are delivered through partnership work, and deliver holistic solutions which are problem-orientated.

A notion linked to the Labour’s agenda around social exclusion was the idea of joined-up government. As a direct implication of the perceived failures of the ‘old style’ of policy making a ‘joined up’ or ‘holistic’ approach was needed to achieve important public policy goals. Lucas (2000) explained that the Modernising Local Government Agenda (1998), the remit of the Social Exclusion Unit (1998) and the new Sustainability Strategy (1999) can all be identified as prime examples of joined-up government that was associated with New Labour. Essentially the ‘joined-up’ approach incorporated a cross-departmental resolution to policy issues, whereby problems are ‘visioned’ and their causes identified.

Geddes and Root (2000) provided thoughts on a local level through their work, suggesting that there are key difficulties associated with adopting a wider social inclusion agenda. There is the need to redistribute objectives to incorporate social inclusion policies, whilst promoting cultural and organisational changes to ensure an entire organisation is engaged in the social inclusion agenda. Ling’s (2002) view was that important goals in public policy cannot be delivered through separate activities of existing departments and thus the notion of joined-up working specifically aimed to coordinate activities across departmental boundaries was essential.
If our attention is turned specifically to crime reduction there are implications for joined-up thinking and partnership work within this specific context. Firstly, the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act (CDA), and the 2002 Police Reform Act (PRA) represented attempts by the state to target local level practices regarding community safety. Earlier signs of multi-agency community safety introduced to England and Wales included the Safer Cities initiative in the late 1980s and the Morgan Report in 1991. Both illustrated clear attempts of multi-agency approaches. Importantly the CDA attempted to formalise and standardise such practices, designating local authorities and the police as the responsible authorities in the battle against crime at the local level. More recently the fire service, police authority, primary care trust (PCT) and probation service have also become responsible authorities in what are now known as the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) or Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) (Skinns 2003).

Garland (2001) suggested that there has been a (re)discovery in the notion that the responsibility for crime control must be shared amongst the government, non-state actors and organisations. He referred to this concept as ‘responsibilisation’ and claims that it is extremely important in crime prevention partnerships. The ideas surrounding ‘responsibilisation’ for crime control appears to coincide with Cohen’s (1985) earlier view that the divisions between the state and civil society or between various organisations within the partnerships are blurring, with responsibility for crime-related targets becoming a priority for many sectors and organisations.
Skinns (2003) used three Community Safety Partnerships (CSPs) as case studies to examine a range of issues including; the processes involved and outcomes of partnership work, the potential impact of the 1998 CDA on practices, and the resultant implications for governmentality and responsibility for crime control. Their findings exposed difficulties in balancing the various priorities of local people, practitioners, local government and central government. The partnerships highlighted some of the gaps associated with the rhetoric of joined-up practice and this will be explored further in the gatekeeper analysis dimension of this research.

According to Edward and Hughes (2002) partnerships, like many other activities within the field of crime and criminal justice, are inherently political perhaps because they are one representation of the ability of statutory authorities to deliver public safety. There has been a definite shift away from focused and isolated perspectives, more directly towards the standpoint that crime needs to be viewed from a wider approach both causally and practically. Ekblom (2004) provided further understanding of the need for a partnership approach for crime reduction but also its complex nature. For example he stated that crime can be the focal problem to be addressed, and may be exacerbated or diminished by the policy of a government department or alternatively crime can interfere with the policies of departments. Similarly he noted that whilst crime solutions may be a by-product of resolutions to other issues such as social exclusion, solutions to crime can potentially exacerbate other policy problems (Ekblom 2004). Given the range of issues associated with crime it is clear that it is an extreme case which presents a special challenge for everyone involved. Partnerships can be viewed as a means of arranging the division of labour to tackle a range of social problems and thus identify solutions which cut
across it, seeking to re-arrange the distribution of competence in tackling particular problems, assessing the coverage of the extent of the problem, distributing responsibility for dealing with the problem, and to some degree attaching accountability for information assembled and overall actions taken (Ekblom 2004).

Hughes (2004) stated that since 1997 there was an ever increasing number of partnerships, many in the form of multi-agency community safety teams that included managers, officers, project workers, police secondees, drug action teams, anti-social behaviour units. These teams of individuals and groups form part, however easily/uneasily, of local government structures and processes. For Hughes (2004) partnership had become a key technique of local and regional governance and more precisely a vital rhetorical principle of both prevention and safety policies which involved the rearrangement of responsibilities between central government, public services and local government.

Ekblom (2004) further enhanced the remarks of Hughes (2004) regarding a partnership approach within crime reduction, claiming that affiliation is a way of enhancing performance in the delivery of a common goal through joint responsibility and the pooling of resources by different agents. He continued to state that such a collaborative approach adds value stemming from an enhanced ability to tackle problems whose solutions span the division of labour and often centre on a particular locality. Ekblom (2004) highlighted that agents/gatekeepers in partnership may often bring with them conflicting or competing interests, differing perspectives, ideologies and cultures.
Hughes (2004) also emphasised the difficulties associated with partnership working. Local case study examples suggested tensions and conflicts, with political struggles between partners alongside the fundamental pressure to be seen publicly happy, united and working towards the same goals within communities (Hughes and Edwards 2002). According to Ekblom (2004) to counter such tensions within partnership there is usually a requirement for some sort of agreement between partners – whether informal or formal, and possibly contractual or legal. Partnership work and collaboration can vary considerably in their level of formality as identified through earlier work by Liddle and Gelsthorpe (1994). Although informal partnerships are less easy to re-construct than formal ones due to their less public and more ad hoc nature, some respondents questioned through their research stated a clear preference for informal arrangements. Formal arrangements concerning judicial matters are often framed in terms of institutional roles and responsibilities, and therefore formalisation of arrangements might in some cases allow for participation of other groups and agencies that have not been part of an informal network/partnership. However informal arrangements appear susceptible to the (often negative) impact that changes in key personnel can have, often because their partnerships and networks tend to involve liaison between key individuals rather than agencies. Conversely, formal partnerships are perhaps better able to cope with the loss of key personnel due to the formalised arrangements. Additionally informal arrangements are said to involve a certain degree of ‘boundary blurring’ across agencies, where certain issues regarding accountability come into question.
Although a little dated and not sport specific the work of Liddle and Gelsthorpe (1994) provided a detailed foundation for later comparison in the gatekeeper analysis of this research. It is clear that partnerships are expected to operate across a series of institutional barriers between private, public, voluntary and community gaps, with the potential of producing entirely new organisational networks within a managerialised framework (Hughes 2004). However opinions appear mixed on the benefits of such approaches with some arguing that assemblages of agencies and agents (partnerships) are structurally unstable and morally and politically volatile presenting concerns over the very definition of the field, the forms of power and professional domination within the field, and about which communities get to be ‘safe’ (Clarke 2002).

Whilst there are strong differences of opinion about many facets of criminal justice policy, there is a general consensus emerging that the police cannot control crime and disorder alone, and in fact no single agency can control crime and disorder. Agencies with a contribution to reducing crime and disorder need to work in partnership, with evidence-based problem-solving approaches promising the most effective approach to reducing crime and disorder. Problems of crime and disorder are complex, and crime and disorder problems need to be understood in their local contexts with strategies locally tailored (Hough and Tilley 1998). Partnership working is an area of continued importance and necessity, especially in a context, where the relationships between extremely varied agencies are required in order to deliver a successful service. As Nichols and Taylor (1996) highlighted clear objectives agreed by all organisations involved are essential along with agreed performance indicators, which should be used as benchmarks as opposed to definitive measures of
performance. Offering an American perspective on the subject Witt and Crompton (1996) provided detailed accounts of 38 case studies. Of the several themes that emerged from their research, leadership of has been identified as having specific relevance to the gatekeeper analysis study in this thesis.

Witt and Crompton (1996) highlighted that most of the programmes described in the case studies moved recreation professionals into a different mode of operation requiring different leadership skills and the ability to deal with aspects outside of their initial remit. In addition strong collaborative arrangements with participants, parents, and other agencies including public, private and voluntary sectors were also deemed as a contributing factor to the success of a programme. Crabbe (2000) highlighted a particularly potent observation that given the importance of locating sports provision within such a context there might be a need to encourage and develop greater willingness between specialist drug and criminal justice agencies to work in close partnership with non-drug-specific agencies providing expertise in the delivery of sports programmes.

The promotion of partnership and collaboration by governments is underpinned by beliefs that in doing so potential benefits can be achieved. Partnerships and collaboration are viewed as a means of addressing problems associated with fragmentation (Skelcher 2000), in addition to avoiding duplication amongst agencies. They are seen to promote co-operation between agencies and offer opportunities to achieve outcomes that are beyond a single agency operating in isolation.
3. Summary

There has been considerable research that has examined the use of sports-based programmes for crime prevention and/or rehabilitation, amongst children and adolescents. Whilst there has been some variation in the approaches utilised to evaluate these programmes, there is a general consensus amongst academics that although sport has at least the potential to assist positively aspects of crime reduction there is a lack of substantive evidence (Robins 1990; Mulvey et al. 1993; Bloyce and Smith 2010) with over reliance on ‘impressionistic’ and ‘anecdotal’ evidence (Nichols 1997, 2004, 2007). A number of key factors contribute to the widespread difficulties in making specific conclusions within this context and in brief include; the complexity of the area of investigation, inconsistency amongst policy makers, practitioners and researchers within the field, a shortage of long-term high quality research, unclear aims and objectives and a misplaced emphasis on ‘outcomes’ as opposed to ‘mechanisms’ through which change might occur (Coalter 2012).

In particular theorists Pawson and Tilley (1997, 1998) noted that evaluation is a matter of context, mechanism and outcome, where people are an integral part of theory behind social exclusion (and criminal behaviour patterns) and the overall extent to which an intervention is able to facilitate change, is dependent upon the individuals it engages. ‘Success’ and significance of a programme might be relative to the ‘meaning’ participants place on it, for example, if they have greater experience of failure and being labelled negatively by society they might attach greater value to the programme and any corresponding achievements (Nichols 1999a, 1999b, 2004).
Therefore whilst sport might provide a context for the development of positive experiences it is the social process of the participation that is key to understanding what exactly is happening (Coalter 2012). Social interventions have the capacity to ‘work’ by enabling participants to make different choices even though these will be constrained by their previous experiences, beliefs and attitudes, opportunities and access to resources (Coalter 2012). Coalter (2012) noted, that in order to make and sustain different choices this requires a change in individuals’ reasoning (beliefs, values, attitudes etc) and/or the resources that have available to them. Furthermore it is the combination of ‘reasoning and resources’ for instance the programme ‘mechanism’ that enables the programme to work, and therefore, there should be a shift in understanding sports programmes to ‘the processes, experiences and relationships which might achieve desired outcomes’ (Coalter 2012, p. 3).

Traditional rationales for the use of sport within this context focus around (i) reducing the ability to take part in crime (distraction) (ii) meeting a need for excitement (iii) improving physical fitness (iv) increasing self-esteem and sense of control over one’s life (v) the development of cognitive competencies (vi) the importance of role models; and (vii) the importance of employment (Nichols 1997), in addition to providing a ‘hook’ for further engagement (Nichols 2007). There is also support for utilising sport as a flexible tool in a less traditional capacity (Twitchen 1995; Coalter 1996), whereby sport is decentred from the programme (Crabbe 2000; Coalter 2012). This is seen through the use of sport as an ‘exit route’ with stronger associations with training, education and employment (Robins 1990; Nichols and Taylor 1996; Coalter 1996), providing sustained opportunities (Taylor et al. 1999) and viewing programmes within an holistic framework linking to basic needs (Crabbe 2000).
Programme staff were viewed as important elements of a successful programme both in a role model and mentoring capacity (Davis and Dawson 1996; Nichols and Taylor 1996; Tsuchiya 1996; Taylor et al. 1999; Morris et al. 2003; Audit Commission 2009), with the length and intensity of the programme also seen as key to impacting upon reconviction rates (Davis and Dawson 1996; Nichols and Taylor 1996).

This review of literature has revealed the small body of research on sports-based programmes with older offenders. There are two main points that can be drawn from this. Firstly sport and physical activity based programmes may have a limited (if any) role in recidivism amongst adult offenders, and/or secondly the transition of such schemes have yet to reach this age band. Certainly the research suggests that the focus of these programmes will differ to those provided for young people. For example, the purpose of the programmes might be less about the physical involvement in sport and more about the wider impact on sports-based learning opportunities through educational, and employment development. Based on this there appears to be scope to instigate some original worthwhile research into this area with a shift of focus onto older offenders.
Chapter 4: Methodology
1. Introduction

This chapter outlines the research strategy, design, methods and procedures for data analysis used during this research. It considers the ways in which the research process addressed the broad aims of the study, which were to explore the potential use of sport within a crime reduction context. The aims and objectives of this research were identified in some detail in Chapter One (section 1), and therefore the intention of this chapter is to present the theoretical and practical approaches that were adopted during the research, describing in some detail the main research methods that were employed to elicit data that would address the identified research aims and objectives.

A paradigm is a perspective or ‘world view’ that identifies the nature of (social) being or existence (ontology), the relationship between the researcher and the researched or nature of knowledge (epistemology), and the methodologies employed to gather the data to answer a research question (Sparkes 1992; Maykut and Morehouse 1994; Morris 2006). The paradigmatic positioning of the researcher therefore dictates a study’s fundamental theoretical framework. As advised by Kane and O’Reilly-de-Brun (2001), most research is guided by a paradigm or theory in which there is advancement from an unfamiliar place through the use of a specific set of directions.
The first part of this chapter considers the theoretical framework within which this thesis sits, alongside an understanding of the logic (Grix 2002) that lay behind this process. Numerous authors consider paradigms to be differentiated through the dimensions of ontology, epistemology and methodology (Guba 1990; Patton 1990; Cohen and Manion 1994; Maykut and Morehouse 1994; Denzin and Lincoln 2003). Studies that take social phenomena as their objects of analysis are informed by such philosophical considerations (ontology, epistemology, methodology); that is claims made about the consistency of the social world and the ways of gaining appropriate knowledge. In order to locate the theoretical framework which guided this research, the key traditions that underpinned this research are outlined. The purpose of this is to demonstrate an appreciation of the position of the researcher in relation to the research within this thesis. The latter part of this chapter considers the specific methods employed for both empirical studies in relation to the paradigmatic alignment of the researcher.

2. Location within a research paradigm: ontology and Epistemology

Discussions around the philosophy of science and the process of social research tend to take the stance of an ‘either-or’ (Danermark et al. 2002, p. 2) view of the competing paradigms of thought. Regularly and often confusingly, the terms used to define these different philosophical positions are multiple – at times making it unclear whether the terms used are referring to ontological or epistemological positions, or even a conflation of the two. Examples of terms popularly employed include, objectivism and constructionism and positivism and interpretivism (Bryman 2004). Key questions that are integral concerns for the social researcher include: what is
the nature of the social world, and, how can we gain appropriate knowledge of social phenomena? (Grix 2002).

Crotty (1998, p. 10) clearly states that ‘ontology is the study of being. It is concerned with “what is”, with the nature of existence, with the structure of reality as such’. In brief ontology refers to the nature of reality. It is the study of different conceptions of reality that establishes the researcher’s positioning on what might be considered a continuum from a realist to a relativist perspective. Through adopting a specific perspective with regards to the nature of knowledge, it is this ontological perspective that dictates the epistemological positioning. Crotty (1998) provides a specific road map to assist in the selection of appropriate theoretical and practical approaches to planning and conducting research projects. Figure 6 illustrates an adapted version of this model (Crotty 1998) specific to the methodological elements of this research.
Figure 6. The four elements of social research (adapted from Crotty 1998, p. 4)

The model provided by Crotty (1998) does not make ontology an explicit entity, contending that epistemological and ontological issues have scope to merge somewhat and therefore both inform the theoretical perspective. Crotty (1998) would argue that to include ontology within the framework would mean setting it alongside epistemology. Figure 6 has been adapted to reflect this notion.
The epistemological question is concerned with the nature of the relationship between the knower or would-be knower and what can be known (Guba and Lincoln 1994). Epistemology influences the nature of research questions to be asked relevant to ontological beliefs. Thus, it is about the relationship between the researcher and their perception of reality. For example if a realist ontology is assumed the epistemological assumption is that objective facts, external to the researcher, are attainable; the researcher views the world from the outside looking in. Similarly, if the ontology is relativist, then the epistemology is internal and subjective; thus the researcher views the world from the inside looking out (Gratton and Jones 2010). Therefore, epistemology is concerned with the nature, sources and limits of knowledge, the answer of which is constrained by the answer to the ontological question i.e. what is the form and nature of reality and what can be known about it (Guba and Lincoln 1994).

Consequently, the methodologies employed by the researcher should be in unison with the perceived ways in which the researcher believes knowledge of the world and reality is gained, informed by their ontological and related epistemological beliefs. In general, a realist ontology and objectivist epistemology promotes an experimental methodology that aims to prove or disprove a statement or research question. The findings can be assumed to be either right or wrong and are therefore considered to be generalisable in a wider context. In contrast, a relativist ontology and subjective epistemology suppose the adoption of naturalistic methodologies that do not demand proof, but aim to further develop the nature of knowledge (Denzin and Lincoln 2003). To take a broad view the paradigmatic positioning of this research was not to generalise from the results acquired, but to develop greater
understanding around the use of sport within a crime reduction context. Therefore ontologically speaking this research has been undertaken from a relativist perspective, providing justification for the methodologies employed.

3. Theoretical perspective: interpretivism

The contradictory paradigms of positivism and interpretivism can be viewed in terms of the environment and perceptions of human nature (Sparkes 1992). Each has differing epistemological and ontological assumptions, and thus differing implications for the types of research questions asked, subsequent methodology adopted, the nature of the data collected and the analysis and interpretation of such data (Gratton and Jones 2010). The positivist approach argues that the only ‘true’ or valid form of knowledge is that which is ‘scientific’. Measurements themselves should be objective and not subject to influence of the researcher’s values or interpretation (Gratton and Jones 2010). Alternatively, the interpretive paradigm contests the objective reality assumed by the positivist view of the world and seeks alternative means of making sense of reality (Patton 1990; Sparkes 1992; Denzin and Lincoln 2003).

Interpretivism assumes a subjective and therefore relativist reality (ontology) in which the researcher and the researched are independent factors that combine in an attempt to discover reality together. To generalise, researchers who adopt the ontological and epistemological assumptions of interpretivism, are of the opinion that the social sciences, unlike the natural sciences, do not deal with a succession of inorganic and impassive objects, independent and external to the individual (Sparkes
Predictions cannot be made whether X will always cause Y, as we all have, to differing extents, freedom to act in a number of different ways (Gratton and Jones 2010). It is acknowledged and accepted that ‘the presence, the effect, and the biases and selections of the researcher, cannot be removed from interpretive research’ (Ball 1990, p. 167). Therefore by adopting an interpretivist perspective the ability to generalise about the subject or issue under investigation is eradicated. This said, in a world of multiple realities, generalisation is a matter of extent rather than absolutes; as within the realm of social science, future behaviour cannot be predicted and therefore behaviour must be explained in relative terms and in relation to the context of the study itself. Relativism is important and should not be underestimated as it assumes that numerous interpretations of a study will always exist and therefore a singular truth of such constructions cannot be established (Sparkes 1992).

To expand on the notion of relativism, every individual has their own viewpoint from which they see the world and as such, human experience must be understood as a subjective reality (Morris 2006). It could be argued that all paradigms are subjective to a certain extent, with individual beliefs shaping choices. This is an important concept, and it is the view of the researcher that data are always open to multiple interpretations, with an inability to avoid complete subjectivity.

The issue of generalisation does not have to be perceived as inhibitive or problematic to the research process or resultant findings. Moreover it is about accepting that multiple-constructed realities exist and that time and context-free generalisations are neither desirable nor possible (Johnson and Onwuegbuzie
The mind identifies its own set of categories in relation to a particular research problem or issue and this plays a central role in edifying the multiple realities that are believed to exist in response to a particular research question (Sparkes 1992). Unlike the opinion of the positivist the mind and object are inextricably linked together, ‘the knower and process of knowing cannot be separated from what is known, and facts cannot be separated from values (Sparkes 1992, p. 27). Through the acceptance of multiple realities the researcher is concerned with the understanding and accurate portrayal of situations and behaviour, whilst facilitating understandings of why individuals think and behave in such a diversity of ways (Fetterman 1989). Whilst different researchers could gather the same data, their interpretations of that data may vary depending on their pre-existing research knowledge, experience, beliefs, in addition to their knowledge and experience of the researched.

The two empirical studies within this thesis were located within the interpretive paradigm for a number of key reasons. This research aimed to provide a dual perspective on the use of sports-based programmes for crime reduction purposes, from both an ex-offender and gatekeepers’ perspective. The ex-offender case study was based around an in-depth investigation of a sport-based programme, aimed at a single ex-offender, to explore the attitudes, perceptions and behaviours of that individual towards sport and its subsequent use through their own rehabilitation. Whilst the gatekeeper analysis aimed to provide an alternative perspective on the use of sport within a crime reduction context, via key individuals either directly or indirectly responsible for crime reduction practices (further details of both studies are provided through later sections). It was imperative to determine the reasons behind
the thoughts, beliefs and actions of the individuals involved in this research and subsequently the only way to accurately determine this was to take an emic perspective and look from within the targeted groups themselves and outward, making generalisations context-specific. This interpretive approach accepts a multitude of realities exist but asserts that only the individuals themselves can provide insights into the thoughts and beliefs of the subject matter at hand. For example, with regards to the single case study, an important part of the research process was to uncover the motivations of participating on a sports-based programme through their rehabilitation. This could not have been accurately conveyed by anyone other than the individual them self.

It was not an aim of either empirical study to prove or disprove a theory, but to find out as much relevant information regarding the scope, impact and current use of sport-based programmes for crime reduction purposes. This information therefore, could only be determined through an interpretive paradigm positioning that delves into the participants viewpoints. The process was deemed as important, if not more so, than the actual outcome, particularly from a learning and development position. Having highlighted the paradigmatic positioning of this research the next section discusses the methodological associations, focusing on qualitative research within a single case study and gatekeeper analysis.
4. Methodology: qualitative research

Qualitative research aims to capture meanings that are not quantifiable, that are often associated with interpretive approaches such as feelings, thoughts and experiences (Gratton and Jones 2010). Qualitative research is used to assist understanding of how people feel and why they feel the way they do. By adopting qualitative approaches to research one is taking a holistic perspective with the assumptions that there is not a single reality; reality is merely based upon perceptions that are different for each person and change over time. Social reality is continuously constructed and related to the immediate social context (Gratton and Jones 2010). Creswell (1994) offers that qualitative research should be chosen when the topic needs to be explored; where variables cannot be easily indentified, theories are not readily available to explain behaviour and material is required to provide further insight into the topic area. As identified through the review of literature chapter (Chapter 3) the depth and scope of research available, particularly with regards to the unique approach taken in this thesis is somewhat restricted. The literature that is available is largely related to young people, sport and crime and the theories explaining behaviour in this setting is often limited. Simply this particular research was about exploring the topic area further from a unique perspective using a qualitative approach.

Sherman and Webb (1988) analysed leading qualitative researchers work from a variety of different disciplines including philosophy of education, history, biography, ethnography, life history, grounded theory, phenomenology, curriculum criticism, uses of literature in qualitative research, and critical theory. Their analysis produced
five characteristics similar to all of those species of qualitative research, and one that was characteristic of many (p. 5-8):

1. Events can be understood adequately only if they are seen in the context. Therefore, a qualitative researcher immerses her/himself in the setting.

2. The contexts of inquiry are not contrived; they are natural. Nothing is predefined or taken for granted.

3. Qualitative researchers want those who are studied to speak for themselves, to provide their perspectives in words and other actions. Therefore, qualitative research is an interactive process in which the persons studied teach the researcher about their lives.

4. Qualitative researchers attend to the experience as a whole, not as separate variables. The aim of qualitative research is to understand experience as unified.

5. Qualitative methods are appropriate to the above statements. There is no one general method.

6. For many qualitative researchers, the process entails appraisal about what was studied.

The essence of these characteristics weaves it way through the qualitative research within this thesis. The goal of this research is summarised neatly by Hardy et al. (1996, p. 256) when referring to qualitative research, to ‘obtain rich, in-depth and detailed information from an “insider’s” view – one that stresses the perspective of
the participant (subject) and strives to understand the context or situation in which
the experience takes place.’ A qualitative approach encourages flexibility in that it
facilitates the exploration of novel and unforeseen issues rather than simply adhering
to a standardised research protocol (Green and Thorogood 2004). The interviewer is
an integral part of the investigation in qualitative research (Miles and Huberman
1984; Gratton and Jones 2010). This differs from quantitative research which
attempts to gather data objectively.

The problem of bias within qualitative research, in particular is one which is still
debated within methodology texts, with a lack of overall agreement on how much
researcher influence is acceptable and whether or not it needs to be ‘controlled’ and
accounted for. As previously noted the research within this thesis is viewed from an
interpretivist perspective whereby it is accepted that researcher biases cannot be
fully removed (Ball 1990), with environmental and situational factors potentially
affecting the human behaviours observed as part of a study. As argued by Smith
(1983, p. 35):

...society is the result of conscious human intention and that the
interrelationships among what is being investigated and the investigator are
impossible to separate. For all people, lay people and social scientists alike,
what actually exists in the social world is what people think exists. There is no
objective reality as such, which is divorced from the people who participate in
and interpret that reality...From this perspective, human beings are both the
subject and the object of inquiry in social sciences, and the study of the social
world is, in essence, nothing more than the study of ourselves.
Subjective interaction is the only way to access realities in such a paradigm, as these realities only truly exist in the minds of those being researched in a particular study. Thus, the methodological approach is based on the researcher seeking to interpret the behaviour or subject of enquiry in relation to situational and environmental factors (Sparkes 1992; Denzin and Lincoln 2003; Morris 2006). As this research was about attempting to understand the attitudes, perspectives and contributions of two distinct social groups, surrounding the same system and context (for instance, sport, crime and criminal behaviour), it was inevitable that this research would remain qualitative in nature to allow this rich, detailed data to emerge. Qualitative data allows the focus to remain on the experiences and meaning of subjects, thus providing a richer type of data (Corbetta 2003). Therefore to summarise, this research comprised two principal elements; a qualitative in-depth single case study of an ex-offender, and a qualitative gatekeeper analysis of a collective group of individuals.

As part of the research process reflective journals were utilised in two main ways; within the single case study by the ex-offender as part of the weekly diary account sessions, and by myself as a researcher. The former of these has been discussed throughout the methods and data analysis section for the case study, whilst the latter is discussed in greater detail in the next section.
4.1 Reflection and reflexivity in qualitative research: The use of a research journal

A reflexive approach to the research process is now widely accepted within qualitative research, whereby researchers are urged to disclose about themselves, ‘their presuppositions, choices, experiences, and actions during the research process’ (Mruck and Breuer 2003, p. 3). Reflective practice as such aims to make visible to the reader the choices and decisions researchers undertake during the process of researching (Mruck and Breuer 2003). Rather than attempting to completely control researcher values through method, or by bracketing assumptions, the aim was to consciously acknowledge those values and reflect upon them throughout the research process. Whilst it is acknowledged that maintaining a reflective journal is a common practice in qualitative research, particularly reflexive research (Etherington 2004) there appears relatively little literature available on the use of reflective journals in the research process (Ortlipp 2008). As a relatively novice researcher, from a methodological perspective, the reflective journal provided a mechanism which allowed the researcher to reflect along the entire research process and attempt to create the notion of transparency to a certain extent.

Given the sensitivity of some of the population under enquiry within this research (i.e. the ex-offender), the nature of the topics, and the relative inexperience of the researcher operating within this context, a reflective journal presented itself as a key opportunity for the researcher to make experiences, opinions, thoughts and feelings visible and an acknowledged part of the research process. The reflective journal was
utilised predominantly during the single case study and subsequently when writing up the research.

In addition, the research in this thesis was entirely interview-based, with the researcher as the primary ‘instrument’ of data collection. Much of the literature read, within traditional qualitative methodology texts, in relation to the role of the researcher as an interviewer presented the research process as linear and unproblematic, with rules regarding reliability, validity and objectivity (Patton 1990; Glensne and Peshkin 1992). For example, the interviewer is required to be non-reactive in order to increase the reliability of the interviewee’s responses, whereby the same answers would be given if the questions were asked at another time, in another setting, and even by another interviewer (Glensne and Peshkin 1992). Whilst every effort was made to achieve the highest degree of validity, reliability and trustworthiness of the data collected (this is discussed in detail in section 7 of this chapter), the integration of the reflective journal throughout the research process allowed further transparency to be achieved. Such concerns relate to what Denzin (1994, p. 501) refers to as the ‘interpretive crisis’ in qualitative research. The researcher’s reflective journal was not an attempt to remove bias per se, but to make the research journey visible to the reader. Extracts from the researcher’s journal, although used sparingly, are incorporated throughout the remainder of this thesis with particular emphasis during the single case study.
A brief insight into the background of the empirical research is presented through the following section which further developed into two empirical studies including a single case study and gatekeeper analysis.

4.2. Background to the research

Originally the ex-offender case study element of this research was to be conducted within the PE department of a local Category B prison. The initial research proposal was to conduct a series of interviews with individual male offenders sentenced to imprisonment who then chose to enrol on a twelve week PE programme. These interviews and this overall approach were impeded by the cancellation of the programme, one week before the research was due to commence, as a direct result of staffing difficulties within the PE department within the prison. This was extremely frustrating at the time as many months had been spent ensuring the researcher was prepared for this rather unusual research environment.

A formal application for approval had been sent to the prison, and various meetings with key contacts were facilitated. Discussions with the ‘Head of Learning and Skills’, the physical training instructor (PTI) and other personnel of the prison provided opportunities to scope the study and identify issues and training required before embarking on the research. Subsequent to the formal application process to undertake research in her Majesty’s Prison Service, certain requirements prior to conducting the research were identified. These included: a security clearance application which was fundamental in order to achieve access into the prison, a three
day prison awareness course (8th – 10th May 2006), and five days shadowing experience of the psychology team within the prison. Clearance and approval to conduct the research within the prison was obtained and these elaborate and prolonged negotiations with the prison were, in part, standard red tape, but more importantly they were procedures that the researcher had sought to undertake in order to develop experience and understanding of operating within this environment.

The rationale behind this original approach to conduct the research within the prison was to explore the views, attitudes and motivations of participants (offenders) enrolled on a sport-based programme within a prison setting. Additionally it was about investigating the expectations of the programme and future directions following the completion of the programme, from the perspective of the offenders’ themselves. The research sought to then further compare and contrast between the views, attitudes and expectations of these offenders, with those expressed by the providers of the programme (the PE department within the prison) to highlight any consistencies and discrepancies between the two perspectives. Unfortunately, this initial approach was abandoned due to reasons outside the control of the researcher (the cancellation of the programme a week before research was to commence). The question of access into a particular field under investigation is an important consideration, especially in cases where the subject under investigation is regarded as sensitive or part of a sensitive population; access can become particularly problematic (Yin 2003). At the risk of stating the obvious this original approach relied heavily upon negotiated access being agreed in a suitable environment for it to be undertaken effectively, and in this instance this was not accomplished. The journal
extract provided below summarises the researcher’s thoughts and feelings during this period:

I am undoubtedly disappointed and frustrated that the research will not take place as originally planned. A significant amount of time has been spent completing application forms, obtaining security clearance, attending courses and ultimately familiarising myself with the research population. I have learnt an invaluable amount as a researcher and not least this process has minimised my own fears and concerns about conducting research in this area. The days spent shadowing the Psychology department within the prison, allowed me to enhance my own interviewer ability and liaise with experts in this field. I have also managed to make some extremely useful contacts through this process and I will now need to re-evaluate how they might be utilised as part of a future direction for this research. (Research journal extract).

Once access to the prison PE programme had been denied it was important to develop an alternative strategy. Based on original contacts that had been made within the prison and further investigation of available sports-based programmes, this issue was resolved by adopting a dual perspective approach, investigating a post-release (from prison) sports-based programme for a single ex-offender (case study approach), and conducting a gatekeeper analysis focusing upon the views, attitudes and opinions of individuals with either a direct or indirect influence on crime reduction practices, on the use of sport-based programmes within the context of crime reduction. Further detailed discussions can be viewed in section 6 of this chapter.

Ultimately this new direction allowed for the exploration of the original aims of this thesis which were to utilise applied ‘real world’ research to add further knowledge to the subject area and potentially inform policy and practice. As identified through the literature review (Chapter 3), the issues surrounding the use of sport-based
programmes as a medium to assist crime reduction are undeniably complex, interrelated and not easily teased apart. The general paucity of literature on adult sports-based programmes and crime inevitably creates certain difficulties and problems for researchers. It was intended that this research would help to provide a greater understanding of the potential for sport within an ex-offender’s rehabilitation, whilst additionally exploring the perspectives of key gatekeepers on the use of sport within this capacity.

To summarise, Figure 7 extends the earlier model provided by Crotty (1998) (see Figure 6) and combines this with an example provided by Denzin and Lincoln (2003) that visually represents the different phases of research according to the paradigmatic variations. It is pertinent to illustrate this process at this point in the chapter as it clarifies the journey between the initial ontological assumptions and the resultant methodology assumed in relation to the two studies in this research.
Figure 7 illustrates how the initial beliefs of the researcher about the individual, group and/or behaviour under study determined the paradigmatic perspective adopted. Subsequently, the ensuing ontological and epistemological assumptions inform the research strategies and specific methods utilised. The research design is ‘the logical sequence that connects the empirical data to a study’s initial research questions and, ultimately, to its conclusions’ (Yin 2003, p. 20). It was imperative that sufficient time
was spent at the outset of the research in selecting the most appropriate methods, since data that doesn’t assist in answering the research question is of limited value. The method of data collection for both studies was interview based, the variation in techniques employed is discussed in greater detail in section 6. The chosen method, and thus data collected, facilitated an in-depth understanding of two differing perspectives surrounding the same theme. Study one (a single case study) was based on an individual (ex-offender) actively immersed in a sports-based programme. Study two (a gatekeeper analysis) investigated key individuals directly or indirectly responsible for providing opportunities and support to (ex)offenders. Accordingly, the sections that follow consider the specific methods employed through both studies (addressed separately) including the approach to data analysis, followed by some final thoughts regarding, validity, credibility and trustworthiness of the data.

5. Ethical considerations

All social researchers encounter ethical issues during some point in the research process, with ethical considerations directly relating to the integrity of the research undertaken (Bryman 2004). Indeed Cohen et al. (2003) stated that ethical problems may arise at any or all stages of the research process, be it from the nature of the actual project, the research context, the procedures implemented, the data collection tools, the current nature of the participants, the kind of information collected, or the resultant analysis and interpretation of the assembled data. One of the main problems in the world of ethics is its subjectivity and that people have different opinions regarding what is ethically acceptable or not. Generally ethical
considerations evolved around participant harm, lack of informed consent, and invasion of privacy and the use of deception; each of which are not mutually exclusive (Diener and Crandall 1978).

A number of ethical considerations were implemented throughout this research, specifically regarding confidentiality, informed consent and safety protocols. Firstly, each stage of data collection was recorded on a tape/digital recorder to ensure that all the information provided was accurate and complete. In order to avoid identification and maintain the privacy of participants involved in this research, tape recordings were restricted to the researcher, with all interviews transcribed by the researcher and stored in a safe and secure place. In addition pseudonyms were used throughout this thesis as replacements for names, and to maintain confidentiality. This can prove difficult within qualitative methodologies where analysis is often descriptive and accounts of individual behaviour are divulged (Bryman 2004). Every effort was made to ensure that identities were not inadvertently revealed through the way in which the data was presented, and where direct quotes were used the researcher ensured identifiers were removed or disguised.

Further to this an overview of the research was provided to participants prior to their involvement in the research, and informed consent was attained from all participants. Ethical approval was obtained for both empirical studies from the research committee within the University of Wales, Institute, Cardiff (now known as Cardiff Metropolitan University, UWIC). Finally risk assessments were conducted on the ex-
offender by both the prison and sports-based programme prior to the case study research commencing.

6. Methods of data collection

The researcher was aware of a number of different techniques within research methods including, observations, questionnaires and focus groups, to name but a few. However, in alignment with the assumptions of the interpretive paradigm, issues, perceptions and beliefs are emergent rather than predisposed, and therefore interviews were deemed the most suitable method to permit the depth and richness of the data. Alexander (2000), Hollin (2001) and Myer (2001) posit that the interview process is an effective method to gather information for a comprehensive assessment covering important areas of discussion, including specific to this research, (ex)offender needs, beliefs, attitudes, perceptions, and motivations for rehabilitation treatment. Interviews can take a variety of forms including; structured, semi-structured, unstructured, telephone and focus groups. It was not an intention of this section to address each of these in isolation instead the focus remained on semi-structured interviews, which were the method of choice for both studies. As acknowledged by Champion (2000) and DeVos et al. (2002), semi-structured interviews are organised around known areas, while still allowing considerable flexibility in both scope and depth. The researcher was aware, however, that it would be a misconception to presume that the flexibility of the semi-structured nature of the interviews offers a deeper analysis, as the quality of the information is dependent upon the interviewer’s skills and experience at eliciting information (Hollin 2001). The decision was made to specifically employ semi-structured interviews as a means of
collecting information from participants of both studies, and a discussion surrounding the advantages and disadvantages of this method of data collection proceeds.

6.1 Semi-structured interviews

Justification for using interviews was that the research at hand aimed to gather detailed information from a relatively small number of individuals who were key to the topic area under discussion. This research was about gaining depth and insight into the attitudes and opinions of participants over breadth of coverage as it was believed that this would provide greater insight into the understandings of the topic area. Additionally due to the limited availability of sports-based programmes for crime reduction amongst older convicted (ex)offenders, and the restrictions and difficulties of gaining access to key gatekeepers operating within this field, it was deemed essential that maximum insight was achieved from those participating in the research. This said, there are both advantages and disadvantages attached to any chosen method, but it is about maximising the strengths of the tool and minimising the weaknesses. Denscombe (1998) and Cohen et al. (2003) provide a list of both potential advantages and disadvantages associated with interviews, in particular semi-structured interviews, and forms the basis of this discussion.

Firstly, semi-structured interviews in particular permit extensive opportunities for questioning and probing of respondents, thus, detailed information can be harvested from a relatively small population facilitating the collation of more in-depth discussion of specific topics of interest. Additionally, they encourage interviewees to respond to
open-ended questions in a way they see fit, encouraging them to talk at length about the issues they feel comfortable with or perceive to hold greater importance, whilst maintaining the general focus of the research (Denscombe 1998; Cohen et al. 2003; Gratton and Jones 2010). Although this has the potential of resulting in a significant amount of irrelevant data emerging, that does not coincide with the key aims of the study. The interviewer would need to be aware of this and act accordingly, maintaining the primary objectives of the research.

The nature of semi-structured interviews provides a degree of flexibility with regard to the wording and order of questions and the time allocated to each interview, whilst still imparting some degree of structure with a clear list of issues that the interviewer wishes to cover (Denscombe 1998; Cohen et al. 2003). They allow for unexpected data to emerge enabling the respondents to reveal insights into their attitudes and behaviour that may not be apparent to the researcher from their prior awareness of the phenomena (Gratton and Jones 2010). Furthermore the less rigid nature of the interview should help put the interviewee at ease and encourage him/her to speak more freely and at length with the interviewer (Denscombe 1998; Cohen et al. 2003). This was viewed as an essential component of this particular research, given the nature and sensitivity of some of the participants (the ex-offender) and topic under discussion (offenders, ex-offenders and crime). However, should the interviewer fail to establish a rapport with the interviewee, there is a reduced chance of extracting the most in-depth and high quality information (Denscombe 1998; Cohen et al. 2003).
Due to the subjective manner of the interview both in terms of the interviewer and interviewee, it is impossible to avoid involvement completely. This may occur in the wording of questions, the tone of voice or emphasis placed on certain words, or even the willingness of the interviewee to contribute and please the interviewer. Inevitably there is always a chance that bias can occur during qualitative research and thus during the interview process (Denscombe 1998; Bell 1999; Cohen et al. 2003; Gratton and Jones 2010). As Fontana and Frey (1998) further noted, ‘the spoken word always has a residue of ambiguity, no matter how carefully we word the questions and report or code the answers’ (p. 47). Furthermore, the quality of the data through this method is also dependent on the interviewee’s responses, and overall ability to recall information (Gratton and Jones 2010).

In summary, the semi-structured interview is more flexible in its approach than a structured interview with the wording and ordering of questions less firmly controlled. The use of semi-structured interviews within this thesis allowed participants of both studies the opportunity to talk about their own experiences in their own words, and elaborate on areas of particular interest and importance, whilst retaining the focus on the issues and/or areas that needed to be covered (Denscombe 1998). Aside from the undoubted strengths of this method of data collection, there are also a number of potential limitations which needed to be considered. It was decided that the advantages of this method outweighed any recognisable disadvantages for this research, with every effort made to counteract and minimise their effects. Discussions around the exact design and data analysis of each study succeed this section, starting with the single case study and then followed by the gatekeeper analysis.
7. Method design and data analysis

The research for this thesis broadly followed three different routes:

(i) Firstly, an extended literature review that incorporated a government documentary analysis of social exclusion, deprivation and multiple deprivation (see Chapter 2 for further details).

(ii) Secondly, an in-depth single case study over an extended time period, which utilised a semi-structured interview technique.

(iii) Thirdly, a gatekeeper analysis of individuals responsible (either directly or indirectly) for crime reduction and offender rehabilitation. Individuals involved in this element of the research represented a wide-range of positions, roles, responsibilities, and organisations.

In addition, the researcher maintained a reflective journal throughout the research process (please see section 4.1 for further details). The remainder of this chapter focuses upon routes (ii) and (iii), which are the single case study and gatekeeper analysis, with the government documentary analysis covered in Chapter 2. This broadly reflects the emphasis that the first element of the project was primarily a foundation from which the two empirical studies organically developed, and therefore
ended up as a relatively small component of the research undertaken over the research period.

7.1 Single case study

Case study is an ideal methodology according to Feagin et al. (1991) particularly when a holistic, in-depth investigation is required. As asserted by a number of researchers in the field, including Yin (1993); Stake (1995); and Feagin et al. (1991), case study research is not sampling research, however, cases must be selected appropriately so as to maximise what can be discovered in the time period available for the study. Case study within this thesis is considered to be the intensive study of a specific case (Gratton and Jones 2010), over a prolonged period. Yin (1994) presents at least four applications for a case study model: (i) to explain complex causal links in real-life interventions (ii) to describe the real-life context in which the intervention has occurred (iii) to describe the intervention itself and (iv) to explore those situations in which the intervention being evaluated has no clear set of outcomes. Generally this case study was concerned with describing the real-life context in which the intervention occurred by ‘giving a voice’ to the case and providing the mechanisms by which he could deliver his message.

The issue of generalisation is a topic which has appeared in the literature with regularity, and is often a frequent criticism of case study research in that the results and material obtained often fails to be applied widely. Yin (1984), however, particularly refutes this criticism via a constructed explanation of the difference
between analytic generalisation and statistical generalisation. In analytic generalisation, theory that has been previously developed is used as a template against which to compare the empirical results of the case study. It should be clearly articulated that due to the single case study approach it is not an aim of this research to generalise findings, as it is recognised that the case study has limited generalisability, with limited scope to larger social aggregates, and thus not representative and conclusive to all criminal behaviour. Single cases may be used to confirm or challenge a theory, or to represent a unique or extreme case, thus when using the single-case explanatory design Yin (1994) suggested the use of multiple sources of evidence as a measure to ensure construct validity. The single case study in this research used multiple sources of evidence including; pre-programme semi-structured interview, reflective journal and weekly reflective diary account sessions during the course of the programme, post-programme semi-structured interview, follow-up semi-structured interview, and the researcher’s personal reflective journal throughout entire process. The rationale for using these multiple sources of data was based upon the premise that both the development of the case over time and the context within which the case was operating were necessary elements of enquiry (Gratton and Jones 2010). Indeed this case study demanded that the researcher spent extensive time with the case to maintain personal contact and explore interpretations of attitudes and behaviours within specific settings (Stake 2003) and time periods (pre/post/during/following the programme).
Therefore, the research design was developed to investigate an ex-offender at first-hand and to explore, evaluate, analyse and explain a selected case from a qualitative standpoint, based on the ex-offender’s own experiences, perspectives and world. As highlighted by De Vos et al. (2002), a case study can be regarded as an exploration or in-depth analysis of a single case over a period of time, with the sole criterion for selecting cases being the opportunity to learn, this proved to be a fundamental objective of this particular case study.

The sports-based programme was voluntary based and at any stage the ex-offender could decide to finish. Two full-time staff were assigned the role of mentors to the participant, with the premise of the intervention to attempt to break the cycle of further offending amongst this particular person. The mentoring staff were responsible for managing partnerships between the University (where the programme took place), the prison, and individual staff members coordinating the sports-based opportunities within the prison. The ex-offender was male and aged 39, had a number of court appearances, and had served more than one custodial sentence. The programme was a post-release sports-based programme that commenced immediately following the ex-offender’s release from prison. If following Brantingham and Faust’s (1976) categorisation for crime reduction efforts, due to the ex-offender’s criminal profile, this programme would fall firmly into the tertiary end of the spectrum targeting known offenders to prevent recidivism. The ex-offender was selectively chosen for the programme by a prison officer whilst in prison, and various meetings occurred between the prison officer, probation officer, ex-offender, and both mentors, prior to his release and start on the sports-based programme. This
was a pilot programme that was looking to continue for future ex-offenders, if possible.

The aim of this study was to assess the potential impact of a specific sports-based programme on an ex-offender, through their rehabilitation. More specifically, it attempted to identify and explore an individual’s journey of rehabilitation from prison confinement back to a community context, with the principal focus of sport throughout. The intensive case study of the ex-offender took place over a 17 month period, and involved tracking the individual through different stages, between the 14th September 2006 to the 7th February 2008. The programme itself involved participation from the ex-offender one day per week over a two month period. The case study approach was chosen because, as Denscombe (1998) argued, the case study enables data to be collected in some depth; focusing on relationships and processes; it takes place in the natural setting; and can facilitate a number of data collection methods. The researcher spent extended periods with the ex-offender both during and following the completion of the programme, facilitating the collection of in-depth data, rapport building, and ultimately gaining rich and detailed data.

7.1.1 Data collection

Semi-structured interview guides were developed for different stages within the research design, for example pre-programme, during, post-programme and follow-up where probing rules were established to obtain responses that needed further depth or clarification within the schedules (Patton 1990). Five separate interview guides
were developed for the research in this case study four of which were based around the ex-offender and each focused on specific discussion areas relative to the time they were conducted, and the fifth being the interview schedule used during the mentor interview. Once developed, the guides were scrutinised by both supervisors in relation to content, structure and the wording of questions, and small revisions were made to a few of the questions particularly regarding the specific wording of questions which sought to remain as open as possible. A pilot interview was conducted prior to conducting the first interview with an individual labelled ‘at risk’ of offending behaviour, via personal contacts. As suggested by Yin (1994) the researcher should possess or acquire a number of skills prior to embarking on case study research, for instance; the ability to ask high quality and appropriate questions and interpret responses, the capacity to listen and be adaptive and flexible in response to various situations, fully understand the issues being explored and ensure an unbiased perspective (Feagin et al. 1991). The pilot interview was undertaken to provide an opportunity for the researcher to test questions, focus on the continuity and flow of probing questions and primarily practice the interview technique. Based upon feedback from the pilot interview and the researcher’s own personal reflection final changes were made to the guide and principally interview technique (please see appendix A for revised copies of the ex-offender interview schedules used within this study and appendix B for the mentor’s interview schedule).
This study incorporated data collection from the following sources:

(i) The ex-offender – Semi-structured interviews over four distinct data collection phases.

(ii) The first mentor – A semi-structured interview with one of the mentors post completion of the programme.

(iii) The second mentor – A summary evaluation report on the ex-offender post completion if the programme.

As mentioned the ex-offender’s interviews were completed over four different data collection periods. Table 7 summarises the general topics that were covered in relation to the different stages, and in line with the overall research aims of this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL TOPIC UNDER DISCUSSION</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION PHASES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1</td>
<td>Stage 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-programme semi-structured interview</td>
<td>6 Weekly reflective diary account sessions (during the programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-release mentoring programme</td>
<td>Description of mentoring programme and week generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting/physical activity background</td>
<td>Feelings on what has been described above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General background</td>
<td>Evaluation of any high and/or low points of the week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of sport in people’s lives</td>
<td>Analysis and making sense of the situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusion on week and what else could have been done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action plan including intended actions for the subsequent week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Firstly, stage one (pre-programme) was essentially a fact-gathering exercise, and was more structured than subsequent sessions with the ex-offender. It aimed to gain an insight into the views and attitudes of the ex-offender, in addition to setting the agenda for the subsequent sessions and follow-up interviews which were to be conducted after the completion of the programme. This initial interview focused on the ex-offender’s views and attitudes towards his own personal background, community, and more specifically thoughts on sport and physical activity. These general themes were generated as context setting, ascertaining an overview of the ex-offender’s background and previous experiences. The intention was to relate this data to the literature on mechanisms of contribution through sport (Shafer 1969; Nichols 1997, 2001; Nichols and Crow 2004 – see section 3.2.1) and risk and protective factors contributing to criminal behaviour (Graham and Bowling 1995; Catalona and Hawkins 1996; Farrington 1996; Beinart et al. 2002 – see section 3.2.2). The one-to-one semi-structured nature of the interview allowed the focus to remain, as discussions were sequenced around themes that had been developed. The interview maintained a flexible, open approach where further follow-up (probing) or changes could be implemented (Kvale 1996).

Secondly, stage two (during programme weekly reflective diary account sessions) asked the ex-offender to maintain a reflective log throughout the entire programme to assist the weekly interview sessions. One consideration was whether the reflective log kept by the ex-offender would remain confidential and not be seen by the researcher, or collected back following the completion of the programme. It was decided that the log would remain personal to the author (ex-offender) but would be used by providing reference points and guidance during the weekly diary account
sessions. There were two central reasons behind this decision. Firstly the log was more about providing a tool that the ex-offender could utilise for recall purposes and thus to assist dialogue during the one-to-one weekly sessions than the actual content of the log per se. Secondly, there was also some concern over whether the ex-offender would feel uncomfortable if he thought his written notes would be scrutinised and therefore he would not use the log diminishing its purpose. The researcher’s own dilemma over the precise use of the ex-offender’s reflective log and its contribution to this stage of the research process can be seen through a personal extract from their own reflective journal:

I am unsure how I should fully utilise the ex-offender’s reflective log within the research process. I have major concerns that if I ask for it back at the end of the process that he will not fully utilise it as a tool to assist our sessions together as he will worry about what to write and how he is writing (spelling and grammatical errors). The purpose of these sessions is not for me to assess what he has written and how he has used Gibb’s reflective cycle (if at all), more so it is about allowing him to voice his thoughts, opinions and attitudes in the way he feels fit – I want to ‘give him a voice’. I do not think I need to collect the reflective log back at the end of the process to achieve this and think that actually there is more potential of hindering the depth and detail provided in these sessions by doing so. (Research journal extract).

The diary account sessions followed an adapted version of Gibbs’ (1988) reflective cycle (see appendix C to view a copy). The aim of these sessions was to maintain rapport with the ex-offender and assess views and attitudes towards the programme on a weekly basis, identifying any changes in perceptions over time. The ex-offender was supported in maintaining the diary with a copy of Gibbs’ (1998) reflective cycle attached to the diary to facilitate his thinking.
The third stage (immediate post-programme) focused on the ex-offender’s opinions and attitudes towards his own personal development through the programme and expectations for the future. This one-to-one semi-structured interview also provided the opportunity for further background questioning extending on from the initial stage one interview. Finally stage four (follow-up interview) comprised a single semi-structured interview. This stage presented certain difficulties with regards to gaining access and contact with the ex-offender, resulting in the follow-up interview taking place 15 months after the participant had completed the programme. Although a time lapse was planned as part of the original design, the 15 month period did cause concerns to the researcher in trying to locate and communicate with the ex-offender. Once contact had been achieved the interview focused upon the ex-offender’s current situation and concluding thoughts.

Interviews ranged between 30 and 90 minutes, with the diary account sessions usually taking 45 minutes in duration. The interviews were conducted by the researcher with all interviews and diary account sessions, apart from the final follow-up interview, conducted in a private office within the University setting where the programme was operating. All sessions between the researcher and ex-offender, again apart from the follow-up interview, were carried out on the day of the post-release sports-based programme. The follow-up interview was conducted at the residence of the ex-offender, due to his availability and transport difficulties. This in itself presented concerns for the researcher as seen through the following research journal extract:
Although I feel I have developed a good rapport with the ex-offender and we have maintained prolonged contact over the research period, I am slightly concerned about the unavoidable setting (at his home) arranged for this follow-up interview. Previous interviews have always taken place in a public setting mutual to both parties, and I am unsure especially given the sensitivity of the participant, that I am comfortable with putting myself in such a position. *(Research journal extract).*

Following the researcher’s own personal reflection, detailed discussions with supervisors and a conversation with one of the mentor’s of the programme, it was agreed that one of the mentor’s would accompany the researcher to the interview. By taking the mentor of the programme, whom the ex-offender was familiar and comfortable around, the researcher was able to remove any potential risk and avoid questioning from the ex-offender regarding the extra person.

The intent of the study was to take the single case study and follow the participant through repeated data collections. The practical impediments to achieving a staged approach across a specific time-frame were unquestionably a concern for the researcher, especially given the fact that the programme had not operated prior to this case and therefore the success and continuation of the ex-offender on the programme for the complete duration was uncertain. The attrition of the ex-offender to this research design was essential, as highlighted by Hakim (2000) the failure to trace respondents at each subsequent stage of the study, and the inclination to withdraw from it presents a substantial problem to researchers.
The development of rapport between researcher’s and their participants is an essential component of successful qualitative research (Gaglio et al. 2006). Listening but without judgement and absorbing the feelings of others were features of the research environment within this thesis (Campbell 2002), particularly in relation to the single case study which at times discussed sensitive subject matter and relied on a sustained relationship between the researcher and participant in order to complete multiple data collection phases over an extended period. As demonstrated throughout this chapter, the researcher’s own journal allowed for reflection on feelings (both researcher and participants) which were conceptualised as a form of data to be analysed as part of the research process. The researcher was aware of their epistemic responsibility and need to maintain boundaries (Dickson-Swift et al. 2006), along with the need to establish rapport, represent someone who at a minimum was non-threatening, and ideally someone with whom those being studied wished to spend time with. There has been discussion in the literature about the completion of fieldwork and the subsequent halting of interaction between the researcher and participants, with possible feelings of exploitation (Taylor 1991). From the outset the case study participant was informed of the purpose of the research, how the findings would be disseminated, and additionally that the research would not have any impact or influence on their situation with regards to future prospects. One of the issues that few qualitative researchers address or even consider at the outset of the research project is how to end relationships with those in the research field (see Tewksbury 2006 for further discussion of this). The final follow-up interview was an opportunity to revisit the topic with the ex-offender and once again address research dissemination. The participant was informed that they were able to view transcriptions of the different data collection phases if they wished
to do so, and the researcher ensured that the participant had their email to enable further contact in relation to the research project. The researcher did not have any further contact from the case study participant following this final follow-up interview.

As far as possible, barriers such as noise and interruptions were minimised by conducting the interviews on the day of the programme within a private office in the gym department. There were a few occasions where the individual was asked to manage the front desk of the gym whilst still participating in the interview process due to a staff shortage, and this proved difficult and frustrating at times to maintain the focus of the session with such frequent interruptions. Due to the restrictions on time when the interview subject was available it was decided that although on these occasions the environment was not ideal the information obtained during these sessions would still be useful and worth continuing.

The researcher recognised that it was important to clearly communicate to the ex-offender the nature of the research and the indirect impact of participating in the study. The request for co-operation in this research even though the researcher and/or research would not directly impact upon his situation and circumstances, might have influenced the level of support that was received. For example if the ex-offender had thought there was a lack of perceived value for him personally. Due to the nature of the research topic and its potential sensitivity, and issues related to confidentiality of information, the ex-offender may have been more cautious about contributing to the research. As the research was an iterative process whereby
separate admissions were required in order to conduct the four staged research design, he was made aware from the outset the length of his intended participation.

Our sessions together generally proceeded in the following manner. The ex-offender was provided with a standardised introduction briefly explaining the general purpose of the interview, and informed that the information they provided would remain confidential and the highest degree of anonymity would be maintained. The ex-offender was informed that he could withdraw from the research at any point, and was notified about the practical issues such as the tape recorder etc. It was also communicated to the respondent that any information regarding unsolved offences should not be disclosed to the researcher and that if this did occur the researcher would be obligated to report such matters to the police.

In addition to the research conducted with the ex-offender a semi-structured interview was performed with one mentor of the sports-based programme following its completion, and a final report on the ex-offender and his time on the programme was provided by the other mentor. The purpose of this interview was to explore a number of key topic areas from the perspective of an individual who had been responsible for the delivery of the programme and had significant contact with the ex-offender. Areas that were explored throughout this interview surrounded the mentor’s perceptions of the programme and their awareness of current sports-based crime reduction practices, experiences of partnership work, attitudes towards sport for crime reduction purposes including the rationale behind the current programme, and an overview of their own personal philosophy towards (ex)offenders. This
interview and the final report provided by the mentors’ was undertaken to add further scope and depth to the case study and provide an additional perspective. Interview protocols can be viewed in appendix D (for the ex-offender’s) and appendix E (for the mentor’s).

7.1.2 Data analysis

Every investigation should have a general systematic strategy when analysing the evidence in order to guide the decision making process regarding what to examine and the reason(s) for such decisions (Yin 2003). A key task facing many researchers utilising data through qualitative means is how to make sense of the data once it’s been collected, given the complexity and subjective nature of the raw material.

All interviews within the case study were recorded and transcribed verbatim, with the data collected during the period of the case study (nine ex-offender interview transcripts, a mentor transcript and a mentor final report) all providing richly detailed, extensive raw data. In addition the researcher’s own reflective journal featured throughout this process. To avoid becoming overwhelmed by the expanse of data collected through the case study, it was vital to be guided by some relatively simple principles of qualitative data analysis. Denscombe (1998, p. 287-288) usefully outlines four key principles of qualitative data analysis:
(i) Analysis should be grounded in the evidence collected (not rely upon abstract theorising).

(ii) Interpretation of findings should be derived from careful reading and re-reading of the data itself.

(iii) Analysis should avoid wherever possible the introduction of researcher preconceptions.

(iv) The process should be iterative, that is, moving back and forth from collection to analysis through constant comparison of data.

The principles suggested by Denscombe seem to be directly concerned with the relationship between theory and raw data, each statement attempting to refute the logic of deduction, where a prior theory or explanation is tested (or disproved) through the collection of data. Alternatively Denscombe suggests that qualitative methodology tends to be more inductive, that is, theory is generated from the data collected, hence a ‘move from the data to the theory and from the particular to the general’ (1998, p. 288). The iterative approach is more pragmatic in the generation of knowledge and is appealing as it describes much more clearly the process the researcher followed when trying to make sense of the data collected for this study. Certainly, the researcher was unable to follow a deductive ‘theory testing’ approach for the study, given the lack of previous research and theoretical postulation available on the area concerned (see Chapter 3). Nonetheless it would be naive to suggest that at no point in time was the researcher informed by wider theoretical propositions during the research, both from the researcher’s own observations and the data collected. Indeed there were several moments during the study where a
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number of key themes were identified and investigated further throughout the research.

A copy of the audio-recordings and transcripts was independently checked for accuracy, and a thematic analysis of the data using a multistage approach was performed. Table 8 illustrates an adapted version of Braun and Clarke (2006) that was utilised during the data analysis stage.
Table 8: Phases of thematic analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description of the process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarizing oneself</td>
<td>Transcribing data, reading and re-reading the data, noting down initial ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the data:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating initial</td>
<td>Labelling interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>labels:</td>
<td>set for that particular stage of the data collection, collating data relevant to each code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes:</td>
<td>Collating labels into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing themes:</td>
<td>Checking if the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>set (Level 2), generating a thematic ‘map’ of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming</td>
<td>Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themes:</td>
<td>tells, generating clear definitions and names for each theme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Producing the report:</td>
<td>Selection of vivid, multiple prevalence, compelling extract examples. Final analysis of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>selected extracts, relating back to the analysis and the research question and literature,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>producing a scholarly report of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Braun and Clarke 2006)

Phase one of the thematic analysis commenced during data collection and subsequently whilst the researcher was transcribing the recordings. The researcher repeatedly re-read through the data to become familiar with the data set. Phase two through an iterative process, labels were generated across the data set separately
for each stage of the data collection period, and relevant data collated. Proceeding the labelling and collating of data, analysis progressed to phase three where the researcher refocused at the broader level of themes rather than specific labels. The various items (relevant labelled data extracts) identified through phase two were sorted into potential themes, which were acknowledged as representing something important about the data in relation to the research objectives which were to explore attitudes and perceptions towards the use of sports-based programmes and to investigate the thoughts and experiences of an ex-offender through their rehabilitation. Phase four involved the refinement of themes where the researcher was responsible for ensuring the data within them cohered meaningfully and clearly, and identifiable distinctions between themes were evident. Phase five involved the refinement of emergent themes and the development of clear definitions and names for each theme. This stage involved ongoing analysis to ensure the overall story was being portrayed. It was important that the themes didn’t try to do too much, or be too diverse or complex. Rather, the researcher considered whether each theme told a story and accurately reflected the journey of the ex-offender, as he told it. Whilst also identifying, and limiting, any overlap between themes, making sure that each theme fitted into the broader overall story about the interview data, in relation to the research objectives. Phase six involved final analysis of extracts and the production of thematic reports. It is important to note that this thematic analysis was repeated for all four stages of the ex-offender data collection (pre/during/post/follow-up), and also for the mentor interview. This totalled five sets of thematic outputs (see appendices F for a detailed example of a thematic output result). An overall thematic output incorporating all four phases of the data collection with the ex-offender was
then further developed to facilitate detailed discussions in Chapter 5 (case study results and discussion chapter).

7.2. Gatekeeper analysis

The gatekeeper analysis involved multiple cases allowing for the logic of ‘replication’ to be addressed, thereby, generating theory in a range of different local settings. For example, by asking the same types of questions to similar types of people but whom operate within a range of different settings and organisations, one should build a more coherent picture of some of the key issues/views and perspectives present. This works particularly well when there are several organisations that do the same thing (for instance directly or indirectly impact upon crime reduction) available for the study (Yin 2003).

7.2.1 Data collection

Having completed the single case study a number of semi-structured interviews (n=21) were conducted with key individuals from a variety of organisations based either directly or indirectly within a crime reduction context. Participants possessed a mixture of roles and responsibilities, and thus provided a range of knowledge, experiences and expertise. Managerial levels ranged from Management Team (Director level), to Senior Manager, to Manager, to Officer. Table 9 outlines the number of interviews undertaken according to the organisation and position of the respondent.
Table 9: Organisations and positions of gatekeeper interviewees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position of interviewee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CJB</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMP</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Council</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Council</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly Government</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Team Assembly Initiative</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working links</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIP</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOT</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nacro x2</td>
<td>Mentoring Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacro</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach Project</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince’s Trust</td>
<td>Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering Organisation</td>
<td>Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMP</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS Drug Aid</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned previously the overall aim of this gatekeeper analysis was to investigate an additional perspective on the use of sports-based programmes for crime reduction, from organisations and individuals potentially responsible for supporting and implementing such opportunities. This study sought to explore a
second dimension to the first study which was much more individually contextualised.

Due to the context and operational environment of the research area access to gatekeepers proved difficult once again. Gaining access relied heavily upon pre-existing contacts within the field and subsequent recommendations from interviewees. Organisation protocols, particularly within the prison and probation service, proved problematic at times often relying on flexibility on behalf of the organisation and interviewee to allow access for the research. On such occasions where a formal application had been requested it was the researcher’s already established connections in the area that allowed delays to be avoided and the research to progress.

The gatekeeper interviews usually lasted between one and two hours, often reflecting the knowledge and experience of the interviewee. At the start of each interview the interviewee was given a brief overview of the project using a standard script to maintain consistency. Confidentiality among all participants was explained and in most cases, respondents appeared comfortable to co-operate. Interviews took place in a range of settings, where the researcher tried to ensure the location was a comfortable setting for the respondent and this was often their own place of work.
Whilst organisations such as the Probation Service, Police and HMP were considered pivotal to the study, other organisations and interviewees were selected because of their local expertise, knowledge, status or particular interest in the topic of the research. While informed by the researcher’s own personal wish list on the variety of different organisations, the choice of interviewees was also heavily reliant upon the advice and recommendations of the previous gatekeepers.

The relatively ‘closed’ nature of some criminal justice organisations, suggested that a rather narrow range of views and perspectives might be obtained. The researcher was conscious that, by relying on previous gatekeepers for the selection of other interviewees there was the possibility of skewed sampling, with organisations pushing their ‘preferred’ interviewees or contacts and thus opening up the possibility of bias in findings. This was countered by utilising both personal connections and targeting organisations that would provide a wider range of potential respondents and responses. These included volunteering organisations, working links, Sports Councils and other relevant contacts.

7.2.2 Data analysis

All interviews conducted in the gatekeeper analysis were recorded and transcribed verbatim. The audio recordings were transcribed by the researcher and transcripts independently checked by the researcher’s supervisors. A thematic analysis of the data using the multistage approach adopted in the single case study (adapted from Braun and Clarke 2006) was once again utilised. The thematic analysis allowed the researcher to determine key themes from a number of different interviewees, across
the entire data set and therefore compare findings between each organisation and identify recurring themes across the board. Whilst also attempting to make sense of any anomalies that appeared to stand out when comparing findings from different settings and is discussed in further detail throughout Chapter 6. Finally the data derived from both the single case study and gatekeeper analysis was later combined and discussed more generally identifying key conclusions (see Chapter 7).

8. Validity and reliability, or rigour, credibility and trustworthiness

Validity and reliability are two important concepts to consider when undertaking research irrespective of the ontological and epistemological assumptions adopted. This said, they are intimately related to one’s perspective on the nature of social existence and social knowledge. As expressed by Gratton and Jones (2010), validity and reliability respectively, refer to the extent to which the method used actually reflects the phenomena under study, and thus, the extent to which the data gathered would be the same if the study was to be repeated. Looking from an interpretivist perspective there is the belief that the research instrument utilised is the researcher himself/herself and consequently, there are no reliability and validity coefficients for an individual studying human behaviour in a natural setting (Leininger 1994; Altheide and Johnson 1998). Therefore, unlike the positivist paradigm, the methods assumed under the interpretive paradigm are not viewed as guarantees of truth. There is criticism of this viewpoint (Morse et al., 2002), where it is argued that validity and reliability are appropriate and essential concepts to ensure rigor in interpretive research. As highlighted by Gratton and Jones (2010) there has been considerable discussion regarding the means by which qualitative research in particular is
assessed. There is a growing consensus that the concepts of reliability and validity are inappropriate for qualitative research with leading authors Lincoln and Guba (1985) arguing for an alternative viewpoint, claiming that within the interpretative perspective, interpretation may differ between different researchers, or even between the same researcher at different times, thus concepts relating to test-retest reliability are unsuitable. Alternatively they state that the key is to ensure sufficient detail is provided so that the study could be repeated by others, even though findings would not be exactly replicated. It is important to consider the transparency of the research in terms of replication of the research process.

Given the very nature of the semi-structured interview it promotes flexibility, and for this reason alone questions can never be guaranteed verbatim from one interview to the next. Furthermore, interviewers will undoubtedly vary in terms of the tone of voice adopted from interview to interview, placing different emphasis on a question depending on the person conducting the interview (Bell 1999). The interviewee themselves is not isolated from emotions and interpersonal influences, and one cannot account for the fluctuations and potential influence on the answers given or even the willingness of a respondent to take part (Lincoln and Guba 1985). Further commentary provided by Lincoln and Guba (1985) discusses alternative terms for reliability and validity such as rigour, credibility and authenticity. Although rigour is related to the concept of reliability, this is more about the appropriateness of the methodological choices made by the researcher. By providing a detailed account of the methodology, data collection and analysis of the research this in itself should provide justification. In addition Lincoln and Guba (1985) claim that credibility relates to the believability of the findings of a study. Sparkes (1998) advocates the idea of
credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability of data collection and analysis procedures to enhance the trustworthiness of the research.

A personal extract taken from the researcher’s journal reflects somewhat thoughts at the time of writing the first draft of the methodology chapter:

I am struggling when it comes to writing about trustworthiness and how this will be considered and proven. The reading I have done surrounding validity and reliability within qualitative research has presented conflicting views, generally it seems to be about providing transparency through the research process and ensuring that there has been strong justification for the approach take. It’s not about me claiming that the results obtained are guarantees of the ‘truth’, and if repeated the studies would yield the same results, more so it seems it’s about me clearly demonstrating how and why I took the approach I did...(Research journal extract).

Various methods were employed to establish credibility, transparency and ultimately trustworthiness throughout the research process. Firstly detailed discussions with supervisors took place throughout the duration of the data collection phase of both studies, with supervisors who were familiar with inductive content analysis. The researcher provided transcripts of the interviews to both supervisors, along with feedback with regards to labelling, interpretations and the organisation of the raw data. Narratives were also provided to supervisors for each of the key themes that had been identified. This procedure is known as peer debriefing (Guba 1990), and closely resembles the external audit advocated by Lincoln and Guba (1985), ensuring dependability, and acting on a secondary means of credibility. In addition the use of specific extracts from the researcher’s reflective journal (which was maintained throughout the research process) aimed to display some degree of
transparency throughout the journey; making visible the choices and decisions made by the researcher.

9. Summary

This chapter has located the research strategy and design within wider concerns of ontology and epistemology. There are various paradigmatic positions which exist along a continuum between positivism and interpretivism, and it is the interpretivist perspective that has been assumed for this research. Thereby interpretivists assume relative ontology, a subjective epistemology and a methodological approach that emphasises qualitative and interpretive data gathering in order to further the existing knowledge base (Sparkes 1992; Denzin and Lincoln 2003; Morris 2006). There is neither a right nor wrong paradigm, but each is different and therefore should be considered from their own viewpoints and in relation to judgements surrounding the research at hand. Both studies within this thesis aimed to explore perspectives of the individuals it engaged, and therefore were located within the interpretive paradigm.
Chapter 5:
Ex-offender case study
1. Introduction

To recap the aim of this study was to explore the use of a sports-based programme, intended for an ex-offender, with the explicit objective of crime reduction. The sports-based programme was a targeted initiative, in a less traditional context, with an older ex-offender (39 years old). The purpose of this study was to focus upon the processes, relationships and experiences that might achieve desired outcomes (Coalter 2012) from the ex-offender’s perspective by ‘giving them a voice’. This research was not concerned with ‘outcomes’ or evaluating the objectives of the programme as a means of determining whether it was ‘successful’. Alternatively the research sought to contribute to knowledge and understanding of the mechanism through which change might occur. Within this unique and specific context, given the complexity of this area it is impossible to develop a definitive and prescriptive programme theory (Coalter 2012), and therefore it was not an intention of this research to generalise findings to wider contexts.

As highlighted throughout this thesis, the majority of literature surrounding sport and crime reduction has been examined with children and adolescents, with less attention given to investigating these processes amongst adult populations. Whilst providing a unique feature to the research, this has also presented difficulties when trying to relate findings back to previous research. This said, whilst not heavily dissolved in previous literature, where appropriate the case study findings have been
applied to general understandings of the area without detracting from the story of this particular ex-offender.

This chapter discusses the findings from the four staged data collection periods with the ex-offender, the mentor interview and final report, plus the researcher’s own reflective journal. The researcher’s reflective journal although used sparingly in this section has been incorporated to provide further insight and transparency of the research process. Although all three elements have been combined to incorporate an overall discussion with reference to specific themes, it was imperative that the longitudinal aspect of the research with the ex-offender remained an important element of assessing whether changes in attitudes, perceptions and behaviour changed over time. For this reason findings for each of the four stages (pre/during/post/follow-up) remain individual entities.

To recap when utilising Brantingham and Faust’s (1976) programme categorisation in its purest sense, the case study falls into the tertiary end of the continuum operating specifically with an identified offender who had been convicted of a crime and served a custodial sentence. This chapter provides an overview of the ex-offender including, general background and offending behaviour, and previous experiences, attitudes and perceptions towards sport. This chapter then focuses upon a detailed account of the sports-based programme, exploring the ex-offender’s attitudes and perceptions towards the programme and highlighting any changes over the data collection period. This is followed by a comparison between the mentor’s perceptions and expectations of the programme and that of the ex-offender;
addressing any consistencies and/or discrepancies between the two. This aspect of
the chapter focused on the lessons learnt and key issues worthy of further
deliberation in the context of this study. These include determinants of sports-based
learning and strong links to education, training and employment; the duration,
intensity and timing of the programme; the role of a mentor; and the transition
process of the ex-offender. These are principal themes that emerged from the
analysis of the data, and are considered to be important to the development of
potential future programmes with a similar remit.

For the purpose of this discussion abbreviations have been used to illustrate the data
collection period in which the material was captured. The following abbreviations
apply:

- Pre-programme semi-structured interview – (P₁).
- Six weekly reflective diary account sessions (during the programme) – (W₁), (W₂),
  (W₃), (W₄), (W₅), (W₆) respectively as conducted.
- Initial post-programme semi-structured interview – (P₂).
- Further follow-up interview – (P₃).
- Researcher’s reflective log – (RRL).
- One Mentor’s semi-structured interview and mentor report (post-programme) –
  (M₁).
In terms of providing quotes and narrative these common codes are used:

- Where the participant’s comments have been included in this discussion: (...) represents a pause or break in the response and (... ...) highlights where the interviewer made comment.

- For confidentiality and the anonymity of the ex-offender has been given a fictional name ‘Joe’ which is used in replacement of the participant’s own name. The purpose of this approach was to engage the reader in the narrative and encourage a stronger connection with the material.

As a means of maintaining the premise of this study, which was to explore an ex-offender’s outlook on his own situation, lengthy quotes have been utilised within this chapter as a way of communicating the thoughts of the participant – most importantly in his own words and language. Thus this case study was about hearing his story.

2. The ‘case’: an overview

This section focuses upon two specific areas, firstly childhood risk and protection factors, and secondly general attitudes and perceptions towards sport. This study aspired to produce a complete insight into the case as a whole, in order to understand the present context in which Joe resides. In order to facilitate this it was important to enhance knowledge surrounding the background of Joe and potential ‘causes’ of his present offending behaviour.
2.1 Childhood risk factors

As discussed within the literature review (Chapter 3), research in Britain, the United States and other Western Countries has revealed a number of influential factors in children’s lives which are associated with an increased risk of developing a range of health and behavioural problems as they age (Hawkins et al. 1992; Farrington 2001). Key criminologist Farrington (1996) suggests that by considering which risk factors relate to the underlying causes of delinquency, and which can be viewed as indicators or symptoms of underlying anti-social tendency, links can be established between these factors and the risk of onset offending. The CiC-YS measures 23 risk factors across four specific domains; community, family, school and peer/individual (Flynn 2008; McCarthy et al. 2004). During initial sessions with Joe he was directly questioned regarding his general background to draw upon this theory and try and ascertain a deeper understanding of potential risk factors that might have influenced the life-course chosen by Joe.

Adopting the ‘risk factor paradigm’ (Farrington 2000), early discussions revealed a number of potential risk factors in early adolescence that might have increased the probability of him engaging in his resultant offending behaviour (Shader 2002). This said, the researcher is not by any means suggesting a direct causal relationship between the two, as this is way beyond the remit of this thesis, but is providing acknowledgement of the potential ‘risks’ highlighted by the ex-offender in relation to this theory. Supported by Farrington (2006) it is difficult to decide if any given risk factor is an indicator (symptom) or possible cause of offending behaviour. Therefore observations remain independent reducing the potential of false conclusions and
over-estimation of explanatory and predictive power (Amdur 1989). This section specifically adopts the four domains offered by the CtC-YS as a means of further discussion.

Firstly, when focusing on a community level disadvantaged communities which are economically deprived, with poor living conditions and high rates of unemployment are at an increased risk of involvement in crime (Farrington 1991; CtC 2005). Joe described his neighbourhood area where he grew up as a ‘rough area’, with unsettled living conditions and constantly moving from area to area. This is consistent with studies that have suggested that there is a strong associated between locality and living in areas with high levels of deprivation and criminality (Brooks-Gunn et al. 1997; Sampson et al. 1997).

The second dimension ‘family factors’ was one that revealed the most detailed insight into the childhood of Joe and for the most part presented the strongest link to the risk factor theory. Joe highlighted a specific incident in his adolescence that he believed had a significant impact upon him as a person and thus his subsequent offending behaviour. Joe revealed that as a teenager he witnessed the murder of a biological parent (in this case his mother). Consistent with the literature, Farrington (2006) notes that in general research has found that children separated from a biological parent are more likely to offend than those from stable families. Joe continued his commentary on his family history by stating that although his father remained in his life, due to his own battle with alcohol, the support he received from his dad was limited. This again is consistent with the ‘poor family management’ risk
factor identified through the CtC-YS and thus the failure of family protective factors (Flynn 2008).

Joe commented on a number of occasions about the negative impact the death of his mother had on his overall mental wellbeing and behaviour. The following quote summarises this major incident as a pinnacle influence on the life-course of Joe:

Rough area...council estate um father was a bit of an alcoholic, well turned into an alcoholic uh mother died when I was seventeen. Was murdered in front of me and ah I ended up in jail within ah eight months of that happening... ...few behaviour problems after that I had a lot of anger problems...violence like...but uh I think that stems from years back... ...pushed from pillar to post, I've lived all over the country, um just moved house to house, town to town. (P1).

Most studies of broken homes have focussed on the loss of the father rather than the mother, as this loss is believed to be much more common (Farrington 2006). However explanations of the relationship between disrupted families and delinquency is said to fall into three major categories (Farrington 2006, p. 26):

1. Trauma theories – suggesting the loss of a parent has a damaging effect on a child.
2. Life course theories – which focus on separation as a sequence of stressful experiences.
3. Selection theories – which argue that disrupted families produce delinquent children because of pre-existing differences from other families i.e. in risk factors such as parental conflict, criminal parents.

Whilst it is beyond the scope of this research to hypothesise behaviour to a specific theory, it is clear that Joe experienced a significant trauma during his adolescence which shortly after resulted in a custodial sentence. The researcher would like to acknowledge that this is Joe’s interpretation of what led to his criminal behaviour. Furthermore at no stage in the research process was Joe directly questioned with regard to his family background, this information was completely volunteered by Joe, potentially reflecting his ease in my presence and the rapport built with him during the initial interview. Following the first interview the researcher logged her personal thoughts following Joe’s revelations:

Today was my first session with Joe, however instantly he appeared relaxed and open in my presence. Although I did not directly question Joe about his background he was very forthcoming with information, explaining his family issues and the death of his mother. Although Joe did not provide specific details regarding this incident, he did not hesitate in highlighting that his mother had been murdered and this inevitably had a major impact on him as a teenager. I felt surprised by this revelation, but ensured that I allowed Joe to divulge the amount of information he felt comfortable with. No further probing occurred on this matter. I felt encouraged by the fact that Joe had confidence in telling me such personal details, and hoped this would continue through subsequent sessions together. ($R - P_1$).
Thirdly when discussing school, Joe was initially positive, claiming that he ‘enjoyed school’, however, he wished he had ‘studied a little harder in school’. He commented that he liked art and PE but would not engage in other subjects. Joe left school at age 16 and it wasn’t until later during his first custodial sentence that he achieved GCSE in maths and English. Longitudinal research has consistently demonstrated links between children who perform poorly from late junior school onwards and an increased likelihood of them becoming involved in crime (and drug use) (Maguin and Loeber 1996).

Farrington (2006) also highlighted aggressive behaviour as a durable characteristic of anti-social children (Garmezy and Rutter 1983). Joe openly admitted that he had anger problems as a youngster, providing a specific example of when he got expelled from College due to his violence:

...uh I got half way through the course and was kicked off the course ah basically the teacher threw a shovel at me to get me to do some digging and all that and I planked him around the head with it basically and uh I was thrown off the course... (P1).

In general Joe portrayed himself as disengaged from school and what might be perceived as the traditional educational system, reflecting the lack of formal qualifications (GCSEs) obtained when reaching school-leaving age. Post-schooling attempts were made to attend college, however as noted he was expelled. Joe disclosed that he had worked in a wide-range of jobs from ambassador conservatories, security guard, factory worker, bar worker and window cleaner. Joe’s jobs were interrupted by stints within prison for committing various crimes. This case
is consistent with the thoughts of Shiner et al. (2004) who claimed that those who encounter significant problems in areas such as education, training and employment are often more likely to become negatively involved in the CJS, or exhibit some other forms of problematic behaviour.

The final domain surrounds the individual and/or peers. Impulsiveness is said to be the most crucial personality dimension that predicts offending behaviour (Farrington 2006). There are a number of constructs referring to a poor ability to control behaviour including: impulsiveness, hyperactivity, restlessness, clumsiness, not considering the consequences of actions, poor ability to plan ahead, short time horizons, low self-control, sensation-seeking, risk taking, and poor ability to delay gratification. Virtually all these constructs are said to be measured in different ways, and are consistently related to measures of offending (Blackburn 1993; Pratt et al. 2002; Farrington 2006).

In Joe’s specific case there were clear signs of early impulsiveness in his behaviour, which were then quite closely linked to his offences. For example, as previously mentioned whilst in college Joe failed to control his aggressive behaviour towards his teacher, and consider the consequences of his actions and ultimate expulsion from college. In addition Joe claims that his first offence was a direct response to the fact that his father stole his wages from him and therefore he had no other option other than to commit his crime:
...I only committed the crime my first time I went to jail, after my mam died, is because uh I’d come home from work doing the job that I was in and I was start to stay with my father, and because father used to drink heavy I jumped in the bath after work left my wages on the side it was just before Christmas, he’d upped and gone off with the wages, I come out and all my money’s gone and I ended having to walk into a petrol station basically and uh held up the place. (P1).

It is interesting how Joe comments that he didn’t have any option with his first offence as this behaviour displays characteristics similar to those identified within many studies in relation to impulsiveness. As Farrington (2006) argued offenders tend to believe that what happens to them depends on fate, chance, or luck, as opposed to their own actions. Such thinking makes them feel that they are controlled by other people and by circumstances beyond their control. Joe’s comments clearly support such notions where his own interpretations of his crimes externalised the blame for his actions to other people or incidents rather than taking responsibility himself.

Even when discussing his most recent offence, statements were expressed where again there was no alternative available, with no control over the situation:

...I’ve been done for ABH and GBH before and assault and all that but uh, this was an incident that uh how do you put it I had no control over this incident. I was out with a quiet drink with my brother...a guy tried bottling me in the face...so I stopped tried to stop him and uh sort of hit him he went down onto the ground and was unconscious and uh his mate jumped on my back and bit me...and I just went nuts then and threw him over and I bit him on the face and uh that’s what I was done for biting him... ... So uh I ended up four year sentence...I had no option but defend myself... (P1).
In summary, it is apparent that from the case profile of Joe that he had experienced multiple forms of disadvantage and was at considerable risk of becoming isolated from mainstream social, economic and cultural life as a youngster. Joe had experienced substantial disruption in his family life, with the death of his mother, and initial contact with the criminal justice system had been experienced at a young age. This is consistent with well-established empirical research that suggests a link between risk factors in childhood and a heightened likelihood of problem behaviour later in life (Shiner et al. 2004; Farrington 2006). Each domain has been addressed in isolation for the purposes of this section, however underlying risk factors are not mutually exclusive but in fact a complex web (Loeber and Farrington 1998; Morris et al. 2003).

If one was to consider the protection factors of Joe there appeared to be a higher risk and lower protection ratio, increasing the likelihood of delinquent behaviour occurring (Catalano and Hawkins 1996; Farrington 1996; Campbell and Harrington 2000). For referencing purposes this theory provides insight into Joe’s childhood and adolescent experiences. Continuing with the case background overview the next section identifies Joe’s previous experiences, attitudes and perceptions towards sport.
2.2 Attitudes and perceptions towards sport

Prior to assessing Joe’s attitudes towards the sports-based programme it was important to explore previous experiences of sport, in order to try and ascertain why this activity might have appealed over other options.

Joe demonstrated a keen interest in school sport as a youngster, something which was encouraged by his father:

... I was in ah school rugby team, ah athletics team, ah run for ah the Gwent schools, played rugby for district ah Welsh under nineteen’s and uh I was always been into it as my father was ah pushed me into sport he had a bit of ah crushed leg and uh I think he sort of looked at me to do achieve what couldn’t achieve… \( \text{(P_1)} \).

Joe continued this involvement in sport prior to leaving school particularly in rugby. However, soon after this period and at the age of seventeen he ended up in prison for his first offence. Following the completion of his prison sentence and a little while later Joe was selected to play semi-professional rugby until a critical injury ended his career. Joe comments that the main motivational factors behind his participation in sport and physical activity changed over time when his commitment for sport tapered once he reached his teenage years. The prime focus turned into a more fun social aspect, with Joe becoming more involved in alternative activities:
...rugby yeah but I ended up in prison then ah just after ah my mother died, and it discontinued then for a while for the time I was in... ...I was getting paid for playing rugby...it was semi-professional...and then uh I got a bad injury had to retire from uh rugby so I lost that income... (P₁).

Without speculating it is difficult to determine the range of experiences Joe sought through sport (Crabbe 2000) during his adolescent years. It would appear that his involvement remained largely competitive with physical participation being the focal point, however enthusiasm appeared to taper during his teenage years with socialising becoming a more prominent feature (Nichols 1997):

As a youngster I wanted to do really well at it [sport], but uh once I started hitting my teens ah that that started to die off...I think you get into other things as a teenager. (P₁).

However, Joe’s central incentive appears to have changed over time and at present is now largely focused on education, and being able to learn more about sport whilst putting something back into the community:

...now I want to put something back into rugby maybe do some coaching in rugby at some point...I'm involved with a rugby club now and I've already been asked to do some fitness training for them and things like that and write out programmes for the rugby lads. (P₁).
There was a clear emphasis placed on education, training and employment by Joe throughout this entire case study and as such it is an area that is discussed in some detail later in this chapter. To date there has been little formal exploration of the role of sport in prison (Meek 2012) of the relatively few small scale studies that have taken place (Andrews and Andrews 2003) authors supported the use of sport in a capacity which de-emphasises regulations and winning, and promotes choice and positive feedback. Andrews and Andrews (2003) cautioned that sport has the potential to replicate the institutional settings from which offenders are often already alienated, and therefore there is the risk that a competitive sporting environment might foster social comparison concerns.

When discussing participation in sport and/or physical activity whilst in prison Joe was extremely positive, often noting it as a form of release/escape from the prison environment:

...I couldn’t wait to get in the gym...I think when you're locked in a cell, that ah getting out of the cell I think and and going into the gym gets a lot of frustration ...it’s actually when I’ve taken part in sport I didn’t feel like I was actually in in prison. It’s it’s a form of escape; ... ... So I’ve taken part in the gym up there [prison] and basically the general interest of uh sport in general, I I’ve always had that but but by going to the gym weight lifting got a lot of frustration of being penned up locked up in a cell really. (P1).

Joe’s sporting experiences whilst in prison were largely restricted to gym-based activities in particular weight-lifting. Strength training within prisons is a controversial subject amongst practitioners (Amtmann et al. 2003) with a number of key benefits associated with the use of strength training amongst inmates. These include the fact
that weight lifting can be used as a behavioural tool, in which if an inmate misbehaves, the privilege of using the gym is removed. Furthermore it allows for teaching qualities such as discipline, record keeping, and goal setting, whilst filling time, reducing boredom, releasing pent-up frustration and tension, and improving self-esteem (Polson 2000). Conversely, negative comments surrounding the use of strength training within prisons are based around the notion that inmates could use their size and strength gained from training in the gym to overpower prison offers, with prison guards feeling intimidated by larger inmates (Polson 2000). With reasonable arguments for both the pros and cons to inmates utilising the gym within the prison setting the controversy remains an area unresolved. This is further explored during the next chapter that focuses upon a gatekeeper perspective towards such topics.

Views held surrounding non-sporting based opportunities available within the prison system were often negative. Joe claimed they provided a lack of meaningful purpose and often result in limited future prospects:

There are other activities in there I could have undertaken, well work wise...but uh dead end jobs really...um you know menial jobs dead ends...They do hardly any work they sit in one room supervised play cards they might do some work maybe one, two days a week and they got no other work on for the rest of the week and you’re sat around all week doing nothing. I couldn’t handle doing that I couldn’t. (P1).
Joe portrayed the use of the gym as a privilege claiming that he was fortunate to be given gym-based activities whilst in prison. Through further discussions it was implied that there was a discrepancy between the opportunities available to prisoners in accordance to their location within the prison, thus the prospects open to inmates did not appear to be standardised across the entire prison system:

…I was lucky enough to be given a gym orderly job uh as a job orderly I had privileges I had use of the gym every day…so the it depends on which part of the prison you were in and what wing you were on and things like that… ...But uh the other opportunities [non-sporting] within the prison is uh really uh lacking, they don’t give you a lot of opportunity. Uh I’m glad I just had the gym to go to… (P₁).

Further into the conversation Joe noted that there were opportunities that he could have followed across the educational aspect within the prison including IT. However, it appeared that the non-sporting opportunities although available did not appeal to Joe, as oppose to there being a possible deficiency. For Joe it went beyond the physical element of using the gym with him achieving the gym orderly position within the prison. It was clear that various sport/gym specific qualifications and awards were undertaken in compliance with this opportunity:

…I sat the OCN…sat uh Youth Achievement Awards…I sat YMCA level two in anatomy and physiology, which it makes me a qualified instructor, so uh the opportunities for that was brilliant so the gym department in the in the prison. (P₁).
When questioned about motivations behind enrolling on programmes/courses within prison, education was the principal incentive and the desire to learn more. Thus it could be argued that sport provided a ‘hook’ for further engagement from Joe, who had demonstrated signs of reluctance working and learning in more traditional contexts (Witt and Crompton 1997; Baldwin 2000; Coakley 2002; Hartmann and Wheelock 2002; Hartmann 2003; Hartmann and Depro 2006). This hook seemed to be a way of getting Joe to engage in an area he enjoys, subsequently exposing him to learning in a comfortable environment (Meek et al. 2012). Apprehensions about attending education and training can stem from previous negative and disrupted educational experiences, particularly amongst offenders (Stewart 2008). Therefore some prisoners might avoid going to the education department in a prison, with its typically traditional set-up, due to the negative connotations this method has for them (Meek et al. 2012).

When considering the PE department, Joe notes how relaxed he felt within that environment, including the difference between the gym staff and uniformed staff within the prison, and the feelings and reactions towards the two. The lack of uniform by the PE staff appeared to portray a relaxed atmosphere and feelings of belonging:

…the gym’s brilliant I got I got no complaints and the staff were good there. It was really weird because when you haven’t got a uniform on the staff there is like ah what do you call it, you don’t see them like staff they were just like one of the lads like my mate or whatever… (P1).
Meek et al. (2012) supported the idea that ‘in order to engage reluctant learners, embedding learning into prison activities is a useful means of making it more relevant and less intimidating’ (p. 2). Thus, a sporting environment has been argued to be a less traditional setting whereby there could be opportunities for staff to build a rapport with clients/participants and thus address further work that needs to be done with them (Taylor et al. 1999).

The next section addresses this particular case study sports-based programme, across the entire data period, with a comparative element between the perspectives of the ex-offender and mentor, being utilised throughout.

3. The sports-based programme

Contact with Joe was made on the first day of the programme, via the initial pre-programme interview. Joe welcomed the opportunity to take part in the research stating that it was his chance to tell his story and hopefully help someone else in the future, by preventing them from making the same mistakes. To recap Joe had been recommended onto the programme via collaborative discussions between the prison and the mentors of the programme. Nonetheless, the programme was completely voluntary and Joe was free to discontinue at any point with no direct consequence on his release conditions. Attendance on the programme was one day a week for two months, and there was no financial support provided to Joe (for example travelling costs).
3.1 Aims and expectations of the programme

It was important to ascertain Joe’s initial aims and expectations of the programme from the outset, and explore whether they remained constant over the data period. During our interview (pre-programme) Joe revealed that the prime focus of undertaking the programme revolved around gaining employment afterwards and increasing his knowledge base within the industry. There was clear emphasis on the importance of the programme as a means of raising the chances of subsequent job opportunities within the leisure environment:

… [Hoping] it [post-release mentoring programme] will lead to work. Yeah definitely lead to work uh I don’t think it would have been a lot harder me getting a job without this. Because…Dave said uh that uh like he’s going to write a report on what I do here and everything and that’s that’s a right step in the right direction as far as looking for jobs… …the more knowledge I learn by being in this environment I think I can only carry on later… (P1).

Consistent with the findings of Meek et al. (2012), Joe specifically referred to employment-related benefits as a rationale for undertaking qualifications and further training. Such benefits were perceived as facilitating the uptake of a career in the sport and leisure industry, and more generally the opportunity to improve knowledge of the area (Meek et al. 2012).

An important observation to note is that Joe was questioned on a number of occasions about his expectations and aims for the programme. These remained fairly consistent and unsurprisingly strongly linked with employment throughout the entire process. However, when the mentor was asked about the aims and objectives
of the programme, he revealed community integration as a key aspect of the programme with an increase in knowledge, experience and overall job opportunities being by-products.

As Wilczynski (2002) noted a key element recommended by the literature is the need for clear and realistic objectives and operating principles for mentoring programmes. This is further extended by Wilczynski (2002) who claimed that ideally these should be developed via consultations with participants and stakeholders, be realistic and attainable, and still maintain flexibility to tailor according to individual needs. There appeared inconsistencies and a lack of awareness among mentors of Joe’s strong expectations towards guaranteed employment afterwards, the result of which appeared to present further difficulties during the latter stages of the programme.

At the time of the programme the expectation of employment seemed to be set in Joe’s mind and one that he believed was definitely achievable as a direct result of the programme. Joe seemed to see this outcome as a necessity of the programme. Life-course transitions, such as entry into employment may be a ‘turning point’ (Elder 1985) in the lives of criminal offenders (Sampson and Laub 1993; Warr 1998). Joe’s expectations were consistent and remained fairly positive throughout the programme viewing it as a means of adapting his previous life course. This is consistent with life-course theories that suggest employment is critical to explaining desistance or cessation from crime (Shover 1996). The motivations of Joe for engaging in the programme strongly map on the resettlement pathway of education, training and
employment – one of the seven resettlement pathways in the Reducing Re-offending Action Plan (Home Office 2004).

Although out of my control as a researcher ‘observing’ as opposed to ‘delivering’, a concern, and one which was logged on several separate occasions was the potential risk that came with such a strong employment expectation by Joe. As identified through Chapter 3, whilst links to employment are significantly supported as key elements of a sports-based crime reduction programme (Robins 1990; Coalter 1996, 2012; Nichols and Taylor 1996; Taylor et al. 1999; Crabbe 2000; Meek 2012; Meek et al. 2012), the potential reality of this failing to materialise post-programme had the potential of increasing the risk of subsequent problems. This is noted through the researcher’s reflective journal during the latter stages of the research process, where there was some clear dissatisfaction and distress by Joe surrounding the lack of confirmed job opportunities available to him on completion of the programme:

During today’s session with Joe it seemed that he was becoming quite anxious about the likelihood of a job opportunity arising directly after finishing the mentoring programme. He appeared concerned in the session and clearly frustrated when asked to talk about his future. I felt quite helpless at times throughout today’s session particularly when he made comments like he ‘didn’t want to be left dead in the water’ following the completion of the programme. I asked him if he had discussed his feelings and concerns with his mentors, but he said he was a private person and that I was the only person that he actually talked to about his feelings. Although I had clearly highlighted at the beginning of the research process that I would not be able to have any direct impact on him or the programme, I felt quite helpless and a little discouraged by the lack of control I had over the situation, particularly given Joe’s honesty and openness about his feelings. (R – Ws).
The researcher tried to encourage Joe to discuss his concerns with his mentor’s, yet trying not to discourage him from confiding within our sessions together. The researcher’s observations in the reflective journal were further supported through statements made by Joe:

I’m eager to get things done now rather, when I first got out I thought I thought right I’m going to try and take my time hopefully it will all pan out and I’m sure it will work itself out. As I get closer to the end of this course I’m thinking I need I need to hurry up things need to be done I’m wanting things to hurry up a bit now… …I don’t want to be left dead in the water. (W5).

These thoughts and feelings were even further extended and illustrated in the final diary account session, where Joe explained that as time was progressing he was becoming even more worried about the whole process and the lack of possible opportunities that were going to be available to him once his time on the programme finished:

…I don’t know what to make of it it’s just I’m feeling a bit confused over it I suppose because I don’t know what’s uh at the end of the tunnel… …I’m thinking wow hold on a minute it’s getting to the end now and still nothing’s going on here well what is going to happen. I just feel something I might be left dead in the water… (W6).

There was clear confusion and disparity over the expectations of Joe and those of the programme staff, regarding the fundamental purpose of the programme. It is well documented within the research that the use of mentoring and mentors can positively impact upon further problem behaviour (O’Donnell et al. 1979; Grossman
and Tierney 1998; Newburn and Shiner 2005; Jolliffe and Farrington 2007), with programmes whereby mentoring relationships are developed demonstrating a significant influence on participants, particularly through critical career transitions (Craine and Coles 1995; Nichols and Taylor 1996; Nichols 1999b). Given the fact that neither parties (Joe and mentors) were aware of the differences in overall expectations of the programme, there appeared to be a clear lack of communication between the two. Unintentionally and probably due to the continued contact and nature of our sessions (intense one-to-one), Joe seemed to perceive the researcher as someone more in line with a mentor, however, the programme staff perceived themselves as somewhat aware of their position as a mentor and the need to address any issues their mentees might have, ‘...as a sort of a mentor you’ve got, you’ve got to find out where that individual is, if they’re at rock bottom...’ (M1). Potentially this aspect was a key limitation of the programme and one which requires consideration in future projects within this context, as there was a discrepancy between the thoughts and perceptions of the ex-offender when compared to the mentor.

Further discussion during the final interview of the programme around the individual’s initial expectations of the post-release mentoring programme become more vague. Heavy probing was required regarding initial expectations highlighted by the individual during the first interview (pre-programme), with comments such as, ‘well I didn’t know what to expect...’ (P2), featuring during the post-programme interview.
This final session with Joe, where he was specifically asked about his expectations of *employment* following the completion of the programme, portrayed responses which were a little dismissive lacking the conviction demonstrated through the initial interview process, ‘Yeah I well I I hope it would…the report I’m going to get I think that’ll help me…get my foot in the door and I think yeah its its achieved it to a certain extent’ (P2).

Weekly diary account sessions with Joe mentioned a variety of activities which were undertaken throughout the programme including: using the computer operated till, attending sports degree lectures, completing inductions with clients within the fitness gym, viewing testing equipment for sprint work, and use of the library for developing programmes. When directly questioned about areas of the programme that were particularly useful, Joe identified the fitness testing and the gym induction performed as key aspects. He believed this allowed him to become fully prepared for the industry and re-adjust more speedily by providing structure. Joe appeared satisfied with the content of the programme, however believed a longer duration would have enhanced the learning process:

…I think they covered it all really it’s not not a lot more that what they could have shown me really…pity it wasn’t longer…would have given me you know a bit more uh learning curve… (P2).
This was consistent with the mentor’s evaluation of the programme where he also highlighted the duration of the programme as being an aspect which might be extended. The mentor stated that a key aim of the programme was to integrate Joe back into the community. As such there needed to be more time available on the programme particularly in the early stages to provide more structure upon release and assist his rehabilitation more effectively:

Yeah, time, time was always going to be a problem... [Joe] was sort of ah, finding it difficult to integrate back inside. If we’d given him more of a structure, maybe sort of on one to two, three days a week, but ah, that just wasn’t feasible at the time. (M1).

Commentary surrounding the length and intensity of a sports-based programme for crime reduction supports the idea that the more intense and longer the programme the greater the impact (Nichols and Taylor 1996; Nichols 1999b, 2004), particularly when operating with ‘high risk’ individuals (known offenders) who require more intensive approaches for a longer time period (Coalter 2012), thus increasing the chances of long-term behavioural change (Davis and Dawson 1996).

When asked his personal opinion on the most suitable positioning of the programme through the rehabilitation process, Joe clearly stated that it should take place once the offender’s prison sentence is complete. Reasons included; confidence building when released around dealing with the general public, there may be too many temptations and distractions for offenders still serving their prison sentence, and ultimately they are not mentally prepared for such a programme. Joe noted that it
was only after the completion of his sentence and release from prison that he felt fully prepared to undertake such an opportunity:

...when you’ve finished your sentence...because it's no chance of uh proper rehabilitation I think by going out one day, or from a prison sentence each week...you’ll look forward to going there but there’s a I don’t know it could been a small possibility of the thoughts of doing a runner and things like that could have come into play...other distractions that you all of a sudden you’re in prison for so many years your getting towards the end of your sentence your put out into the public and your thinking well you you haven’t been there...its going to be a bit of a, it’s a culture shock coming out...I think by having it after your sentence its helping you go back to you know blend in a bit to society... (P2).

In contrast the mentor felt that in an ideal world providing the programme to offenders whilst in prison on ‘day release’ would be the most positive approach to take. At the time of this programme too many unresolved issues had been raised preventing this from happening, for instance the need for a prison officer to be present through the programme duration if the offender was still in custody. As Joe was due for his release it was decided that they should wait until this time. When questioned about future aspirations Joe did not possess any long term plans, but simply immediate plans which involved getting a job within the leisure industry. He remained confident that he would achieve such goals:

...get a job in sport that that’s my first main priority...make a better way of life for myself...other than that I can’t see I can’t really see much beyond that until I get get there...I’m quite confident I’ll get there. (P2).
Through discussions the researcher logged that Joe saw his age as a critical determinant in terms of his change in approach, and the fact that he no longer wanted to follow the same life-course as he had been doing for so many years. With statements such as he was ‘passed it’ and was ‘too old for going back in and out of prison’, he seemed to view the meaning of work and its implications for crime differently than perhaps he had at a younger age. Although the general contours of this ‘age –crime curve’ are well established, the curve’s interpretation has been hotly debated. One viewpoint and that which appeared consistent with Joe’s comments is that of Shover (1996) who suggested that employment reinforces an emergent non-criminal identity among older offenders but not necessarily amongst younger offenders.

When asked about any concerns surrounding the post-release mentoring programme Joe raised no major concerns, there was simply a slight apprehension in terms of the unknown aspect of the programme when he first began, with the only factor raised that could potentially affect continuation of the programme being financial constraints. This said, Joe remained positive about the whole mentoring process and determined to attend the weekly sessions of the programme:

…I’m playing it as it comes at the moment…I was a bit nervous coming here at first but uh they’ve [mentors] made me feel really welcome and uh I’ll get my head into it…what I put into it I’m only going to get out of it…I’ll give it my best shot that’s all I can do…. …uh my money I’m finding, I like since I’ve got out I’ve had what £46 to live on since I been out I’ve had nothing for the last three weeks that’s what I’ve had to live on for the last three weeks. Uh just my money side of it is the only thing that I could that stops me getting here, but I’ll always get here…I’m determined to get here actually I’ve got to get get on with it… (P1).
The financial difficulties continued for Joe throughout the entire programme and proved to be something which was continually raised through our weekly sessions together. The mentor seemed to be aware of this complication and identified it as an area which potentially requires attention in future programmes:

...if the programme was funded, maybe in the sense where he was coming to work, then he would have found that a lot easier, and um, I think it would have been quicker to get him on his feet... (M1).

The researcher noted that a monetary incentive for attending the programme may need to be considered when facilitating such post-release opportunities for ex-offenders, in order to minimise the inevitable financial constraints of travelling costs. Joe demonstrated considerable commitment to the programme even with financial difficulties and the travelling distance (approximately 40 minutes). As identified by Twitchen (1995) a key aspect of a programme is the commitment of an individual to that programme, and the ability to feel attached and empowered to continue. Others note (Coalter 1996) that the voluntary commitment of participants to a programme increases motivation and dedication.
4. Transition process, rehabilitation and reintegration back into the community

When focusing specifically on the transition period of Joe from prison back into the community, one challenge which is critical is understanding the pathways and reintegration of people from the prison system. It is important to establish some understanding of Joe’s transition from prison to the community; this transition is termed re-entry, by which it means the process of leaving prison and returning to free society (Visher and Travis 2003).

In review, offenders are sent to prison as punishment for a crime they have committed, or as some have described it, for violating the ‘social norms or generally accepted standards of society’ (Laub and Sampson 2001, p. 10). These individuals are then returned to society following their served prison sentence, with the hope that they will not return back to prison. Therefore the importance of bridging the gap between prison and the community is an area of particular concern (Berinbaum 2009). One may argue that if little effort is made to increase the chances of successful resettlement and desistance while offenders are incarcerated, then they are likely to return to criminal activity once released, because none of the issues that initially led to incarceration have been addressed (Berinbaum 2009). In general an offender who is given a prison sentence of 12 months or less is automatically released halfway through and only supervised in the community if under 21 years of age (SEU 2002). For sentences of 12 months to four years most prisoners are still released halfway through on licence (with conditions) (SEU 2002). Prisoners released on licence in England and Wales are supervised for a period of time by a probation/parole officer in the community (SEU 2002). Generally, an offender on
conditional release is required to report to their probation officer once a week for a meeting that lasts fifteen to thirty minutes (Home Office 2005). In the specific case of Joe he was released on licence whereby he had to attend weekly meetings with his probation officer.

In 2004 the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) was established post Criminal Justice Act 2003 on the premise that it would better manage an offender’s sentence through ‘end to end’ management, targeting the correct sentence on the correct offender and additionally ensuring the right interventions are being delivered to the right person at the right time (NOMS 2005). It would be naive to assume that prisons can be expected to undo and ‘fix’ in a relatively short period of time the experiences and mindsets of offenders that have developed over long periods. Therefore, there needs to be continuity between the efforts made to support and change offender mindsets accomplished within prisons back into the community setting. The Social Exclusion Unit (2002) rightly pointed out that if efforts are not made to bridge the gap between prison and the community any progress accomplished while in prison inevitably ends upon release.

There was strong support expressed by Joe for the use of sport to integrate back into a community setting following a custodial sentence. In particular Joe personally believed it was an opportunity to give something back to sport and the community, as well as a means of providing direction in his own life:
I think it’s my way in it’s my way back in, definitely it’s my way back in its also my way of giving something back to sport and maybe the community which I’ll get involved in, and uh I think that’s the way, the right way for me to go really…at least I’ve got a direction with this way. (P$_1$).

Joe considered the use of sport through the rehabilitation process of offenders to possess no limitations, however, importantly there was some recognition from Joe regarding the potential obstacles of using sport for some offenders, depending on their particular offences:

...I think sport can break down any barrier really...its endless of possibilities...I don’t see no issue with that [coaching sports] its uh depending on obviously what their crime was or what they were in for but uh that would be the only issue that I could see... (P$_2$).

When asked to consider the transition process from the prison system and back into the community following the completion of custodial sentences, it was claimed that there was a definite lack of support for prisoners when they are released from prison, a principal determinant in prolific offending and recidivism:

There’s not enough done for people coming out of prison I really do believe that...if I hadn’t had our Nan’s I would have had to do another eight months, I’m kicked out I’m on the road, I have no home I’m homeless then, and then part of the way down the line at some point I’m going to be skint and its going to force me into a situation where a crime will either be committed...where you have no option but to feed yourself... ... I see saw many guys go through that in prison...uh times I’ve been on my one sentence and I’ve seen the same faces go in, come in, go out come back in go out come back in… (P$_1$).
A key issue highlighted by Joe was the difficulties adapting to the change of routine from the prison system when back in the community. As expressed by Goodstein (1979) if prison inmates become institutionalised, it is reasonable to expect that they will experience difficulties in adjusting to freedom, especially during the initial period immediately after release. Joe struggled immensely within the initial two weeks where often thoughts of wanting to be back inside prison were experienced, with the change of routine and lack of structure appearing to be the main factors influencing this thought process:

My first uh two weeks was hard it was strange at one point in the first week I wanted to go back to prison…it took me about two weeks before I realised and thought right this it... ...because of the routine I was used to...its totally strange its it totally a different environment...I was let out for one day and then I was let out for five days prior to that on parole release...but once you come out and then reality hits you think right this is it your out, it's a it's a heck of a different thing...to have out in your head like to thinking oh is that where I belong...I realised now that this is the direction I got to be heading and uh you know hopefully flourish... (P1).

As noted earlier one of the mentor’s appeared to be aware of Joe’s struggle during this transition period, offering that the sports-based programme might have been a greater support during this time (by increasing the length and intensity), however, a subsequent lack of resources made this impossible. During the initial diary account session (week two of the programme) Joe continued to highlight his initial struggle with his new found freedom noting that the key factor was the lack of routine on the outside and disruption from his prison lifestyle. Strong feelings of isolation were expressed during this transition period, with the need for greater support during this time:
…it was really hard ah I suppose I been used to a routine and it all just got
turned upside down…I suppose that’s part of being institutionalised I reckon
after eighteen months ah everybody in there everybody doing eighteen
months and over is institutionalised and uh they need help adjusting when
they come out… (W1).

Joe continued to explain how he still reflected back to his prison life but as time
passed his thought process had began to change, and the desire to be back inside
prison subsided, ‘…now and again…it’s just the odd reflection I’d I do sometimes
think oh what I been doing now but I’m glad I’m not there…it’s just adjusting…’ (W1).

Joe’s feelings are consistent with those identified within the literature relating to the
institutionalised effect of prison confinement. Like the shock of incarceration (Lhuilier
and Lemiszewska 2001), prison exits on leave can generate characteristic reactions
caused by the process of assimilation to the prison world, with its culture and way of
life.

Throughout the entire process Joe raised the difficulties that he continued to
experience with probation these ranged from a lack of consistency with the probation
officers available and the overall support offered, ‘…and I’ve seen what one, two,
three, four different probation officers and I’m supposed to be under one and I seen
four…they don’t help in any way…’ (P1).
Discussions through the final interview revealed that Joe feels fully rehabilitated and part of society and that the post-release mentoring programme assisted him through this process. When commenting on the transition process from the prison system back into the community Joe asserted that there is not enough direction and support provided to assist offenders onto the correct pathway, often resulting in a cyclic pattern of re-offending:

…it’s a culture shock going into prison just as it is coming out, and I I think that’s where the government don’t really seem to get get it right they thinking well oh you been to prison you come out right you’ve done your time and your just let go…and there’s nothing to help a prisoner on, to get back on their track, more likely you’ll go back down the same ole road down the same old path you’ll meet the same old mated and end up into the same old thing and end up within a couple of months he’s back in jail…there’s so many returns back to jail, because there’s no structure there… (P₂).

Joe provided a clear example of this recurring pattern of crime as demonstrated on his recent release from prison:

You’re out the gate your forgotten…its weird when I got out the day I got out there was four guys coming out with me and the one turned around and said to the officers as he was leaving, I’ll see you in a couple of weeks…and the other two were sat deciding which car they were going to nick when they got outside the door…they just finished their sentence and I’m thinking well it’s just a matter of time boys and you going to be back here again…and there’s nothing set in place for them you know to pick them up or take them somewhere and say right this, they were just left to their own devices they gone…there’s no structure to actually help them through the first couple of weeks to try and get them on the right road… (P₂).
It was noted that he has experienced difficulties reintegrating into the community following past prison sentences, however has experienced support and positive attitudes on this occasion. It is perceived by Joe that the community can have great bearing on an ex-offenders chance of re-establishing oneself into a community setting:

...this time I’ve had nothing but support from people the first time oh when I got uh I remember when uh I had to go back home...the people on the street its weird you come up the road and you could see the windows twitching...people staring and things like that...a bad attitude...a stigmatise in it uh your sectioned off.... ...I think that the community can have a a bigger bearing on some of these uh the way they are towards them or the way they act towards a person. Once an offender always an offender always stick sort of stick them in a box... ...I believe that some people can be narrow minded...I think that people should be trying to be more be or community or try and absorb the prisoner coming back rather than try and isolate him... (P2).

This is supported by Visher and Travis (2003) who stated that the characteristics of the environment to which the former prisoner returns is a key influential factor in individual transitions from prison to the community. With specific reference to sports-based programmes Tsuchiya (1996) noted that the acceptance of the community towards both the clients and programme itself are important aspects of its effectiveness. Further to this Robins (1990) advocated a community development perspective, whereby the work of a sports-based programme is integrated within the community, to try and minimise the negativity surrounding such approaches to crime reduction. On a number of occasions Joe made specific reference to ‘giving something back’ to the community.
Whilst on the programme Joe enrolled on an IT course which was self motivated and something which he personally highlighted as an area of weakness as a direct consequence of being on the sports-based programme. Joe completed the IT course during the programme period and talked about enrolling on additional courses in this area:

...last week when I was here and when uh Dave said about oh this is the till and showed me the computer side of it I thought well I’ve got to I’ve to learn how to do computers...like it was through this [post-release mentoring programme] I enrolled on it I thought right I’ve got to get something done about it...because I’ve only got basic knowledge, very little knowledge on it...and it’s just picking up on skills. That I will that I need for working down here like on the computer... (W1).

Although Joe is a unique case study and therefore findings might not be applicable to all ex-offenders in the same situation, some general conclusions that can be drawn regarding the rehabilitation of offenders and overall re-entry of offenders back into a community setting include: the need for greater intensive support during the initial period of release, with opportunities provided to ex-offenders integrated within the community setting.
5. Summary

Throughout the programme there were clear personal developments in self-confidence and self-esteem. As the weeks developed Joe gained more and more confidence, even considering the possibility of enrolling within University to undertake a degree course:

Since I been out of prison it’s just uh I know I got a direction I got to go in now, it’s uh I’m not getting the thought oh I want to be back…Uh feeling a bit more confident about myself… ($W_3$).

The literature supported the notion that sport can provide an avenue for achievement and increased self-esteem particularly amongst individuals who have failed in the educational system (Coalter 1996; Nichols and Taylor 1996; West and Crompton 2001).

In the final diary account session there is comment around the possibility of Joe becoming involved in the mentoring process with another ex-offender, however this time as the mentor as opposed to the mentee. This seemed an avenue that Joe would be keen to pursue due to his own experiences and ability to relate to others in the same situation:

…I might be taking another prisoner and doing the role modelling you know you be the second one coming through the line and uh I’ll be his I’ll be mentoring him his role model…I’ll know more about the pitfalls maybe than other people…you know a bit more sympathetic side of it because I understand I’ve been in exactly the same boat… ($W_6$).
Joe demonstrated some clear difficulties with his transition and although he remained positive about the mentoring process, expectations he originally expressed through our initial consultations appeared a little optimistic and maybe even unrealistic within the context they were set.

During our final session together in the follow-up interview 15 months following his completion on the programme Joe had remained in a steady job within the industry since completing the programme and was currently looking for a better job with more money. He appeared to have a secure family environment with the forthcoming arrival of his child with his partner.

To conclude, whilst the programme demonstrated clear reinforcement of positive links to work experience and training there was some disparity between the expectations of Joe and those expressed by the programme staff (mentors). The differences between the two did result in later confusion from Joe, with several key areas requiring further attention in future practice:

(i) The length and intensity of the programme suggested that a longer duration with more intense support would have been more favourable.

(ii) There is a need to establish clear, consistent and realistic aims and objectives between staff and participants, prior to the commencement of the programme to avoid later feelings of confusion and disappointment. For instance, whether employment is attainable.
(iii) The development of a strong mentoring relationship throughout the programme, involving one-to-one sessions and additional long-term support.

(iv) A financial incentive to assist with travelling expenses.

(v) A strong attachment with training, qualifications, work experience and employment, particularly when operating with adult populations – the need for sports-based learning.

Although not an exclusive list, it provides some initial thoughts surrounding the use of sports-based programmes for adult (ex)offenders – from the perspective of an ex-offender and mentors of a sports-based programme operating within this unique context. The following chapter provides details on the second empirical study contained within this thesis which aimed to explore the views and perspectives of gatekeepers towards the use of sports-based programmes for crime reduction.
Chapter 6:
Gatekeeper analysis
1. Introduction

In seeking an all-comprising definition for ‘gatekeepers’ involved within crime reduction activities, it was important that it could be used to refer to work which is undertaken by the majority of agencies involved. Thus in this research, gatekeepers referred to key policy makers and practitioners within the community who were working in organisations that either directly or indirectly were able to facilitate opportunities for (ex)offenders. This interpretation is largely in keeping with the aim of the study which was to access a variety of respondents to investigate attitudes and perceptions towards using sport for crime reduction and which provided an alternative standpoint from that of the previous case study.

Ekblom (2004) highlighted that actions to reduce crime and more generally, problematic behaviour, can range from the individual offender or target of crime, to family, community and institutions such as schools. Policy makers, gatekeepers and partnerships can be confused if they are unclear over which of those entities their crime prevention method is supposed to act upon. In addition there are potential difficulties with decisions surrounding the settings in which to operate and at which level to deliver results.
This chapter discusses the thematic data output from the gatekeeper interviews, with specific reference made to four specific areas that emerged from the data: current practices and approaches identified by gatekeepers specifically relating to crime reduction, general understandings of criminal behaviour, perceptions and attitudes towards sport within a crime reduction context whilst identifying any personal experiences of gatekeepers utilising this approach as part of their work, and ideas and experiences around partnership work and collaboration. In short, twenty-one in-depth interviews were conducted and the themes identified are discussed across the complete data set.

For the purpose of this discussion abbreviations are used to maintain the confidentiality of the interviewee. Each respondent has been given a number ranging from 001 – 021, to allow further exploration of specific individuals and highlight any variations and/or consistencies amongst gatekeepers. In terms of providing quotes and narrative some common codes are used: (...) represents a pause or break in response from the interviewee. Furthermore, the names of individual gatekeepers and specific organisations have been removed whilst still trying to provide the reader with insight into the range of organisations, roles and responsibilities involved in the analysis. The following organisation coding system has been used: Management Team (Director level); Senior Manager; Manager and; Officer. A brief description of each gatekeeper including their overall role and responsibilities is provided:
Officer, Criminal Justice Board.

Management Team, Crime Reduction and Principal Psychologist, HMP.

Manager, Sports Council: Responsibilities to encourage people to be more active specifically targeting individuals above the age of fifteen.

Officer, Sports Council: Responsibilities to encourage people to be more active specifically targeting individuals above the age of fifteen.

Management Team, Research and Information Unit, Social Justice and Regeneration Department, Assembly Government: The aim is to meet the evidence needs of the entire social justice and regeneration department comprising a number of different topic areas. Extensive liaison occurs between the division and Home Office.

Senior Manager of Employment and Vocational Learning, Assembly Initiative: Responsibilities to address issues around employment and vocational learning surrounding key priority groups.

Management Team, Working Links: The organisation was specifically formed to develop the Government’s welcome to work agenda. A number of the programmes specifically focus on ex-offenders through substance misuse and homelessness contracts.

Manager, Drug Intervention Programme: Manages clients through their referral regarding all aspects of their life in particular managing their drug use. Referrals include self referrals, arrest referrals and prison referrals and are aged between 18 and 65 years old.
009 – Officer, Youth Offending Team: Involved in supporting young people through preventative work with both ‘at risk’ and those convicted of offences. Main responsibilities include working with young people who have come through the courts and engaging them into some form of education and training.

010 – Officer, National Probation Service: Aim is to rehabilitate offenders in the community if given a community order following sentencing. Includes an educational aspect such as OCN’s.

011 and 012 – Mentoring Officers, Nacro: Both individuals operate within different prisons, but with the brief to work with young adults aged 18-25 who have been sentenced to prison confinement for less than twelve months. The aim of their role is to assist individuals six weeks prior to their release and support them within the community for between three and six months covering anything that they require assistance with. These are new positions and therefore are not currently working with any particular clients.

013 – Nacro Manager: responsible for four different projects and twelve members of staff and volunteers. Two of the projects deliver basic skills to probation and referrals, and two projects are youth traces projects and environmental around prevention. Clients are referred to Nacro projects for re-education and employment assistance, and therefore comprise anybody with a low score for basic skills.

014 – Officer, Neighbourhood Learning Project. European Social Funded community outreach project with the role of co-ordinating activities to enable learning through the outdoors, delivering to a variety of different groups.
015 – Manager, Prince’s Trust: Works mainly with 16/17 year olds who have often left school with no qualifications, and aims to assist them in obtaining qualifications through a thirteen week course.

016 – Senior Manager, Detective Chief Inspector and Acting Superintendent: Responsibilities for nine Detective Inspectors covering a variety of activities from public protection, intelligence through to operational matters. Personal interest in sport having formerly been an international athlete, and currently interacts with a Sports Council. This individual aims to connect current role within the police force and the crime reduction area of policing to sporting commitments outside of official role.

017 – PC Officer: Involves working in partnership with a number of agencies to tackle drug and substance misuse and mental health issues.

018 – Probation Officer, National Probation Service: Responsible for a generic case load of clients including the Drug Rehabilitation Orders, the Priority and Prolific Offenders, and Community orders of licence cases. The strategies adopted with clients is dependent upon the requirements attached to their orders some of which can include; OSAPP – Offender’s Substance Abuse Prevention Programme, Lifelong Learning and a mixture of multi-agency work surrounding advocacy. Currently there’s very little in terms of diversionary activities for clients.

019 – Volunteering Officer: Role is to recruit volunteers for over five hundred organisations, providing two hundred and twenty opportunities over a wide range of categories.
020 – Senior Manager HMP: A senior manager within the prison responsible for four accredited offender behaviour programmes including: F.O.R – Focusing on Resettlement Programme which is done towards the end of a prisoners sentence, and seeks to prepare them for their upcoming release; E.T.S – Enhanced Thinking Skills, which involves problem solving and working on core cognitive deficits of prisoners; P.A.S.R.O – Prison Addressing Substance Related Offending, which utilises cognitive motivational styles; and the Sex Offender Treatment Programme. In addition to these programme unaccredited programmes are offered to prisoners which have developed organically within the prison.

021 – Senior Manager, National Probation Service Drug Aid: Clients attend the project on a voluntary basis or through referral orders directed by the courts. Responsible for one-to-one and group work with clients covering a wide range of activities some of which include stimulant focus groups, general drug awareness focus groups, education focused, motivational focused, life focused or cognitive behavioural focused, and advocacy. In addition clients are also offered acupuncture to help with cravings, sleep problems, anxiety and pain relief from withdrawals and a limited amount of diversionary activities including climbing workshops.

2. Influence of government strategies and plans

The Crime Strategy published by the Home Office in July 2007 increased the emphasis on aligning crime reduction activity with efforts to reduce re-offending patterns. The National Indicator Set includes a number of pointers including: alcohol misuse, health or economic development, in addition to specific indicators for
reducing re-offending and the re-offending rate of prolific and priority offenders (NOMS 2005).

The current framework for reducing re-offending delivery plans can be traced back to the Social Exclusion Unit’s 2002 report ‘Reducing Re-offending by Ex-Prisoners’. This report suggested a number of interrelated reasons which underpinned a great degree of re-offending, which specifically needed to be addressed at the strategic policy and individual case level. The SEU report identified seven ‘pathways’ to reducing re-offending and was deemed particularly important for the government’s ‘Reducing Re-offending Delivery Plans’ in 2004 and 2005 (Home Office 2004), which built upon the SEU report and focused the action of both practitioners and policy-makers. The seven pathways included:

1. Accommodation – providing access to suitable and settled accommodation for offenders.
2. Skills and employment – ensuring that offenders have the skills, education and training necessary to assist them to settle into suitable employment.
3. Health inequalities – securing effective access to primary care and additional health services for offenders in custody and the community.
4. Drugs and alcohol – encouraging offenders into treatment and providing the required support and through care to help them build productive lives.
5. Children and families of offenders – work to ensure appropriate information and support.
6. Finance, benefit and debt – tackling financial problems often faced by many offenders.
7. Attitudes, thinking and behaviour – programmes and support to address specific offending behaviour and problems.

(Home Office 2004).

The ‘Reducing Re-offending National Action Plan’ aimed to guide service provision and promote partnership working with third sector organisations as a means of achieving best results (Gojkovic et al. 2011). Interestingly only two respondents from the 21 interviews specifically addressed all seven pathways to reducing re-offending when discussing their key strategies and approaches. Despite the differences in the interventions and programmes used by gatekeepers there was clear inclusion of one or more of the broad categories of the seven pathways within their approaches. This said, gatekeepers did not necessarily refer to them as a pathway to reducing re-offending, and therefore it was down to the researcher’s interpretation to place them into these categories. Examples of the variation in the opportunities provided specifically for (ex)offenders included activities such as: acupuncture, yoga and music lessons, however these approaches were believed to target the individual’s attitudes, thinking and behaviour, providing them with a more positive outlook.

Comments made by one particular gatekeeper (020) based within a HMP suggested that there is negativity surrounding programmes and interventions aimed at offenders, in that the focus remains on the problems associated with the individual as oppose to the amplification of positive characteristics. This gatekeeper was not
specific in their commentary, failing to highlight where this approach was being utilised:

A lot of programmes um and lot of the approach to working with offenders is very much based on what’s wrong with you. And you know I can fix you, and we, we feel, here, here in this prison at least, that um we try to focus much more on actually what’s right with the person, and on amplifying that. (020).

Only one of the gatekeepers surprisingly mentioned the notion of ‘end to end’ offender management which was originally introduced by NOMS. Simply this involves working with the most serious and prolific offenders to address the underlying causes to their offending but with specific emphasis on ensuring continuity of service provision across custody and into the community. In 2004 NOMS intended to integrate the probation and prison services of England and Wales by providing an operational framework for the ‘end-to-end’ management of offenders throughout their sentences (Robinson and Burnett 2007). Interestingly when questioned about the opportunities available to individuals on community sentence orders, and whether they were appropriate, challenging and motivating to individuals through their rehabilitation, the specific gatekeeper (010) responsible for this stated, ‘some of the things we do, yes I would say are good but some of the things we do are negative and not, not helping them at all in their rehabilitation’ (010). Implying that although some of the opportunities were useful others were quite unproductive and negative in their nature.
Gatekeeper **010** continued to comment that although they believed the opportunities available needed to be revised and more efficient as rehabilitation mechanisms, speaking personally as an individual gatekeeper they were not in a position whereby they held the authority to make the necessary changes to the unpaid work orders offered. Therefore this gatekeeper stipulated that they would continue to wait until the Home Office implemented changes:

...I mean that comes probably from the Home Office down I would imagine; from them like, somebody one day will probably come up with a brain wave in the Home Office to do that but unfortunately it's not not yet...And it will just take somebody you know in the Home Office to figure it out or somebody you know, but I am sure it can be done. **(010)**.

Overall there was much commentary amongst gatekeepers about how their approaches to crime reduction were very much controlled by the Home Office, allowing for limited input from them as individuals, and also their organisations as a whole. Many gatekeepers demonstrated clear frustrations with this approach to local practices, stating that the government and their choice of the ‘in word’ was a big hurdle for them. Several of the interviewees elaborated, ‘...but I think one of the biggest hurdles we’ve got um, politicians. Now everything comes down to what the Home Office says, what the Government say’ **(011)**. In addition gatekeeper **(012)** offers it's ‘what the in word is at the moment isn’t it’. Gatekeeper **(005)** further comments on this matter:
...I’m not sure that’s universally true I mean I think one of the complications of crime per se is that quite a lot of action is driven by political by political reasons really. Um so some things that might that might work that might actually be very effective but probably politically impossible to implement even if you wanted to. Uh and some of the actions that take place are probably not very well evidenced but but need to happen because of you know perceived need to respond to a problem in a particular way. Um so as far as Home Office as far as Home Office led work is concerned I would say that the evidence base is usually quite strong…whether that evidence base then works through into actual policy is a slightly different issue. (005).

Interviewee 005 continues to note the frustrations faced by many gatekeepers around the concern of those delivering strategies on the ground:

So all of this is very important a lot of a lot of what happens in terms of interventions in this field as I say is driven by kind of raw politics…about what’s going to appeal to the public, what’s going to get people the most you know the prejudice is it the particular politician… (005).

In contrast gatekeeper 008 discussed how they were personally trying to move away from a conventional approach such as counselling and alternatively trying to introduce new activities to clients. This gatekeeper discussed utilising his own personal interests and hobbies, transposing them into his day-to-day working environment:

…I found was they had had so much counselling over the years, and interaction with youth workers and whatever, these guys are in their 30’s the one’s who are working well on this, they’re kind of sick of talking about drugs. They wanted something else, and I could see they were glazing over, they would go once or twice then they wouldn’t attend again. So no, they do enough of that in the week we need to look at something else which is a bit more fun, something you can talk about on the weekend, something which you will lead into the weekend as well in a healthy way you know. And sort of
something that will give you that feel good factor you’re gonna get from being outside and scaling a 60ft cliff face so, you know that was what lead to that really, but we did actually try acupuncture for a while which went really well. And we also put a yoga course on as well which was really cool. (008).

Although not exclusive to sport, reference can be made to the literature surrounding traditional rationales for using sport within a crime reduction capacity (and potentially drug abuse). Consistent with the work of Nichols (1997) the gatekeeper describes four out of the seven rationales associated with sport, these include; meeting a need for excitement, improving physical fitness, increasing self-esteem and sense of control, whilst developing cognitive competencies. This particular gatekeeper (008) refers to his own work within drug prevention, using various activities (including sport) as a ‘hook’ to retain participants (Taylor et al. 1999; Nichols 2007). However, this gatekeeper also highlighted the difficulties they had experienced with trying to adopt this innovative approach with clients and the resistance faced by managers:

One day a week so far. That’s all they allow me to do but we are looking to developing the role to be honest with you, and that was a bit of a contentious point for a long time you know. Our managers really didn’t want us to do any activities it was just refer them through to an organisation. (008).

Overall current practices were vague amongst gatekeepers, with some gatekeepers feeling unconvinced by the policies they were implementing. There was a strong consensus and general discontent around the fact that they had minimal input into their personal approaches, and that actually regardless of their own opinion and or practical experiences, they were obliged to follow the guidelines provided by the Home Office.
3. Criminal behaviour: a general overview of gatekeeper attitudes and beliefs

As claimed by Shiner et al. (2004), ‘...there are a number of readily identifiable ‘risk factors’ in childhood and adolescence that heighten the likelihood of problems later in life’ (p. 13). In total twelve out of the twenty one gatekeepers engaged with discussions surrounding the notion of potential risk factors and their prospective impact on criminal behaviour patterns. Therefore the results obtained for this section are specific to those twelve that provided their views on this matter. Overall there was considerable acknowledgement by all twelve gatekeepers that potential risk factors if evident could result in a causal relationship to crime, due to their strong statistical relationship to recorded offending (Catalano and Hawkins 1996; Farrington 1996, 2000, 2006).

It is important to note that one gatekeeper in contrast to the widely accepted literature on the ‘risk factor paradigm’ highlighted that although aware of the evidence surrounding potential risk factors, they believed that this was not an accurate prediction of whether an individual was likely to become involved in crime,

I don’t know, I mean there’s a, the standard answer to that is always you know if your parents are drug users and if you come from a poor environment and if you know you weren’t given any education or any nurturing with with health or with you know all these sort of things then that leads to criminal behaviour. Um and I, and I do understand the empirical evidence for that, and there’s a there’s lots of research, and I do get it you know. I I do understand that kind of hidden harm perspective that’s been released, sort of 2004 was it or something.... But I also just definitely don’t think that just because your parents are an alcoholic means that you’re going to be one. Or just because my dad beat my mum up that I’m going to be one, and that’s going to send me to prison. Or just because everyone else in my family has you know been in and out of prison all my life I will, because I, there’s just more going on than that and it’s a difficult one for me to answer. (021).
As Farrington (2006) warned, it is difficult to decide if any given risk factor is an indicator (symptom) or possible cause of offending, however, knowledge regarding criminal careers (Farrington 2001) suggested that risk factors are a general pattern of childhood anti-social behaviour (Graham and Bowling 1995; Capaldi and Patterson 1996; Farrington 2000). When looking more closely at the specific risk factors that were identified by the gatekeepers, a typical opinion of all the gatekeepers was that family environment, parenting and nurturing presents the biggest risk factor for an individual. One particular remark provided by gatekeeper 020 illustrated this point and thus the view of the gatekeepers:

So if you’ve got, if you’re brought up in a nurturing supportive kind of family or family unit type thing, um then you’re less likely to get into offending, than if you, if you grew up in a um in an environment where there was um you know openly substance misuse, offending, violence um if there wasn’t that kind of nurturing, bonding element there then that’s likely to again statistically that’s likely to push you towards offending. (020).

Such views are confirmed by all the major longitudinal studies (Wadsworth 1979; Ensminger et al. 1983; Fergusson et al. 1986, 1994; Mednick et al. 1990; Coughlin and Vuchinich 1996) that revealed there is some relationship between broken homes and delinquency. Weatherburn (2001) continues such thoughts by stating that factors that are associated with or indicative of inadequate parenting are amongst the strongest predictors of, at the very least, juvenile involvement in crime. Through further discussions with many of the gatekeepers there was a strong consensus that more effort was required in targeting this specific risk factor, for example, through the development of detailed parenting programmes. Weatherburn (2001) noted that such
experiments aimed at improving the quality of parenting have occurred and often proved uniformly successful (see Yoshikaiwa 1994).

There was also clear agreement among the gatekeepers interviewed (75%) that geographical area and the overall culture of neighbourhoods can have a strong impact on the choices made by individuals, and what might often be considered the ‘norm’. Such opinions are put into context by gatekeeper (010) who remarked:

Um I think as well um Location, where people, where they are brought up. Um if, If they come from an environment or an area where crime is sort of pretty much the norm then that’s not going to have a great effect on them at all. I mean when looking at the numbers, I haven’t got, I don’t know the stats of it but there are certain areas where I get people on the, on the unpaid work community side of it bus, who committed offences are of a certain area, and there’s about two or three of them. We get from all areas, but the majority, I mean, somebody would have to do the stats on it, then these couple of areas would come out on top all the time. So that must tell you something as well like. (010).

Weatherburn (2001) declared that it is much harder to measure and monitor factors which lead to high crime communities as oppose to those which lead to crime-prone individuals. Therefore he asserted that the understanding surrounding this area is somewhat weak. This said through his work Weatherburn (2001) acknowledged five different but not mutually exclusive explanations for crime prone places, these include: (i) Inequality, poverty and unemployment (ii) Weak informal social controls (iii) Criminal opportunity (iv) Gangs and organised crime (v) Lax/insufficient law enforcement. A few of the gatekeepers acknowledged the explanations provided by Weatherburn (2001), but did this more precisely within the context of discussing the
problems and difficulties they had experienced in changing the behaviour patterns of offenders/ex-offenders (see the next section).

Two additional commonly cited risk factors that were discussed by almost half of the gatekeepers, included: the negative impact of association with delinquent peers, siblings and partners; and the impact of poor levels of academic performance, schooling and employment. In addition other general risk factors identified by a few gatekeepers were drug and alcohol issues, mental health and physical disabilities, homelessness, experiencing childhood and adolescence with criminal parents, and finally a personal choice to follow the route of crime.

Evidently the risk factors recognised by many of the gatekeepers were consistent with those identified by Farrington (1996) and in summary included: poor parenting (consisting of abuse, neglect, mistaken discipline, lack of supervision and marital conflict); poor housing and poverty; association with delinquent peers, siblings and partners; lower measures of intelligence, poor academic performance through schooling and persistent truancy; high levels of impulsiveness and hyperactivity; experiencing childhood and adolescence with criminal parents.

As previously identified within earlier chapters evidence suggested that individuals exposed to multiple risk factors are disproportionately likely to end up as serious or persistent offenders (Graham and Bowling 1995). Reference to this was made through one particular interview (009) whereby it was acknowledged that many of the
individuals referred to organisations such as the YOT possess multiple risk factors and often the more factors that exist in that person’s life the more support they require in order to change their existing behaviour patterns:

Um I think quite often they all come together. I think it’s quite common that um if again you look at the young person individually that they might have you know a few of those factors. Um, with them and uh, um and I would say the more of those factors which, that exist in that person’s life, I think increases the chances of them you know, being involved with the Youth Offending Team for a longer period of time, and how I look at it myself is that they might have a young person come through YOT for say, I don’t know, maybe you know for an offence, which is you know, what you know I would say wouldn’t be you know that serious… Um if you look then at the parents then maybe you know you can see the issues with them, poor parenting skills and so on. (009).

3.1 What works – the ability to change?

For nearly 30 years the masters of the criminal justice system had resorted to a belief which they summarised in two simple words: ‘Nothing works’. Overall comments made by participants suggested mixed opinions surrounding what works, however, as expressed by 002 there did appear a general consensus by many gatekeepers that the notion that ‘Nothing works’ no longer exists, ‘There’s a situation where I think we do actually know now what will work and what wont, and trying to quite systemically address those issues’ (002).

A total of thirteen gatekeepers interviewed expressed opinions surrounding the ability to change criminal behaviour patterns. Of those there was considerable support for the belief that every individual had the ability to change (in the absence of mental health issues) their criminal ways. This said, surprisingly four of the
gatekeepers commented that there would always remain an element of offenders that would never change their criminal lifestyles regardless of the support and opportunities that were offered to them. One gatekeeper (010) extended these thoughts further stating, that there could even be an equal split between those who had the ability to change and those whom would always continue in a life of crime: ‘Um If I was going to give a percentage um, I think, I think it could be about a 50/50 per cent’ (010).

Interestingly, the prime determinant recognised by over half of the gatekeepers with regards to changing criminal behaviour patterns was the offenders/ex-offenders personal motivation, drive, want, and determination to change their own behaviour. Gatekeeper 020 explained this commonly cited view:

That’s the core for me is that if you don’t motivate someone to change what they want in life, then it doesn’t matter what you offer them, he’ll throw, they’ll, they’ll you know use it and abuse it; and throw it away. And you know we, the evidence of that is all around you. And you know I think that’s fundamentally where um a lot of Criminal Justice falls down. Is that they don’t, there’s not enough effort is put into motivating the person to change, that’s the core of it. (020).

In particular over a quarter of the gatekeepers identified the potential impact of their own specific roles in changing behaviour patterns, including the importance of recognising when individual’s are ready to engage with the opportunities available to them:
The question is um about catching them, or when they’re ready, or preparing them to be ready; so that the, the, the expression of readiness is um is kind of critical. Um so you being able to, for a start being able to recognise when a person is becoming ready, in terms of when they’re likely, most likely for you to be able to approach them and engage with them, kind of get them to kind of sign to do a programme. (020).

In addition, identifying realistic targets and accurate support for offenders/ex-offenders, and ensuring that as gatekeepers they remained truthful with their clients to avoid unrealistic expectations was also essential. Other views incorporated recognising and assisting clients in acknowledging the causes behind their behaviour, and tailoring towards individuals needs (Taylor et al. 1999; Cameron and MacDougall 2000). General perceptions highlighted by a few gatekeepers consisted around the need to empower clients to improve their overall self esteem (Nichols and Taylor 1996; West and Crompton 2001), through the positive use of mentoring to develop and support individuals through a life away from crime. Mentoring has been a central feature of much of the research on sports-based programmes for crime reduction (Davis and Dawson 1996; Nichols and Taylor 1996; Audit Commission 2009). Although not in reference to sports specific interventions these opinions are illustrated through the remarks of gatekeeper 016, ‘...to try and visualise themselves and their self esteem and balance this off against the pull of something else which is negative. Um and mentoring is um an absolutely key to it’ (016). Surprisingly only one gatekeeper made reference to the difficulties in measuring change in behaviour, and also only one gatekeeper acknowledged the notion of how the type of crime committed could essentially impact on the ability of the individual to change their behaviour patterns.
A total of thirteen gatekeepers provided commentary on the difficulties they had personally experienced in dealing with offenders/ex-offenders, and changing their criminal behaviour patterns. Of those the overall perceptions were mixed with no over-riding theme offered. Nonetheless, over a quarter of the gatekeepers were of the opinion that often their clients lacked responsibility for their behaviour, and the drive, motivation and commitment to change. Lack of recognition by offenders/ex-offenders of the causes and problems leading to offending behaviour was also acknowledged as a key difficulty for a quarter of the gatekeepers. Again a quarter of the gatekeepers perceived the notion of ‘learnt behaviour’ and the development of generational culture as fundamental complexities in the rehabilitation of clients. Gatekeeper 013 clearly noted such opinions:

Learnt behaviour to me is about you know how, how an individual has grown up, it’s all they’ve ever know, it’s what they’ve been a part of in their sort of circle, social circle or life history. If they’ve been, if they’re a family growing up on benefits, because their parents have lived on benefits. (013).

An interesting factor highlighted by some of the gatekeepers was how the availability of employment and financial gain can significantly impact upon the choices made by offenders/ex-offenders, and thus the overall success rate in changing behaviour patterns. This typical opinion is illustrated through the statement of gatekeeper 005:

But in terms of behavioural change I think it’s an extremely difficult thing to to try to do, um and I think it’s particularly true because when people leave prison the odds are very much stacked against them in terms of you know their likelihood of being integrated or reintegrated into any kind of stable life really which doesn’t involve crime. Um so much in life depends upon economic uh prospects, so much in life depends upon work, um and if that’s
denied to people then more of a reason then to make it much more likely they’ll turn to crime. (005).

In addition to those difficulties already mentioned a few gatekeepers also identified the following: high levels of impulsiveness, and the notion of instant gratification often obtained through acts of crime; the availability of funding and resources for gatekeepers to work with offenders/ex-offenders; the lack of self-esteem of offenders/ex-offenders; and any additional alcohol or drug issues.

Interestingly, three of the gatekeepers claimed that there is a significant lack of deterrents within the criminal justice system, this can be seen through the remarks of gatekeeper 017:

...the offender system I think could be improved um I don’t believe we have massive deterrents at the moment. Quite often cos obviously offenders, who have an awful lot to lose we deal with. But a massive amount of our offenders are actually better off in prison and for that reason alone, there is no reason for them not to offend. Um they find it comfortable, warm they have three square meals a day, um and life is run for them, they have very little to contribute, and I think while we make it a um reasonable option for them, you know in that I know they’re locked up 23 out of 24 hours or whatever it may be. But for a lot of offenders that’s still better than what they’ve got on the outside. And that’s a small amount again um but the deterrent is not there, the sentences are not particularly long um if they’re not given a um sentence if they’re given probation or whatever it maybe. It’s a very slow and cumbersome system with a you know not much deterrent at the end of it. They haven’t got much to lose, that’s probably the easiest way to put it. (017).
Such views were extended much more strongly and somewhat alarmingly by the view of gatekeeper 014 where opinions expressed, although light-heartedly, implied the necessity for sterilisation and imposed birth control among those individuals who demonstrated deviant behaviour and committed crimes:

...what really is needed up here, is a five year military curfew, and a programme of sterilisation (Laughter). Now you’re getting into the uncomfortable territory of eugenics. Social engineering through ‘birth control’, but we are in that uncomfortable territory, this is not unusual for people to discuss these things. We are talking about children having children children who can’t look after themselves having children. Who just haven’t got a chance you know, and these are the children, of the children, of the children already. Their grandparents were out of work, their grandparents will know their rights, and will be screwing the system for all it’s worth. And that’s what they’re growing up into, and we have to address this, at some point we’re going to have to address this, you know. Three crimes and you’re off, you know like. I know they use it in America with “at risk” girls, where they did um subcutaneous um, contraceptive implant, that’s for five years. We have to start dealing with these cases because for instance again, it’s a fairly known fact. Two families up here are responsible for 30% of the crime in the whole Borough, it is genetic, or it’s certainly inherited. Whether genetically, or behaviourally...But, but those, those are the problems you know these are the problems for Central Government to start addressing. And until people are prepared to ‘bite the bullet’ and start talking about things, like eugenics and imposed birth control you know, saying to these girls right you’ve, you’ve commit three street robberies, and beaten up five old grannies, we don’t want you having kids. We should value childhood; we should value children and life enough to be able to do that. You know, we don’t have the right, I don’t. Again we got to work within the terms of the European Human Rights Act, and all the rest of it. But that’s my opinion. That’s what I think there is far, far deeper and far more serious and far more fundamental changes are needed. What we are doing is tinkering, we’re trying to dress it, deal with, it hide it move them on, massage the figures unfortunately. (014).

Nine respondents engaged with discussions surrounding the ability to change behaviour patterns according to the age of offenders/ex-offenders. Almost all of the gatekeepers demonstrated considerable support for targeting the younger population claiming that there is a potential to have a far greater impact on this age band. In
general the reasoning provided for such thoughts included: as an individual gets older and develops further down towards a criminal lifestyle it becomes harder to change their mentality and thus the choices they make, whereas the younger generation are perceived to be much more malleable and responsive to alternative pathways (Crow 2001). The statement expressed by gatekeeper 020 concisely identified the opinion of the majority of gatekeepers:

I think um, um evidence and, and my personal opinion, um suggests that the older a person gets, the harder it is to engage with them. Um and I guess that’s logical really when you think about it. In terms of peoples’ mindsets and how resolved people become to their lifestyles, and their situations, the older people get, the more you know they’re inclined to think “this is my lot in life it’s the hand that I’ve been deal, and that’s what I’ll play with”. Um whereas you know, the younger they are, um they tend to be more ‘soft-wired’ um and malleable, and so you know, you can work with people. Ideally if you can work with children, who are on the, the kind of cuffs of um offending, kind of 12/13 years old in the community. If you could, if you could work with that, effectively there’d probably be a lot less people in prison. Um you know, there’s a rise in the population of young people coming into prison, um which I think reflects the lack of effective intervention in the community at that earlier age. So yeah I mean, certainly you know I’m working with guys who are kind of in their forties and fifties, and trying to engage them and, and work with them about their offending, is really difficult. (020).

In addition, some gatekeepers claimed that children as young as 6 and 7 years old should be targeted, this is consistent with the thoughts of some authors (Homel et al. 1999; Farrington 2002) who asserted that it would do no harm to introduce preventative measures during the very early stages of infancy amongst those at an increased risk of developing anti-social behaviour later in life. Conversely, two of the gatekeepers held an opposing view whereby they perceived the potential to have a greater impact on the older generation, as they believe that individuals reach a point in their lives usually when they are around thirty plus, where they want to change
and turn their life around and their criminal ways begin to plateau. Such views are consistent with the life course perspective and the arguments that state crime rates decline with age (Gottfredson and Hirschi 1987):

I think it’s far more difficult to work with the younger age group than it is with the older. I think if people come to us if they’re sort of thirty plus, generally, and I’m not speaking for everybody, but generally speaking I would say they’re a little bit older and wiser, and they don’t want to continue to go through the Court system, they don’t want to keep coming to probation, they’ve had enough of whatever it is, or whatever the reason it is that they’re on probation for. And you know more often than not, they’re quite compliant, they want to get it finished, you know they want it done and dusted. I think with the youngsters some of them, actually I don’t know about enjoy, but are not, certainly not afraid of going to prison. Some of them relish the opportunity to go to prison, because it is the only structure they’ve ever known, it is the only constant they’ve had in their lives, and in fact often being in custody is the better option than being out in the community for them. (018).

While almost all acknowledged the ability to impact according to age whether that be the younger or older population, three of the gatekeepers suggested there was no particular age that provided a more significant avenue to impact upon criminal behaviour patterns.

4. Perceptions and attitudes towards sport as a means of assisting crime reduction

The use of sport, recreation and physical activity as a strategy for crime reduction, produced limited responses from gatekeepers who predominately viewed it within the prison system via the gym, and as a diversionary tool for young people. As highlighted within the review of literature there is an extensive amount of literature available surrounding the use of sport and recreation as a diversionary mechanism.
for ‘at risk’ young people (Coalter 1989; Robins 1990; Begg et al. 1996; Coalter 1996; Davis and Dawson 1996; Witt and Crompton 1996; Cameron and MacDougall 2000; Hartmann 2001; Astbury et al. 2005; Hartmann and Depro 2006; Coalter 2012). The use of sport as a diversionary mechanism is an approach that the police are keen to utilise and was raised by one Management Team who said,

There’s a number of different examples of that, from Salsa nights, to Bike Clubs, um to Competitions throughout the summer of various sports um there’s a list that I can give you, in fact I’ve got some examples that I can give you in the way it is set out…The age band is usually between um trying to target sort of thirteen to sixteen age group…the aim is to um link in with those young people, um who are predominately responsible for committing ‘Anti Social’ behaviour in area, this is where they get the support of the local people; that we’re targeting the right people…Um it’s not a science it’s not a scientific as that because within that group there are going to people that have never been involved in with the police, haven’t got criminal records, whereas there can be others that will be at different degrees, but I would say generally not at a level where they’ve been to prison. Um more at a level where potentially the minor offending can lead towards that. (016).

The approach described by gatekeeper (016) is often associated with the preventative orientation of sports-based schemes (Coalter 1996) which generally underpin large-scale sports-based programmes that target specific areas, by encouraging the positive use of leisure time and capitalising upon supposed socio-psychological outcomes associated with sport (Bailey 2005). With reference to Brantingham and Faust’s (1976) programme categorisation the approach outlined by this gatekeeper (016), is concerned with both primary and secondary reduction through the modification of criminological conditions and early identification and intervention into the lives of ‘at risk’ individuals.
The use of outdoor activities was more common place among the gatekeepers, ranging from educational organisations through to drug agencies. For these gatekeepers using outdoor activities was viewed as a great mechanism by which individuals were able to become physically active and develop team building skills. This gatekeeper remarked,

Using sort of the outdoors as a means to developing team skills you know sort of doing things like rock climbing, canoeing, gorge walking. And again it’s about developing the, the team so that they can sort of bond together. (015).

Many outdoor adventure programmes are based upon experiential learning from the belief that learning or behaviour change can be affected by including direct experience in the growth process (Gass 1993), alongside the theoretical justifications for the use of sport in developing personal skills and relationships (Nichols 1997, 1998). The Duke of Edinburgh Award Scheme was also mentioned as a programme that is utilised particularly within the Probation service with their young people. However, it is difficult to conclude the exact reasons behind the use of outdoor activities amongst gatekeepers without speculating. Although a general description was provided about the activities of the programme, the rationale behind the decisions to use them was somewhat vague.
The gatekeeper interviewed from a voluntary organisation (019) acknowledged that it did not actually have any sport specific opportunities available on the books. In addition individuals interviewed from the National Probation Service declared that there were no sport specific diversionary activities available to clients at the present moment.

Of the two respondents specifically operating within a sporting environment, both of them admitted that none of their work focused specifically on crime. Instead it was often a by-product of more generic interventions, as they believed it would be viewed upon unfavourably if sports council’s were to exclusively focus on crime reduction. This was neatly captured by the following respondents:

There isn’t any of our work that specifically focuses on crime...um the priority for a number of our funding schemes is areas of social deprivation, so I guess by default a lot of the projects that we’re involved in um impact on crime in a particular area. (003).

Well we are not about reducing crime we’re about getting people more active, it may be a means to an end but it’s not the end itself... ...when a project is heavily geared towards crime reduction it’s not certainly not looked upon favourably because it’s intensive it’s expensive and it’s not helping achieve our objectives always. (004).

Those two gatekeeper’s operating within a sports organisation were of the opinion that crime reduction programmes were both labour and financially intensive, and predominantly outside the remit of sports organisations. This then raises the question, who should be responsible for developing and delivering such
opportunities? And is a partnership and collaborative approach the only way forward?

It proved difficult ascertaining the gatekeepers’ attitudes towards using sport for crime reduction purposes (prevention and rehabilitation), with some of them claiming a lack of expertise on the subject with statements like, ‘I’m not up on the research...so I can’t particularly comment’ and ‘I don’t have that sort of expert background’. These rather cautious statements surprised the researcher due to their indifferent nature. It should be noted however, that of those that did comment on the matter, generally their opinion on the use of sport was restricted to young people, as a diversionary tool, and in a very traditional participatory capacity. When directly questioned on whether they think it could be used with older offenders (21+), in a less traditional context such as a learning tool, most respondents had difficulty in understanding how this might work.

However, when asked about the use of sport as a strategy for offender rehabilitation/resettlement and community integration, this was viewed much more positively, particularly in relation to community integration. Gatekeepers seemed far more willing to discuss sport within this dimension, and were keen to express their opinion on how sport has the potential to reduce community barriers associated with ex-offenders. The following quotes illustrate some of the responses made:
…if you could take an offender and obviously looking at their offending behaviour, if they can address their offending behaviour and gain a skill through sport so say for example they had a coaching award or a coaching qualification…they could use to gain employment. …why sport shouldn’t be used or recreational activity through rehabilitation could not be used to break down some barriers… (001).

I think sport is a fantastic tool to engage people um and I think there’s ah we have examples of projects which have impacted on levels levels of crime…because irrespective of background or history or what what anybody’s done in the past sport is a leveller… (003).

…I see something like sport as being an ideal opportunity to destroy that barrier… (006).

There was inconsistency amongst the gatekeepers’ opinions towards the use of sport within a prison setting, with some strongly advocating the need for it as a tool to allow inmates to release frustrations, and others opposed to the use of it (particularly weight-lifting) (Polson 2000). One respondent in particular was able to acknowledge the benefit of the gym as a cathartic release (Coalter 1996; Nichols and Taylor 1996; West and Crompton 2001), but also raised some serious concerns over its use by inmates:

…you will get a type of prisoner who will bulk up quite significantly…that worries me…because that is a very macho type of and aggressive um type of body image that they’re trying to project…it can look very threatening and frightening and and when you’ve got that in somebody who who’s maybe a rapist or someone who’s got a history of violent offending. I have big concerns… (002).
This particular respondent continued to express concern over the naivety of prison staff members regarding the link between an inmate’s physical image and offending behaviour,

...some people in prisons are quite naive about that, and about how that can have a relationship with their offending behaviour and how encouraging them to do more...can actually reinforce some fairly negative things about the way that person sees themselves and the way that person might see females and others. (002).

Interestingly, this particular gatekeeper (002) was far more optimistic about the use of the gym as part of a detoxing programme, and elaborated on this further:

...there are also benefits in terms of some of the people we’ve got here who have substance related difficulties and we’re actually in the process of trying to get a programme up and running here that links men going through the detoxification and the the gym, and I think that will be a really good programme… (002).

Finally, and consistent with the literature surrounding this topic area (Coalter 1989; Robins 1990; Mulvey et al. 1993; Nichols 2007; Coalter 2012), a few of the respondents highlighted the fact that there was a lack of empirical evidence on the use of sport within a crime reduction context and therefore this was a key limitation restricting the implementation of such practices on a practical level. ‘...I think um the issue is that it’s more anecdotal evidence as oppose to specific evidence’ (003), and ‘...there is little hard evidence it’s mostly anecdotal…’ (004).
5. Partnership and collaboration

With the inception of Labour in 1997 the desire for joined-up thinking and partnership working to tackle ‘cross-cutting’ agendas significantly increased (Martin and Sanderson 1999; Blamey and Mackenzie 2007). According to NOMS (2005) the new PSAs (Public Service Agreements) with their shared targets present a real opportunity for Government Departments to work more efficiently and effectively in reducing re-offending. In England and Wales there are three main governance structures for reducing re-offending namely, the National Crime Reduction Board (NCRB), an Inter-Ministerial Group (IMG) for Reducing Re-offending which drives the implementation of the Government’s cross-departmental objectives, and Ministers from across all relevant Government departments (NOMS 2005). The purpose of this approach is to focus upon the alignment of possible strategic work and targets, to ensure that priorities are fully understood and shared, and those policies are streamlined whilst still recognising the devolved responsibilities of organisations (NOMS 2005). The perception by over half of the gatekeepers interviewed (12 out of 21), was that although there attempts were being made to align services and opportunities available to offenders and ex-offenders. There were still clear issues surrounding funding streams and thus restrictions over which individuals are eligible for certain services. This was highlighted by this interviewee,

...there are resources for criminal justice. There’s the DIP project and they’ve got diversionary activities, but again it’s very limited and again because our offenders are actually in the criminal justice system on an order, they’re not eligible for the, for some of the DIP stuff. So, so it all sort of depends where they are in the system. So it sounds really good, but as they move in and out of the system it can just be differences in accessing this stuff. (021).
Thus, there is a need to deliver through local joint working, whereby both national and local funding is co-ordinated (Audit Commission 2009). Particular problems emerged around ESF funding and the subsequent restrictions attached for offenders/ex-offenders attempting to access funded projects. Gatekeeper 014 believed that some organisations avoided referring individuals onto others due to the concerns over loss of funding, even though it was to the detriment of the offender as they were not always accessing the best available options. This respondent identified the issue in a very real sense stating,

Unfortunately because of the nature of the funding, um it’s almost impossible. It’s, it’s a bit difficult at the moment, because for instance, ‘Communities First’, get a huge amount of very similar European Funding, and they are very much keen to develop little community walking groups, within their individual areas. And it’s against their interests, for instance they could send everybody up here, and get it for nothing. But if they did that, they’d lose the funding. So they don’t want to join with us because then they’d lose, they’d be down a job. Um, so there are a lot of issues like that. (014).

Whilst there has been a definite shift away from focused and isolated perspectives (Hughes 2004), the gatekeepers interviewed were keen to highlight the specific difficulties that had been experienced when trying to work in partnership and accomplish a ‘joined-up’ approach. Below are a range of experiences from different gatekeepers,

…no one agency is better than the other, we work as a collective, we work to support each other and that’s key because the there is and has been traditionally um issues around media playing agencies off against each other… (001).
...I've got personal experience of how disjointed the system can be, the criminal justice system...one part of the system doesn't necessarily talk or work very effectively with another part... (002).

...consensus building um trying to kind of um define common goals...although often one of the problems with that is that um often the process the consultation process of participation uh become more important than actually achieving outcomes... (005).

Um very positive about it in principal...in practice um it's a very difficult thing to achieve because um people can't take their hat off, like like I say they come along with their own sets of objectives...I feel that in order to deliver effective public services we can't do it without working in partnership...partnerships are built on the the strength of the characters involved. Um their willingness to commit to it... (006).

Consistent with the thoughts of Geddes and Root (2000), Ling (2002) and Ekblom (2004) it is important that public policy is delivered through joint working, and co-ordinating activities across departmental boundaries. However, the difficulties with accountability, responsibility, combined targets and objectives, communication, information sharing, are just a few of the common problems associated with partnership and collaboration.

6. Summary

In conclusion, it was clear that there were a variety of different approaches to crime reduction being implemented amongst those gatekeepers questioned. On the whole these seemed largely restricted by government policies, with some of the gatekeepers expressing resentment over the restrictions placed on them. Some gatekeepers even thought the work they were doing with their clients was not
beneficial, but said they would continue with current practices because they had no alternative until a new policy allowed them to make changes. Whilst some gatekeepers were cautious about disclosing their views on sport for crime reduction purposes due to a lack of expert knowledge, those that did provide commentary varied in their overall consensus on its role and capacity. In summary the general thoughts included:

- Sport is particularly useful as a diversionary tool amongst young people.

- Sport was often viewed in its traditional capacity in terms of participating in group activities.

- Minimal recognition of the use of sport for sports-based learning, aiming to develop training, qualifications, experience and overall employment skills.

- There was support for the use of sport as a resettlement and reintegrating tool for offenders returning back into the community – to help to reduce the barriers.

- There were clear experiences of using sport as a ‘hook’ to attract and retain clients whilst working on other aspects.

- In the rare circumstances sport was used by gatekeepers, it was often done in an ad hoc capacity due to the gatekeeper themselves having a personal enthusiasm towards sport.
- Sports organisations appeared less willing to incorporate crime reduction within their programmes, claiming that although it was often a by-product of their programmes it was beyond their remit.

- Consistent with the literature gatekeepers felt that there was a lack of empirical evidence to support the use of sports-based programmes into their current practices.

Finally, there was recognition for the ‘risk factor paradigm’ (Farrington 2006), across the different domains: individual/peer, school, community, family (Flynn 2008), although a few of the gatekeepers were less convinced by its ability to predict future behaviour trends. Whilst most gatekeepers acknowledged previous thoughts that ‘nothing works’ with offenders, no longer exist, some gatekeepers expressed exceptionally strong views towards offenders and the ability to change behaviour. This said, generally gatekeepers felt that the offender him/herself had to be motivated to change. There was a consensus that partnership work and collaboration are essential components of operating within this context, although the experiences of gatekeepers revealed some obvious difficulties and challenges such as agreeing shared objectives and priorities in line with their own funding streams.

The following chapter offers an overall discussion by joining the findings of the two empirical studies and discussing them in relation to the overall research aims of the thesis – to explore attitudes and perceptions towards the use of sports-based programmes for crime reduction purposes, specifically aimed at an adult population.
This is also considered within the wider context of reducing social exclusion and enhancing social inclusion.
Chapter 7:
General discussion
1. Introduction

The overall aim of this thesis was to explore attitudes and perceptions towards the use of sports-based programmes for crime reduction purposes, specifically aimed at an adult population. This research sought to provide a dual perspective on the subject area from both an ex-offender and gatekeepers’ standpoint. Two studies were established which sought to accomplish this, an in-depth single case study with an ex-offender was undertaken to investigate attitudes, behaviour and experiences of that individual towards sport, through participation on a sports-based programme within their own rehabilitation. This was followed by a gatekeeper analysis which sought to present an alternative viewpoint on sport within a crime reduction context, through individuals either directly or indirectly responsible for crime reduction practices. The purpose of this chapter is to synthesise the research undertaken throughout this thesis, and provide an overall discussion of the key elements emerging from the two research studies. Previous chapters (Chapters 5 and 6) provided detailed accounts of the research results and discussions of each study. This chapter aims to develop these further illustrating overall findings and conclusions drawn.
The chapter has been organised into three main sections. Firstly, attitudes, perceptions and experiences towards sports-based programmes for crime reduction purposes are discussed, with a specific emphasis on their use with an adult population. Secondly, the link between sports-based learning and reductions in crime is examined, with an emphasis on the need for education, training and employment prospects to be closely aligned to sport. Finally, there is a brief discussion of the potential of sport in the rehabilitation of (ex)offenders particularly as a resettlement tool. Given the limited literature available, where possible attempts are made to draw upon the most relevant and appropriate material, albeit a rather limited number, available when discussing points.

The concept of social exclusion is a contested issue that can be interpreted in a number of different ways. Whilst there have been many attempts at a definition (SEU 1997, 1998; Parkinson 1998; Long et al. 2002; Roberts 2009), there are those that consider a lack of social relationships a key restriction of full participation in societal structures (Lucas 2000). In addition to those who discuss the conceptual difficulties associated with social exclusion, advocating the need for a distinction between the ‘causes’ and ‘symptoms’ of social exclusion (Edwards 2001; Newman 2001; Catney 2002; Long et al. 2002).

For the purpose of this research the notion of crime was researched with particular reference to how sport might be utilised with adult (ex)offenders. To recap the previous research and literature surrounding sport and crime has focused upon initiatives aimed at children and adolescents, either through a preventative capacity
based on adapting criminological conditions and working with ‘at risk’ individuals to prevent the onset of delinquency (Begg et al. 1996; Davis and Dawson 1996; Cameron and MacDougall 2000; Crabbe 2000; West and Crompton 2001; Nichols 2004; Astbury et al. 2005; Hartmann and Depro 2006; Coalter 2012) or within a rehabilitative context with known offenders (Robins 1990; Twitchen 1995; Coalter, 1996; Nichols and Taylor, 1996; Tsuchiya 1996; Taylor et al. 1999; Meek 2012; Meek et al. 2012). This said, the two are not mutually exclusive, and therefore some programmes operate across both aspects. A general consensus amongst this work is that whilst sport has at least the potential of positively impacting upon aspects of crime and anti-social behaviour, there is a lack of substantive evidence (Robins 1990; Malvey et al. 1993) with an over reliance on ‘impressionistic’ and ‘anecdotal’ evidence (Nichols 1997, 2004, 2007). A number of reasons attributed to the widespread difficulties associated with making specific conclusions within this context include, the complexity of the area of investigation; inconsistency amongst policy makers, practitioners and researchers within the field; a shortage of long-term research; and a misplaced emphasis on the ‘outcomes’ as opposed to ‘mechanisms’ through which change might occur (Coalter 2012). It was not the aim of this research to continue along the same lines, but to develop some initial understanding and insight into how sport might also be applied within a rehabilitative framework with adult (ex)offenders (aged 21+).
2. Attitudes, perceptions and experiences towards the use of sport for crime reduction purposes

Terms such as ‘sport’, ‘recreation’ and ‘physical activity’ are often used interchangeably and available research exhibits a wide variety of frequently used vague definitions (Coalter 2007). Further articulated by Coalter (2012), ‘sport is a collective noun that hides more than it reveals’ (p. 2). However it was not a specific intention of this research to engage in discussions regarding the differences between terms, rather it was about allowing participants involved within the research to portray their own perspectives and understandings of such terms.

Interestingly, when discussing the notion of sport, recreation and physical activity with gatekeepers the majority of individuals viewed these terms in a traditional context around team sports and for the purpose of physical involvement and participation. Views were often relatively narrow particularly when discussing the potential of sport within the crime reduction context, with a general finding being that gatekeepers were rather unaware of how sport might be utilised in a less traditional capacity through sports-based learning (see the next section for further discussion of this). In addition, personal perceptions of gatekeepers on sport appeared to be limited to considering its potential as a diversionary/preventative tool amongst young people. Its placement with older offenders often seemed difficult for gatekeepers to acknowledge and thus it was seen to be more appropriate and beneficial as a diversionary tool. Government support for the use sport has primarily been directed towards young offenders (Collins et al. 1999; PAT10 1999; Sport England 1999) through the development of specific programmes aimed at this target group, for
example Sure Start, Connexions, Education Action Zones and Positive Futures to name but a few (Bailey 2005). Therefore organisations and gatekeepers, if aware at all, would be exposed primarily to this particular context, and therefore might somewhat explain that at the present gatekeepers appear either unaware or dismissive of the wider potential of sports-based programmes, particularly for use with older clients.

In contrast to the gatekeepers the ex-offender in the single case study demonstrated that he had a much more extensive view of sport and how he and others in similar circumstances could utilise it throughout their rehabilitation. Whilst the ex-offender discussed sport in a participatory context, ultimately he viewed it as an employment prospect within the sport industry (this is further discussed in the following section). Consequently, it would seem that a wider view of the potential of sport is required by gatekeepers. Perceptions of sport and the opportunities available within the sport industry need to be more widely recognised by policy makers and gatekeepers alike in order for it to feature in a capacity other than as a diversionary tool with young people.

3. Sports-based learning

One of the most striking features of this research is the idea of sports-based learning, especially in relation to older offenders. It is important that sport is viewed to be more than just a pastime, but something which can offer individuals greater prospects, and assist with other dimensions such as employment. Throughout the
single case study the fundamental concern of the ex-offender was about employment and how the sports-based programme could assist him with gaining relevant work experience in the sport and fitness industry which would then lead to some form of employment. This is consistent with research on offenders, employment and recidivism, where it is claimed that certain characteristics of employment encourage a sense of investment which can assist a reduction in criminal behaviour (Wadsworth 2001; Uggen and Staff 2001; Sampson and Laub 1993). The Home Office research study (2006) found that deficits in education, training and employment were the strongest factors associated with persistent offending. Such findings resonate with and further serve to emphasise the evidence presented in this research and the notion that employment, training and education need to be closely aligned with the use of sport in this context (particularly amongst adult offenders aged 21+).

Sport has the potential of impacting upon younger offenders through a participatory capacity (Nichols 1997, 1999a, 1999b, 2004, 2007; Coalter et al. 2000), the scope of this amongst older offenders appears to become restricted. With regards to young people and anti-social behaviour the concern primarily lies around ‘boredom and frustration’ (Coalter 2007) and therefore diversionary programmes are predominantly large-scale initiatives targeting youths ‘at risk’ of offending. Coalter (2007) suggested that rehabilitation programmes (for all ages – although Coalter’s comments are exclusive to young people) often involve intensive counselling where the focus is specifically around developing personal and social skills with the hope of individuals transferring them to the wider context and reducing offending behaviour. Goldblatt and Lewis (1998) stated that a reduction in re-offending can be achieved by
providing support with practical problems, in particular those stemming from poor education and unemployment, issues which were particularly evident from the case study in this research. It is inevitable that in order for sport to offer a positive contribution to an offender’s rehabilitation it must be used in combination with other elements (for instance employment, financial stability, attitudes and behaviours). This is consistent with much of the literature that argues that sport can only be one tool in a box of many (Sport England 1999), and therefore any opportunities sporting or otherwise should be tailored according to the specific individuals engaging in them.

Arguably priorities change as individual's progress through the lifecycle and with that brings the need for adaptation of sport programmes and the context in which they might be used. For example, young people might be more inclined to gain benefits from participation in sport, however, older offenders might require more substantial and long-term impacts from it such as employment, financial gain and ultimately self-sufficiency (Bachman and Schulenberg 1993). As suggested through the literature available on risk factors (Catalano and Hawkins 1996; Farrington 1996, 2000, 2006; Nichols 2003) interventions should be designed to counteract identified risk factors for offending behaviour (Shader 2002). In summary, the main risk factors include; poor housing and poverty; poor parenting; association with delinquent peers, siblings and partners; lower measures of intelligence including poor academic performance; high levels of impulsiveness and hyperactivity; and childhood experiences with criminal parents (Farrington 2006). In order to fully appreciate the potential influence of sport within a crime reduction context, it was important to acknowledge the potential opportunities for targeting risk factors. This research suggests that the
interrelated nature of the risk factors can impact upon the potential of sport. For example if sport is to be utilised as a means of employment, recognition must be directed towards the additional benefits that might be gained from this, for example housing and financial stability, improvements in academic performance and qualifications.

Consistent with the ideas of Crabbe (2000) there is a need to recognise the range of experiences that individuals seek from sport in general, along with clear acknowledgement of their expectations in order to determine the degree to which sport can influence wider forms of behaviour. For example is it about emotional satisfaction, exhilaration, confrontation, financial reward, overcoming fear etc. Although the idea appears to be rather simplistic on the surface it is apparent from the research that this is a fundamental element of assessing whether sport might be a useful tool for changing behaviour patterns, particularly in the crime reduction context.

The idea that older offenders will be seeking to link sport to educational prospects and ultimately employment presents some further issues raised by the research. Firstly, a number of gatekeepers perceived the sports industry as a context which would actually pose even greater restrictions than other industries due to the community involvement and interaction. For example, sport is perceived to be an area whereby customer and community engagement is key and thus dealing with the general public would be inevitable if embarking on employment within this industry sector. This was seen as a difficult issue with specific restrictions for this particular
group including: protocols, CRB checks and working with children, as a major stumbling block for ex-offenders attempting to work within the sport industry. Gatekeepers conveyed apprehension over sports-based learning amongst (ex)offenders, often highlighting that the actual convictions (types of crimes committed) could be a potential obstacle when seeking employment in the industry.

Gatekeepers were particularly concerned that individuals were being encouraged to gain qualifications in general throughout their rehabilitation, which was raising expectations of offenders who were then unable to use these experiences to gain employment (Employment Support Unit 2000; Taxman et al. 2002; Graffam and Hardcastle 2007). Some of the gatekeepers in this research strongly suggested that opportunities needed to be matched according to convictions and the likelihood of individuals being able to gain experience or employment afterwards (Home Office 2001; Uggen and Staff 2001). If individuals are unlikely to be able to gain any form of employment within the sport industry they should be informed of this from the start and guided towards another sector. This said, sport in these particular instances could still be used but more specifically as part of a healthier lifestyle. Surprisingly volunteering was not an area that was acknowledged by gatekeepers as a means by which ex-offenders could gain relevant work experience and develop their employability. It was actually viewed by many gatekeepers as a context which could in fact pose even greater restrictions and protocols.
A number of strategies to minimise barriers for employment for ex-offenders were offered by the gatekeepers questioned within this research, a summary is outlined below:

- Further engagement between Criminal Justice System and employers – with the primary intention of developing stronger relationships between the two and identifying industries whereby there is a niche for individuals who hold a criminal record.

- Re-education of employers – a significant factor believed to be hindering ex-offender employment prospects is the attitudes of employers towards ex-offenders. Previous studies (Albright and Denq 1996; Heinrich 2000; Fletcher and Taylor 2001; CIPD 2002) have confirmed the potential for employers’ negative attitudes towards hiring ex-offenders posed a major barrier.

- Broader employment opportunities – as identified by the Home Office in 2001 opportunities for employment provided within prisons often involve prison workshops with low-skill level activities unlikely to develop the necessary skills sought after by potential employers. Many gatekeepers reinforced this argument articulating that more variety needed to be offered with a clear and accurate idea of what employers are looking for from employees.

- Awareness from gatekeepers on restrictions of employment sectors particularly depending on convictions. A general conclusion of gatekeepers was the belief that criminal convictions (types of crimes committed) were a major stumbling block for ex-offenders seeking to enter the employment sector. Gatekeepers felt that there was a lack of awareness and recognition
amongst individuals involved in offender rehabilitation with regards to the restrictions and protocols adopted within different industries.

- Realistic expectations, targets and goals of both gatekeepers and offenders – an overarching theme to emerge was the fact that both gatekeepers and offenders alike need to be consistent, clear and realistic about the potential outcomes that might emerge from any service, programme and/or opportunity offered to an offender. Gatekeepers believed that offenders were often disillusioned about the actual reality of what might be achieved following the completion of a programme/course and thus it could have an extremely detrimental impact on the offender’s overall rehabilitation.

- Increased work experience opportunities – gatekeepers argued that a clear barrier to the employment of ex-offenders is the fact that although they might have achieved relevant qualifications, often the experience that they have gained is within a closed unrealistic environment (within prison) and therefore falls short of ‘real life’ work experiences that employers are looking for. This notion is consistent with the idea that more mentoring and work-based experiences are required particularly through the transition period of an ex-offenders rehabilitation, in order to reinforce the qualifications, skills and knowledge gained within the prison system prior to gaining full-time employment.

- Development of a database of potential employers who would be willing to employ ex-offenders – gatekeepers also felt that it would be particularly useful to develop a database of all those industries and potential employers who would be willing to employ ex-offenders if they possessed the relevant qualifications. This database could also include all restrictions, protocols and
barriers that would restrict the employer from hiring an ex-offender. This would assist gatekeepers with earlier points such as, matching the appropriate opportunities to individuals.

More generally both gatekeepers and the ex-offender claimed that the public’s perceptions (individual and community) can also be detrimental to the rehabilitation of offenders and this was specifically relevant to sport. This could be due to a number of reasons which emerged from the research. Firstly there is a lack of understanding of the potential to use sport for crime reduction purposes. The public perceive the use of sport as a privileged opportunity and perhaps an ‘easy option’ for offenders and as such it would be unacceptable as far as the general public is concerned. Secondly, there are strongly embedded stereotypical perceptions of offenders, that ‘nothing works’ and that offenders do not have the ability to change. Thirdly, there is an over-arching negative atmosphere surrounding offenders and ex-offenders largely fuelled by a public fear of crime. Finally, the lack of information and knowledge regarding the potential of sports-based strategies means there is a perpetuation of stereotypical and often ill-informed perceptions of ex-offenders. Interestingly, those gatekeepers questioned from a sports organisation, were aware of the negative public opinion surrounding sport and crime and felt it would be frowned upon if it was a key focus of their work, arguing that it was outside their remit. Some of the specific strategies identified by gatekeepers to overcome these stereotypical attitudes included greater offender community work, stronger links between prisons and community, and an increased awareness of success stories and best practice.
4. The potential for sport

Interestingly, sport and physical activity was highlighted by both gatekeepers and the ex-offender as a sector which provided a more informal environment to operate within. Due to this more informal relaxed environment it was seen to offer opportunities for soft counselling for gatekeepers with the potential of obtaining information they might not be able to if placed within a more traditional room/office environment. It was also recognised as a strategy that could be used to assist in developing the relationship between clients and gatekeepers where it is seen as a more informal context. Nichols (2004) in particular identified the formation of strong relationships between staff and individuals as key in order for there to be any form of long-term impact.

In addition, sport could be used to develop transferrable skills (basic skills) in a manner which is untraditional and therefore less intimidating for individuals who might only possess limited basic skills. At its simplest, by adopting a healthier lifestyle offenders/ex-offenders can take the first step towards consciously doing something other than committing crimes or taking drugs. This is consistent with the literature that has focused on sport and youth delinquency and the notion of providing an alternative activity to crime (Nichols 2007). It is important to note that although not directly highlighted by gatekeepers if this approach was adopted there would be a need for staff (both sports based and those within the criminal justice system) to be appropriately trained and supported. For example, if trying to avoid the often ad hoc nature associated with the use of sport in the rehabilitation of ex-offenders, staff would need to acknowledge its potential and undergo the necessary training in order to develop appropriate skills and strategies which could be adopted
as part of their day-to-day activities. Nichols (2004) has previously highlighted this as a concern stating, that staff are often not trained for the mentoring role needed within this context and thus find themselves operating outside the remit of what is acceptable.

The use of sport and physical activity as an important outlet within the prison confines was widely acknowledged by both the ex-offender and several gatekeepers. There were mixed views on its potential in assisting behavioural and attitudinal changes among offenders. Some argued that it provided a release, outlet and purpose. A small minority were more cautious believing that there was a stronger link between gym-use and the reinforcement of negative behaviours. This said, generally opinions towards the use of sport as part of an offender’s resettlement back into the community were positive, with a consensus emerging that it could in fact be used to break down some of the barriers often present upon release.

The prison setting was also viewed as an environment where there was an opportunity for offenders to gain sport-related qualifications, although as mentioned earlier, gaining them while in prison and then using them in the community later on poses several challenges. Sports qualifications were generally viewed less favourably due to the minimal opportunities available to offenders to gain ‘real’ life experience. The gatekeepers thought offenders would gain qualifications, which would raise expectations but then fail once they return to their community. However, the case study provided an alternative viewpoint which emphasised its potential especially if there was more support and mentoring for ex-offenders during their transition period. This is consistent with the ideas of Tarling et al. (2004) who
commented that mentoring has become established within the UK as a key mechanism for working with those disadvantaged and to combat social exclusion.

At present however, there is a lack of support and structure throughout an ex-offenders rehabilitation and resettlement, particularly through the early stages when individuals are released from prison. Although general support is offered there appears to be a lack of personal and individual opportunities provided throughout transition period. This was recognised by both gatekeepers and the ex-offender. Uggen et al. (2005) confirmed such thoughts claiming that those post-release programmes that do actually exist usually fail due to a lack of co-ordination amongst programmes and correctional agencies, limiting the overall reach and effectiveness of such strategies. In addition, mentoring was viewed as a tool that was under-utilised in assisting offenders to make the transition and get the most out of any qualification and experience gained while in prison as they re-establish themselves in the community. Authors such as Dubois et al. (2002) and Joliffe and Farrington (2007) acknowledged the idea that mentors have the ability to influence offending behaviour by providing direct assistance to individuals.
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1. Introduction

The overall aim of this thesis was to explore attitudes and perceptions towards the use of sport for crime reduction amongst adults. This research sought to expand upon previous research in the area which has been restricted to young people and youth delinquency (Coalter 1988, 2012; Nichols 1997, 2007; Taylor et al. 1999; Witt and Crompton 2003; Nichols and Crow 2004; Meek 2012), and consider the potential of sport amongst adult delinquency. In order to accomplish this, a unique investigation of a single case study on the use of a sports-based intervention with an adult ex-offender was conducted, and an exploration of the attitudes and perceptions of gatekeepers operating within the field was undertaken.

1.1 Summary of key findings

Firstly the case study provided assurance that sports-based interventions can contribute to the rehabilitation and resettlement of an ex-offender, particularly during the transition period between prison to the community when participants are most vulnerable and often require clear guidance on how they can transfer skills learnt within prison to a community context. The research in this thesis provided evidence to support close links between training, employability and work experience within this age band, which could assist with the development of alternative lifestyles. Consistent with the recently introduced concept ‘sports-based learning’ introduced by Meek et al. (2012), the findings from the case study demonstrated that sports-based
learning could offer a meaningful and rewarding pathway into employment. Thus, future deliverers of sports-based interventions for adult (ex)offenders should consider sport as just one component of a holistic process. Sport is not (and never will be) an effective mechanism of behaviour change for all individuals, but is certainly a useful tool as part of a wider strategy. Whilst further research is required, sports-based learning among adult delinquents clearly has the potential to contribute to the broader resettlement agenda around skills and employment, financial stability, rebuilding relationships, addressing offending attitudes, thinking and behaviour, providing opportunities to ‘give something back’ to society, and to encourage psychological improvements. A summary of the findings in relation to the sports-based intervention (Chapter 5) are represented in Figure 8:
Figure 8. Key characterises of sports-based interventions for adult crime reduction

- **Hook for change:** Motivation for further education, employment, and an alternative lifestyle.
- **Promotion of positive social networks:** Positive use of mentors during the resettlement period to facilitate reintegration.
- **Opportunities for ‘giving back’ to the community.**
- **Psychological improvements:** Self-esteem, self-concept, and identity.
- **Employability:** Qualifications, work experience, improvement in skills, and the development of contacts.
As articulated by Meek et al. (2012, p.19) and further consolidated through this research, ‘sport alone will not necessarily provide a panacea for reoffending, but it certainly offers a valuable alternative when seeking effective means through which to motivate and inspire offenders’. The single case study within this research supported this concept particularly amongst those who are hard to engage through traditional routes in education. However whilst there is some recognition for the less traditional capability of sport to provide a hook for further engagement in wider resettlement interventions, greater awareness amongst gatekeepers and practical implementation is required.

The gatekeeper analysis study presented mixed views on the use of sport for crime reduction among adults, with views generally restricted to young people and clear difficulties in recognising its potential with older (ex)offenders. This is unsurprising given the lack of focus, academic investigation, evidence from practice and practical implementation of interventions with this older age band. The case study element of this research provides a stepping stone for this acceptance and offers gatekeepers clear guidance on how it can be utilised. Gatekeepers are inevitably restricted by budgets, protocols and systems, which confine the opportunities they are able to provide. This research determined that often gatekeepers have very little scope to utilise diverse/non-traditional strategies (for instance sport) within their day-to-day operations, and on the rare occasion that such approaches are employed, it is usually done on an ad hoc basis due to the gatekeeper’s individual interest and commitment. This research provides gatekeepers with a clear example and some justification for using sport with clients, and some guidance on the key characteristics which need to feature as part of interventions operating within this older age band.
The availability of services and opportunities can be quite restrictive during the rehabilitation of (ex)offenders particularly within the community context, with gatekeepers acknowledging that often services are controlled by certain criteria in which they operate, with offenders themselves unaware of where or how to obtain certain support. An example of this was related to the operation of funding systems and circumstances whereby if an ex-offender was to seek support from one organisation often they would be precluded from seeking additional support via another due to specific criteria restrictions. In order to allow (ex)offenders access to the most suitable resources restrictions placed on gatekeeper and services specifically related to funding need to be addressed.

Short-term funding budgets are inevitably a concern of gatekeepers, and can often result in frequent changes in an offenders/ex-offenders support framework. Services identified with particular difficulties were probation where there seemed to be a lack of trust between workers and clients, something which was identified by both the gatekeepers operating within this sector and also by the ex-offender. As addressed in the previous discussion chapter (Chapter 7) this research identified the use of sport as a more informal environment where relationship building between clients and gatekeepers could be achieved. Such findings encourage gatekeepers, where relationships between workers and clients may be fraught, to utilise sports-based strategies within day-to-day practices as a means of building client-staff relationships. There was some general apprehension amongst gatekeepers around raising unrealistic expectations amongst offenders through sports-based qualifications, a sector which they believed posed greater restrictions than other industries. The public's perception of sport as an 'easy option' for offenders also
appeared to be influential in gatekeepers’ perceptions of utilising sport within their crime reduction practices. Accordingly there is scope for further research into community perceptions around the use of sport for crime reduction purposes, to provide further clarity.

The limited empirical justification of sports-based crime reduction programmes and strategies (Mulvey et al. 1993; Patriksson 1995; Sherman et al. 1998; Coalter et al. 2000) presents a barrier for gatekeepers to try and encourage management to support the use of sport-based strategies particularly among older clients. It is clear that in order for sport to have a positive impact within this context there has to be enthusiasm from the (ex)offender themselves, in addition to support and willingness from the government through policy directions and then the gatekeepers themselves to provide such opportunities on a practical level. Given that many organisations are target driven and require measurable outcomes in order to justify their chosen approaches further justification and knowledge is needed of the benefits surrounding the use of sport, particularly throughout the rehabilitation of older offenders. Research at the present time provides limited information on this. This was highlighted by Bloom et al. (2005) who concluded that policy makers lack the evidence required to make informed policy decisions that connect sport to other policy priorities. Finally and importantly the more interest (ex)offenders have in sport the more likely they are to utilise it through their rehabilitation and the more successful it can be.
Consistent with the some of the ideas presented by Nichols (2004) this research identifies the following elements as key characteristics to maximise utility and potential of sports-based programmes:

- Sport must be attractive to the offender/ex-offender as an activity that could assist them in their rehabilitation – initial engagement and interest is essential with further recognition of its scope past a basic participatory capacity.
- The programme needs to be flexible and tailored as much as possible to the needs of the individual.
- Good relationships between staff and participants are essential including some form of mentoring role.
- Long-term follow-up and support is essential to further opportunities past original programmes.
- Opportunities, strategies and programmes need to be available following the direct release of ex-offenders from prison – the transition period is a fundamental dimension of an individual’s rehabilitation and often the time when ex-offenders fall back into bad habit and old behaviour patterns.
- Opportunities provided throughout an offenders rehabilitation need to be consistent both inside the prison system and within the community context.
- If sport is to be utilised within the Criminal Justice System it needs to be strongly aligned with long term strategies and potential risk factors such as employment, education, financial stability.
In addition and more directly associated with the methodological approach to this area of research, it would seem particularly appropriate that ex-offenders are supported to utilise reflective practice during the rehabilitation and resettlement period in order to fully capture changes in thinking and behaviour over extended periods. This is something which was utilised in this research (via the ex-offender’s reflective journal) and is a dimension that should be incorporated in future work within this area as a means of providing depth to investigations.

2. Implications of the research

The privileged access onto a sports-based programme with an adult ex-offender, and insight into gatekeepers operating within a crime reduction context enabled data to be gathered directly from those either participating in sports-based opportunities or from those who make important decisions in shaping the services available to (ex)offenders. In effect, this research marks the beginnings of a new realm of enquiry surrounding sport and its potential among adult delinquents. This thesis has tried to bring together ideas surrounding social exclusion particularly from a policy perspective, create links between social exclusion and crime, and provide relevant insights from participants and providers of sports-based opportunities within a crime reduction context. This section briefly summarises the contribution of this research and its impact on the researcher, society, participants and academia.

As discussed in some detail during Chapter 4 (sections 4.1 and 4.2), the researcher’s reflective journal featured as an integral part of the research process particularly during the single case study, providing a context through which the researcher was able to make their own experiences, opinions, thoughts and feelings
visible and an acknowledged part of the research process. Through engagement with this reflective tool, training undertaken within the criminal justice context, and overall engagement in the research process, the researcher has enhanced skills required to effectively research. When embarking upon this process the researcher was in the early stages of their research career, developing confidence as a researcher, dealing with changes in research direction and becoming familiar with new techniques were all key elements of the process. Undoubtedly the research has impacted on the researcher through developing greater sophistication in thinking, becoming more theoretically aware, increasing breadth of knowledge, developing a greater depth of understanding (within a unique context), promoting awareness of wider perspectives, being better able to resolve issues and ultimately enhancing the researcher’s capacity to do research.

When addressing the impact of this research on society it is important to recap that it was the opinion of both the majority of gatekeepers and the ex-offender that there was public resistance towards the use of sport within this context due to perceptions of it being an ‘easy option’ for (ex)offenders. Whilst there is a clear need for further research on this matter, this thesis provides support for the positive use of sport within this context, hopefully enhancing public awareness of its potential as a means of reducing recidivism, the impact of which is significant for society as a whole.

This research provides gatekeepers with further justification for including sports-based interventions within their remit, not exclusive to young people which have been evident in the past. In addition, it allows participants to draw upon a clear example of how they could utilise sport throughout their rehabilitation and
resettlement, and transfer sports-based skills achieved within the prison setting to a community context.

3. Future directions

A particular strength of this research is the unique approach taken within the case study element which focused on an adult ex-offender. This was an area that required research to advance understanding on the potential of sport within the crime reduction context with an alternative age band (21+). But there are limited opportunities at the present where sport is utilised throughout (ex)offender’s rehabilitation, particularly among an adult population, restricting the potential to conduct research in this area. However where there are such opportunities they should be utilised as a source of rich and novel information and understanding.

The gatekeeper research conducted in this thesis obtained access to a wide variety of individuals and organisations, however, due to the sensitivity of the research area standard protocols within organisations can often place restrictions on availability of research participants. The development of collaborative research partnerships are essential as a means of minimising such barriers, in addition the providing feedback on research findings to practice is important.

A number of recommendations emerge from this research with regards to future work. From a range of conclusions four key areas emerge:
Firstly, future work could specifically assess the sporting opportunities offered to adult offenders/ex-offenders within three specific contexts; within the prison system, during the transition period, and within a community context.

Secondly, further investigation into the scope and potential of sports-based programmes with adults could be undertaken, although a potential barrier of this is the lack of programmes available to conduct research.

Thirdly, an investigation into the sport industry as a potential avenue for the employment of ex-offenders. This might include exploration of the educational, volunteering and employment opportunities available to ex-offenders within this sector.

Fourthly, exploration of the attitudes and perceptions of the public towards the use of sports-based interventions for crime reduction purposes.

Despite the relationships identified it is vital to note that sport cannot by itself prevent or eradicate social exclusion and recidivism (Coalter 2012; Meek 2012). Moreover, sport is not seen as desirable by all people, and clearly can never single-handedly eradicate the factors associated with social exclusion and crime. Nevertheless, it is argued that sport can, as part of a combined effort, help to ameliorate some of its related effects namely improvements in health, education, employment and social networks (PAT 10 1999; Sandford et al. 2006). This necessitates a joined up approach, in which gatekeepers (including community groups, criminal justice agencies, leisure providers and the employment sector) combine efforts towards the same remit. It is essential that they draw upon strengths and minimise weaknesses,
avoid duplication of resources, and ensure a more united approach to the delivery of opportunities. As social exclusion and criminal behaviour have a plethora of associated damaging factors and outcomes, it is essential to adopt a more holistic approach in the quest for its reduction (Coalter et al. 2000; Crabbe 2000, 2008).
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APPENDICES
Appendix A:
Ex-offender interview schedules
for all stages
Interview Guide: pre-programme

An examination of the views and attitudes of an ex-offender enrolled on a post-release sports-based programme

(Phase One)

Participant Code……………………………………………………………

Interview Number…………………………………………………………

Interview Date……………………………………………………………

Start time………………Finish time……………………………………
Hello, I’m Maria Galdes from the Cardiff School of Sport, University of Wales, Institute Cardiff. Thank you for agreeing to be a participant in this interview study and research process. For this research project I am talking to you the participant utilising a post-release mentoring programme that is operating under a fitness gym provider, to increase understandings of views on sport in the community and how it might influence behaviour patterns. I am interested in your specific views and opinions on your background, sporting background, and expectations of the programme, including apparent barriers of your rehabilitation process.

Within this stage of the study I will be looking to examine your perspectives on the post-release programme including thoughts and expectations, and also collect some information about previous experiences.

The information gained from this study will be used in two ways. Firstly the material will be for my PhD thesis. Secondly, the results may be submitted to be published in journals to allow others to benefit from the information gathered.
I think that it is important to emphasise that all of the information that you provide in this interview and the subsequent stages of the research design will remain completely confidential. Any information that is of particular relevance will be presented, where selected quotes from the interview will be extracted to illustrate particular points. These quotes will maintain absolute anonymity and your identity will be protected. To ensure that you cannot be identified through the material, identifiers will either be removed or disguised. The interview will be recorded on tape to ensure that all the information provided is accurate and complete, and to make the interview process more efficient. All interviews will be transcribed to assist analysis at a later date and also for referencing purposes. A copy of the transcription will be open for you to review afterwards should you wish to do so.

As a participant in this study, it is important that you are aware of your rights. Firstly your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary, and you are free to end the interview at any time. You are also free to decline to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable answering. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions that you will be asked. I am here to find out what you think about sport, physical activity, and rehabilitation. I would like you to answer these questions honestly. If there is a question that you do not fully understand or are uncomfortable answering, please ask, or decline to comment rather than answering the question anyhow. If you do not wish to answer a question, just state ‘no comment’ and no further questions related to that topic will be asked.
The study comprises two distinct phases. If possible, your commitment to this research will involve this first interview (phase one) and a follow-up interview at the end of the mentoring (phase two), with the possibility of extended follow-up. In addition you will be asked to keep a reflective journal throughout the course of the mentoring, and meet for a face-to-face weekly diary account entry. If you have any queries as we go through the interview please ask and I will attempt to clarify them. Just before we proceed, could I ask you to sign the voluntary consent form.

**ORIENTING INSTRUCTIONS FOR INTERVIEWER**

To begin the interview we will discuss your general background including specific events you have experienced.

Then we will move to the main part of the interview, where I will be asking about your thoughts and feelings about the mentoring programme and then move on to sport in general, including aspects such as:

*POST-RELEASE SPORTS PROGRAMME*, i.e. what you think and expect from the programme

*YOUR SPORTING BACKGROUND*, i.e. previous participation and also opportunities available to you whilst within the prison system
ROLE OF SPORT IN PEOPLE’S LIVES, i.e. thoughts and feelings about the potential use of sport as a positive influence on including people within communities

The sections are all based on developing a clear understanding of your background and views and opinions. Each section will be based on your own thoughts and perceptions, and reasons for your thoughts and feelings. Sections will be explained before the questions begin. In particular I am interested in finding out if views and expectations alter as you progress through the mentoring programme.

Please draw upon your own experiences. Don’t worry about pauses; take as much time as you require considering the question in detail. Please do not guess the answer or tell what you think is wanted from your response.

At the end of the interview there will be an opportunity for you to add anything that you feel is important but was not covered within the interview.

Before we start do you have any questions relating to any of the areas we have just discussed?

Ok then let’s begin.
SECTION 1B

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(To be covered)

1. **Interviewer introduction:**
   - Maria Galdes from the Cardiff School of Sport, University of Wales, Institute Cardiff.
   - Thank you for agreeing to be a participant in this interview study and research process.
   - I am talking to you the participant utilising a post-release mentoring programme that is operating under a fitness gym provider, to increase understandings of views on sport in the community and how it might influence behaviour patterns.
   - I am interested in the specific views and opinions of you the participant on your background, sporting background, and expectations of the programme, including apparent barriers of your rehabilitation process.

2. **Use of research:**
   - The information gained from this study will be used in two ways; PhD thesis and the results may be published in journals to allow others to benefit from the information gathered.

3. **Information confidential:**
   - Information that you provide in this interview will remain completely confidential.
- Any information that is of particular relevance will be presented, where selected quotes from the interview will be extracted to illustrate particular points. These quotes will maintain absolute anonymity and your identity will be protected, to ensure that individuals cannot be identified through the material.

4. **Voluntary participation** - your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary, and you are free to end the interview at any time. You are also free to decline to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable answering by simply stating ‘no comment’. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions.

5. **Consent form** - If you have any queries as we progress through the interview please ask. Just before we proceed, we will both read through the voluntary consent form, which I will then ask you to sign should you wish to take part in the interview.

Please draw upon your own experiences. Don’t worry about pauses; take as much time as you require considering the question in detail. Please do not guess the answer or tell what you think is wanted from your response.

At the end of the interview there will be an opportunity for you to add anything that you feel is important but was not covered within the interview.

Before we start do you have any questions relating to any of the areas we have just discussed? Ok then let’s begin.
SECTION 2
INTERVIEW

SECTION 2A POST-RELEASE SPORTS PROGRAMME

I would like you to focus upon your time in prison and your involvement in sport/physical activity. This section will also talk about your expectations in utilising sport within the community and the potential of the post-release mentoring programme, and how you think it might be important and help you.

(Q.1) Did you take up the opportunity to participate in any form of physical activity/sport whilst within prison? Please provide details.

Probing:

i. What were the types of opportunities available to you? E.g. gym, football, circuits

ii. Were you happy with the opportunities available? Do you have any specific suggestions?

iii. How often would you say you took up the opportunity to participate in physical activity? E.g. daily/2-3 times per week/occasional. Limited time?
(Q.2.a.) Did you complete any courses/programmes whilst within prison?
Please could you explain.

Probing:  
  i. Did you complete all the course?

  ii. If not, what prevented you from completing it?

  iii. Sport specific or other areas?

  iv. What did they involve? Please explain

(Q.2.b.) Can you explain your reason(s) for signing up on this programmes?

Probing:  
  i. Any specific reasons?

  ii. Work prospects and/or employment opportunity?

  iii. Social benefits of sport; recreational tool for when leave prison and whilst inside?

  iv. Classroom or practical based?

(Q.3) What do you expect this programme to do for you? Please explain.

Probing:  
  i. New leisure pursuits
ii. Confidence to do new things

iii. A new view of yourself and future

iv. Enhancing own potential

(Q.4) Do you think this post-release programme might make a difference for you and your outlook? Please explain.

(Q.5) Could you please tell me about any concerns that you have about the programme?

(Q.6) Is it your intention to remain on the programme for the duration of the eight weeks? Explain.

Probing:  

i. How you are going to approach this programme?

ii. What would affect your continuing participation?

(Q.7) Do you have any ideas about what you might do after the mentoring is completed?

Probing:  

i. Are you looking to gain employment from the experience?
SECTION 2B    SPORTING/PHYSICAL ACTIVITY BACKGROUND

This section looks to find out about your involvement with sport in the community.

(Q.1) Tell me about your involvement in sport or physical activity throughout school?

Probing: i. Tell me about your involvement in school sport and whether you enjoyed this aspect? Explain

ii. Were you been a member of any school sports clubs/teams? Can you explain.

(Q.2) Tell me about your involvement after you left school?

Probing: i. were you involved in sport, kick around with friends?

ii. When you left school did you continue to participate in sport and physical activity? (Formal club involvement; or informal kick around with mates)

(Q.3) What types of sports and/or physical activity do you enjoy and why?
Probing:  
i. Team games e.g. football

ii. Individual activities e.g. weight training/running
Weekly Diary Account Session

A weekly examination of the views and attitudes of an ex-offender enrolled on a post-release sports-based programme

(Phase Two)

(adapted from Gibbs, 1988 Reflective Cycle)

Date: _____________________

Time:_____________________

1. Description
   - Describe what this past week has been like? (General and mentoring)

2. Feelings
   - In relation to what you have described above, what were you thinking and feeling?

3. Evaluation
   - What has been good (high points) or bad (difficulties) about this week?

4. Analysis
   - What sense can you make of the situation?
5. **Conclusion**
   - What else could you have done?

6. **Action plan**
   - If the same things arose again what would you do?
   - What are your intended actions for next week?
Interview Guide: *Initial post-programme*

An examination of the views and attitudes of an ex-offender enrolled on a post-release sports-based programme

*(Phase Three)*

Participant Code…………………………………………………………..

Interview Number………………………………………………………….

Interview Date……………………………………………………………..

Start time………………Finish time……………………………………
SECTION 1A
INTRODUCTION

(Interviewer orientation)

This stage of the research involves the follow-up interview subsequent your completion of the sports-based programme, and will further expand on aspects discussed through the initial interview and weekly diary accounts. In addition the interview will focus upon your future outlook and forthcoming plans.

This interview is interested in your views and opinions on:-

- The post-release programme that you have just completed.
- Further background matters extended from stage one interview.
- Sport and where you think it appears in your rehabilitation.
- Community attitudes and perceptions.
- Your attended actions for the future.

As articulated through stage one (initial interview) all of the information that you provide will remain completely confidential and your identity will be protected at all times maintaining your anonymity. The interview is entirely voluntary and you are free to end the interview at any time.
(Q.1) What would you say were your initial expectations of this sports-based programme?

Probing:  

i. Your initial expectations of the mentoring programme highlighted through questions within the first interview were to gain employment within the industry. Would you say this remained your expectation throughout?

ii. Would you say your expectations changed over the duration of the programme or remained the same?
(Q.2) To what extent would you say your expectations of the programme have been realised?

Probing:  
  i. Do you feel like these expectations were realistic?
  
  ii. Were your expectations based upon any particular information?

(Q.3) What aspects of the sports-based programme have been particularly useful/positive (if any)?

(Q.4) Have you experienced any problems/issues with the programme? Please Explain

(Q.5) Do you feel there is anything else that could have been included in the sports-based programme?

Probing:  
  i. Are there any other areas of the industry you would have liked to have been shown?
(Q.6) How are you feeling about the programme?

Probing:  
   i. Do you feel like it has been a worthwhile process?
   ii. Is there anything that you feel you have gained from the programme?

(Q.7) In your opinion at what stage in your rehabilitation do you think the programme would have been best placed?

Probing:  
   i. Whilst in prison serving your sentence?
   ii. Upon your release, as in your particular situation?

(Q.8) Do you feel like you were prepared for the sports-based programme? Please explain in what ways.

Probing:  
   i. Did prison help prepare you for the programme? Please explain.
   ii. Do you think the qualifications gained whilst within prison helped you through the programme? (Which ones in particular?)
(Q.9) Do you feel more prepared to gain employment in this sector?

Probing:   
   i. Do you feel the sports-based programme has had any impact in this preparation?

(Q.10) Do you feel like the sports-based programme has helped you towards your future aims? Please explain

SECTION 2B FURTHER BACKGROUND QUESTIONING

This section is going to further explore your background and extend from the initial interview.

(Q.1) Would you say there are particular instances that had a major impact on the lifestyle you chose and you criminal behaviour?

Probing:   
   i. Have there been particular stages in your life which instigated the routes you chose?
(Q.2) It is often thought that drug and substance misuse are strongly associated with criminal behaviour. In your opinion and from personal experience would you say this is the case?

Probing:  

i. Have you ever experienced any difficulties with drugs and substance misuse?

ii. Do you think this has any particular impact on lifestyle choice and criminal behaviour?

SECTION 2C        SPORT AND THE REHABILITATION PROCESS

This section aims to further explore your views on sport and in particular where it might assist you in your rehabilitation (if at all).

(Q.1) Through the initial interview you said you do not feel there are any limitations in using sport and physical activity to assist the rehabilitation of offenders, do you still hold the same opinion? Please explain

Probing:  

i. Has the sports-based programme confirmed this view or changed your thinking?
(Q.2) Do you believe there could be any difficulties and or benefits with ex-offenders coaching sports?

Probing:   i. Working with children?

   ii. Certain offenders depending on their convictions?

(Q.3) Why have you chosen the route of sport and physical activity in your rehabilitation over other methods/options?

Probing:   i. Do you believe sport has a greater potential? Please explain

(Q.4) Throughout your past rehabilitation have you tried different methods?

Probing:   i. What has been involved in the process of your previous rehabilitation(s)?

(Q.5) Through the initial interview you said that you were quite heavily involved in sport as a youngster. You also said that you think sport has the potential to help young people stay away from crime. Do you feel sport failed to prevent you from turning to crime?
SECTION 2D COMMUNITY ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS

This section looks to discuss your views on community attitudes and perceptions towards offenders and ex-offenders, and identify any personal experiences you have had.

(Q.1) Some research suggests that one of the biggest challenges facing ‘aftercare’ is community attitudes towards ex-offenders. What are your thoughts or feelings about this?

Probing: i. In your experience have community attitudes been positive and/or negative towards you as an ex-offender?

(Q.2) Are you aware of any beliefs you think the community hold about offenders? Please explain

Probing: i. What do you think the community think about offenders?
(Q.3) Have you experienced any stereotypical attitudes towards yourself?

Probing:  
  i. How do these affect you?

(Q.4) Do you think the community have any role in assisting the resettlement of ex-offenders? Please explain.

Probing:  
  i. What might this role include?

(Q.5) In your opinion what are the most important areas that need to be addressed in your resettlement?

Probing:  
  i. How important are aspects such as:

    - Relationships
    - Accommodation
    - Employment

  further questioning:  Where does sport appear in your resettlement?
(Q.6) Would you say you had any expectations about the outside when you were in prison? Please explain

*Further questioning: In reality were these expectations met?*

(Q.7) Can you describe to me any your experiences with the community since your release?

**SECTION 2E WHAT NEXT?**

This section will aim to examine your intended actions for the future and how you think these might be achieved.

(Q.1) Do you have any plans now that you have completed the programme? Please explain

Probing:  *i. What do you think is going to happen next?*

(Q.2) Do you have any expectations for the future? Please explain
(Q.3) What have you got now (if anything) that you didn’t have before?

Probing:  
  i. Do you think the mentoring programme has enabled you to gain work place experience?

(Q.4) Do you feel like sport can take you where you would like to be? Please explain

Probing:  
  i. In which areas do you think you can use sport to help you develop?

(Q.5) How do you feel about the systems that are in place to help you through your rehabilitation?

Probing:  
  i. Do you feel there are sufficient systems in place to help you rehabilitate successfully?

  
  ii. Which areas (if any) do you feel further support and/or systems are required?

  
  iii. Are there any opportunities that you feel are lacking and you would like to see?
(Q.6) What do you think are employer's perceptions of ex-offenders?

Probing:  
   i. Have you experienced any difficulties in the past with employment and/or employers?
   
   ii. How have you approached employment in the past?

(Q.7) Would there be any issues with the geographical areas you choose to relocate to?

Probing:  
   i. Would you prefer to go back to areas you have previously lived or new areas?
   
   ii. What factors would influence where you will relocate?

(Q.8) Do you feel there are any factors in particular that could lead you back into the cycle of criminal behaviour?

Probing:  
   i. Why do you think this time will be different?
   
   ii. What factors have had the biggest impact on influencing your thinking?
(Q.9) Do you feel like your thinking has changed in any way since your release? Please explain

Probing:  
   i. At what point would you say this change happened?
   
   ii. What do you feel are the reasons instigating your thinking?

SECTION 2F  SUMMARY

(Q.1) Is there anything else you would like to add on about sport and the community, or the mentoring programme?

I would just like to take this opportunity to remind you that all your answers will be treated with the strictest of confidence and will be reported anonymously.

That is the end of the interview, thank you very much for taking part in this study; I hope you will be prepared to further continue in this research.
Additional Information

Contact Details for Further Follow-up

Telephone No: _________________________

Address: ______________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

______________________________________

Email: ________________________________
Interview Guide: Follow-up Interview

An examination of the views and attitudes of an ex-offender enrolled on a post-release sports-based programme

*(Phase Four)*

Participant Code..............................................................................

Interview Number............................................................................

Interview Date..................................................................................

Start time..................Finish time..............................................
SECTION 1A

INTRODUCTION

(Interviewer orientation)

This stage of the research involves the follow-up interview subsequent to your completion of the post-release programme, and will seek to establish your future plans. In addition the interview will focus upon your future outlook and forthcoming plans.

This interview is interested in your views and opinions on:-

- Your current situation, including feelings and expectations of the period between your release from prison and the present moment
- The role of the post-release sports programme through your rehabilitation/transition process
- Glancing into the future and potential plans

As explained at stage one (initial interview) all of the information that you provide will remain completely confidential and your identity will be protected at all times maintaining your anonymity. The interview is entirely voluntary and you are free to end the interview at any time.
I would like you to focus upon the past time period since completing the post-release sports programme. This section will talk about what has occurred during this time and whether any initial expectations have been realised.

Current Situation

(Q.1) Tell me about your time since completing the post-release mentoring programme.

Further questioning: 

i. Employment prospects/volunteering

ii. Accommodation situation

iii. Financial stability/insecurity

iv. Activities that you have been involved in (e.g. social/personal development)

v. Current circumstances
(Q.2) Can you describe any problems or difficulties (if any) that you have experienced during this period?

*Further questioning:*  
i. Probation

ii. Employment/employers

iii. Community

iv. Personal behaviour patterns

v. Stereotypical perceptions

(Q.3) Could you describe any structure or support systems that have been available to you during this period (following the completion of the sports-based programme).

*Further questioning:* Have there been any support systems that you think would have been beneficial to you but which have not been available?

(Q.4) Have you experienced any incidents that have affected your behaviour patterns?
Probing:  

i. Socially

ii. In the work place

iii. Community

(Q.5) In what ways would you say the community has assisted and/or resisted or blocked your transition from prison back into society? Please explain.

Probing:  

i. What might this role include?

Role of Sports-based Programme

(Q.1) How far do you feel the sports-based programme has helped you reach your future aims? Please explain

Further questioning:  What other aspects (if any) do you feel have assisted you in achieving your future aims?

(Q.2) At the time of your programme can you remember any expectations that you had for the future?
Probing: i. Employment was a key expectation highlighted through

previous interviews

(Q.3) To what extent would you say your expectations following the completion of the programme have been realised?

Further questioning: i. Do you feel like these expectations were realistic?

ii. Were your expectations based upon any particular information?

iii. Do you feel that the sports programme prepared you for employment?

(Q.4) To what extent has your thinking changed (in any way) since your completion of the post-release sports programme? Please explain.

Probing: i. At what point would you say this change happened?

ii. What do you feel are the reasons instigating your thinking?
(Q.5) Could you recap over the ways in which you feel you have been able to utilise sport and physical activity through your rehabilitation process.

Probing: 

i. Within prison

ii. Upon release from prison

iii. Have you experienced any difficulties trying to use sport through this process?

iv. Employment, socialising?

Concluding

(Q.1) In a year from now where would you hope to be?

Probing: 

i. What further changes would you like to make (if any)?

ii. What opportunities would you like to see available to you during this period?
(Q.1) Is there anything else you would like to add?

I would just like to take this opportunity to remind you that all your answers will be treated with the strictest of confidence and will be reported anonymously.

That is the end of the interview, thank you very much for taking part in this study.

**Additional Information**

**Contact Details**

Telephone No: _______________________

Address: ______________________________

_____________________________________

_____________________________________

Email: ________________________________
Appendix B:
Mentor interview schedule
Interview Guide: Post-release mentoring programme

An examination of the views and attitudes of individuals providing a post-release sports-based programme for ex-offenders.

Participant Code

Position

Organisation

Contact details

Interview Number

Interview Date

Start time........................Finish time........................
Hello, I’m Maria Galdes from the School of Sport, University of Wales, Institute Cardiff. Thank you for agreeing to be a participant in this interview study and research process. For this research project I am talking to individuals who are involved in the prevention or rehabilitation of offenders. I am interested in your specific role as a mentor of the post-release mentoring programme including your awareness of current strategies that are in place; perceptions and attitudes towards sport and recreation for crime reduction; joined-up thinking and partnership setups currently operating; your personal philosophy and thoughts towards offenders; and apparent barriers to community integration.

Within this study I will be looking to examine your perspective on the post-release sports-based programme as a mentor involved in reducing criminal activity levels, and will be looking for you to draw upon previous experiences or examples.

The information gained from this study will be used in two ways. Firstly the material will be for my PhD thesis. Secondly, the results may be submitted to be published in journals to allow others to benefit from the information gathered.
I think that it is important to emphasise that all of the information that you provide in this interview and any subsequent stages of the research will remain confidential. Any information that is of particular relevance will be presented, where selected quotes from the interview will be extracted to illustrate particular points. These quotes will maintain anonymity in terms of names and any personal identifiers. Broad identifiers such as professional roles and job positions will be required for the research. The interview will be recorded on tape to ensure that all the information provided is accurate and complete, and to make the interview process more efficient. All interviews will be transcribed to assist analysis at a later date and also for referencing purposes. A copy of the transcription will be open for you to review afterwards should you wish to do so.

As a participant in this study, it is important that you are aware of your rights. Firstly your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary, and you are free to end the interview at any time. You are also free to decline to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable answering. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions that you will be asked. I am here to find out what you think about the use of sport within the area of crime. I would like you to answer these questions honestly. If there is a question that you do not fully understand or are uncomfortable answering, please ask, or decline to comment rather than answering the question anyhow. If you do not wish to answer a question, just state ‘no comment’ and no further questions related to that topic will be asked. If you have any queries as we go through the interview please ask and I will attempt to clarify them. Just before we proceed, could I ask you to sign the voluntary consent form.
SECTION 1B

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

(To be covered)

6. Interviewer introduction:
   - Maria Galdes from the School of Sport, University of Wales, Institute Cardiff.
   - Thank you for agreeing to be a participant in this interview study and research process.
   - I am talking to you as a mentor of the post-release sports-based programme who is involved in the reduction of crime and criminal behaviour patterns, to increase understandings of views on sport in the community and how it might assist aspects of crime prevention and/or rehabilitation.
   - I am interested in the specific views and opinions of you the participant on your specific role as a mentor including your awareness of current strategies that are in place; perceptions and attitudes towards sport and recreation for crime reduction; joined-up thinking and partnership setups currently operating; your personal philosophy and thoughts towards offenders; and apparent barriers to community integration.
7. **Use of research:**

   - The information gained from this study will be used in two ways; PhD thesis and the results may be published in journals to allow others to benefit from the information gathered.

8. **Information confidential:**

   - Information that you provide in this interview will remain confidential.
   
   - Any information that is of particular relevance will be presented, where selected quotes from the interview will be extracted to illustrate particular points. These quotes will maintain anonymity in terms of names and any personal identifiers. Broad identifiers such as professional roles and job positions will be required for the research.

9. **Voluntary participation** - your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary, and you are free to end the interview at any time. You are also free to decline to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable answering by simply stating ‘no comment’. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions.

10. **Consent form** - If you have any queries as we progress through the interview please ask. Just before we proceed, we will both read through the voluntary consent form, which I will then ask you to sign should you wish to take part in the interview.
Please draw upon your own experiences. Don’t worry about pauses; take as much time as you require considering the question in detail. Please do not guess the answer or tell what you think is wanted from your response.

At the end of the interview there will be an opportunity for you to add anything that you feel is important but was not covered within the interview.

Before we start do you have any questions relating to any of the areas we have just discussed?

Ok then let’s begin.
SECTION 2

INTERVIEW

Themes

- Individuals’ role as a mentor of the post-release sports-based programme and awareness of current strategies in place
- Joined-up thinking and partnership work
- Perceptions and attitudes towards sport and recreation for the purpose of crime reduction
- Personal philosophy and thoughts towards offenders
- Apparent barriers to community integration

SECTION 2A POST-RELEASE SPORTS-BASED PROGRAMME

I would like you to focus upon the post-release sports-based programme and your thoughts surrounding it. This section will talk about your role as a mentor, any aims and objectives of the programme, and how you think these have been realised and/or changed throughout the process. You will also be asked your thoughts on joined-up thinking and partnership work.

(Q.1) Can you tell me about the post-release sports-based programme, and who instigated this work?

Probing:    i. Who developed the programme?

              ii. What was the reasoning behind it being set-up?
iii. What did the content of the programme involve? Who decided this?

iv. How much involvement have you had in the programme (part/continuously/developing stage)?

Further questioning: What did/does the process involve?

Did an initial referral meeting take place? If so, who was involved in this process?

(Q.2) What support (if any) was provided to you for the running and funding of the sports-based programme?

Probing:  
i. University /prison system/probation service?

ii. Who referred the ex-offender for the programme?

Further questioning: To what extent would you say this support was sufficient?

Do you feel any further support/funding was required? (please explain)

(Q.3) What (if any) were the partnerships that had to be set up and managed in order for the programme to operate effectively?
Probing:  
  i. Prison system?  
  
  ii. Probation service?  
  
  iii. University of Wales Institute Cardiff?  
  
  iv. Key individuals who assisted the process?  
  
  v. Were these partnerships effective? Please explain  

Further questioning: Were any details provided back to the prison/probation officer about the participant? Please provide details.  

(Q.4) As a mentor what would you say were your initial aims and objectives for the sports-based programme?  

Probing:  
  i. What would you say were your initial expectations?  
  
  ii. Was an initial plan developed? If so, who by?  
  
  iii. Who was the programme directed at?  
  
  iv. Who decided on the selection of the individual? Were there a set criteria?  

Further questioning: In your opinion was everyone clear about what the programme involved? (Please explain). Did the referral meeting assist this process?
(Q.5) To what extent would you say your aims and objectives for the sports-based programme were realised?

Probing:  
  i. Do you feel the aims and objectives were realistic?  
  ii. Were they based upon any particular information?  
  iii. From your experience(s) to date, do you feel they are being met?

(Q.6) What aspects of the sports-based programme do you think have been particularly useful/positive (if any)?

(Q.7) Have you experienced any problems/issues whilst delivering the sports-based programme? Please explain.

Probing:  
  i. What would you say were the major tasks in providing the programme?

(Q.8) Was the participant free to leave at any stage in the programme?

Further questioning:  Were there any consequences?
(Q.9) Do you believe you were fully prepared for the sports-based programme, and able to perform your key role as a mentor?

Probing:  
  i. Was there anything that helped you prepare for the role/programme?
  ii. The content of the programme?
  iii. Criteria used to select the individual?

Further questioning: Can you tell me about your previous experiences of working with offenders/crime etc?

(Q.10) Do you feel there is anything more that might have been included in the sports-based programme?

Probing:  
  i. Briefings/familiarisation?
  ii. Induction/training?
  iii. Time allocated to the programme?
  iv. More opportunities?
  v. delivery/content?

(Q.11) Overall how would you say you’re feeling about the programme?

Probing:  
  i. Do you feel like it was a worthwhile or frustrating process?
  ii. Strengths/weaknesses?
(Q.12) In your opinion at what stage do you think rehabilitation programmes for offenders would be best placed?

Probing:  
  i. Whilst in prison serving sentences?  
  
  ii. Upon release, as in this particular situation?

(Q.13) How do you think the participant felt about the programme?

Further questioning: Do you think this changed during the programme? Please explain.

SECTION 2B PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES

This section aims to explore your perceptions and attitudes towards sport and recreation for the purpose of crime reduction; your personal philosophy and thoughts towards offenders; and any apparent barriers to community integration.

(Q.1) Can you tell me about your specific role and area of work outside of the sports-based programme?

Probing:  
  i. Please explain what is involved in your position/role?  
  
  ii. Can you explain which area of work you are more closely involved in?
iii. Can you tell me about the individuals that your work is involved with? (Ex-offenders; ‘at-risk’; youth/adults; community fear)

(Q.2) In general what are your perceptions of those individuals who commit crimes? Please explain.

Probing:  
i. Have you any previous experience of offenders/crime/victim or observer?

ii. What are your attitudes and views towards offenders?

iii. What is your view on changing the behaviour patterns of such individuals? How do you think this might be done? Please explain

iv. In your opinion what are the difficulties when dealing with individuals who have offended? Please explain.

(Q.3) What are your overall perceptions and attitudes towards sport and recreation as a tool to assist aspects of crime prevention and/or rehabilitation? Please explain.

Probing:  
i. In your opinion does sport currently appear on the continuum of crime reduction (prison/probation/conditional discharge/bound over/police caution)?

ii. Where does it appear and in what capacity (rehabilitation/prevention)?
iii. In your opinion is there a best time to use sport and recreation?

For the remaining few questions please draw upon both your experience of the post-release sports-based programme and your own personal views and opinions.

(Q.4) When considering specifically the ex-offender population, what is your opinion on the ability to change? Please explain.

Probing:  
   i. Do you think there is potential to have a greater impact on a certain age group? Please explain
   
   ii. What is the outlook when considering the younger generation and adult population?

(Q.5) What do you perceive to be the main barriers that exist in the rehabilitation of offenders?

Probing:  
   i. What do you think needs to be done to minimise the impact of such barriers? Please explain
(Q.6) What do you think are the main factors necessary for ex-offenders to make a successful transition back into the community after spending time in prison?

Probing:  
  i. In your opinion does sport have the capacity to support this transition? Please explain
  
  ii. In what capacity?

(Q.7) Would you like to add anything that you feel is important but was not covered within the interview?
Appendix C:

Gibbs (1988) reflective cycle
Gibbs (1988) Reflective Cycle

- Description (what happened?)
- Feelings and thoughts
- Evaluation (good/bad)
- Analysis (what sense can be made?)
- Conclusion (what else can be done?)
- Action plan (if it occurred again what would you do?)
Appendix D:
Ex-offender interview protocols
CONSENT FORM

PhasemOne – Interview One

Informed Consent

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Maria Galdes

TITLE OF PROJECT: An examination of the views and attitudes of an ex-offender enrolled on a post release sports-based programme

This informed consent will explain about being part of this study. It is important that you read through carefully and fully understand what will be involved and then decide if you wish to be a part of the research.

This study aims to look at personal views and attitudes of you the participant taking part on a post-release mentoring programme, on the use of sport through the rehabilitation process including information about past, present and anticipated futures. The study will try and find out special difficulties in achieving anticipated futures.

The project will involve two interview stages throughout the duration of the mentoring process over the period of September to November. This first interview phase-one will last approximately 40 minutes and is interested in views and opinions of you the participant on your background, sporting background and expectations of the mentoring programme. A follow-up interview at the end of the mentoring (phase two), with the possibility of extended follow-up. In addition you will be asked to keep a reflective journal throughout the course of the mentoring, and meet for a face-to-face weekly diary account entry.
PROCEDURE

1. During the interviews I will ask you to answer questions in a one-to-one interview that I would like to tape-record to make sure that all the information you provide is recorded correctly and to make the interview process more efficient.

2. I will type the tape and nobody else will hear the tape. The material used will make sure that no one is able to identify you, with any identifiers removed or disguised. Your name is not required for the research.

Two further points:

1. Voluntary participation - answering questions in this study is your choice. You do not have to take part and can stop at any time. You are free to ask questions.

2. Involvement in this study will have no influence on your situation.

Interviews will be conducted with all those who wish to be part of the study.

By signing below, I agree that I have read or had these pages read to me. I have been able to ask questions and to discuss my part with the researcher. I choose to be in this project.

______________________________  ____________________________
SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT      DATE

______________________________  ____________________________
SIGNATURE OF RESEARCHER        DATE
Appendix E:

Mentor interview protocols
CONSENT FORM

Informed Consent

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Maria Galdes

TITLE OF PROJECT: An examination of the views and attitudes of mentors providing a post-release sports-based programme for ex-offenders

This informed consent will explain about being part of this study. It is important that you read through carefully and fully understand what will be involved and then decide if you wish to be a part of the research.

This aspect of the study aims to look at personal views and attitudes of individuals who are engaged in the process of reducing criminal activity levels through the provision of a post-release sports-based programme.

This semi-structured interview will last approximately 60 minutes and is interested in your views and opinions on your specific role as a mentor of the post-release sports-based programme and awareness of current strategies that are in place; perceptions and attitudes towards sport and recreation for crime reduction; joined-up thinking and partnership setups currently operating; your personal philosophy and thoughts towards offenders; and apparent barriers to community integration.
PROCEDURE

1. I will ask you to answer questions in a one-to-one interview that I would like to tape-record to make sure that all the information you provide is recorded correctly and to make the interview process more efficient.

2. Tape recordings will remain safely stored with access through me and restricted to supervisors and examiners.

3. The tape will be transcribed and the material used will make sure that anonymity is maintained in terms of names and any personal identifiers. Broad identifiers such as professional roles and job positions will be required for the research.

One further point:

Voluntary participation - answering questions in this study is your choice. You do not have to take part and can stop at any time. You are free to ask questions.

Interviews will be conducted with all those who wish to be part of the study.

By signing below, I agree that I have read or had these pages read to me. I have been able to ask questions and to discuss my part with the researcher. I choose to be in this project.

________________________________________  __________________________
SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT                DATE

________________________________________  __________________________
SIGNATURE OF RESEARCHER                  DATE
Appendix F:
Gatekeeper interview
An examination of key policy makers and practitioners within the community, who are engaged in reducing criminal activity levels.
SECTION 1A
INTRODUCTION
(Interviewer orientation)

Hello, I'm Maria Galdes from the School of Sport, University of Wales, Institute Cardiff. Thank you for agreeing to be a participant in this interview study and research process. For this research project I am talking to individuals who are involved in the prevention or rehabilitation of offenders. I am interested in your specific role and awareness of current strategies that are in place; perceptions and attitudes towards sport and recreation for crime reduction; joined-up thinking and partnership setups currently operating; your personal philosophy and thoughts towards offenders; and apparent barriers to community integration.

Within this study I will be looking to examine the different perspectives of individuals who are involved in reducing criminal activity levels and will be looking for you to draw upon previous experiences or examples.

The information gained from this study will be used in two ways. Firstly the material will be for my PhD thesis. Secondly, the results may be submitted to be published in journals to allow others to benefit from the information gathered.

I think that it is important to emphasise that all of the information that you provide in this interview and any subsequent stages of the research will remain completely confidential. Any information that is of particular relevance will be presented, where selected quotes from the interview will be extracted to illustrate particular points. These quotes will maintain
absolute anonymity and your identity will be protected. To ensure that individuals cannot be identified through the material, identifiers will either be removed or disguised. The interview will be recorded on tape to ensure that all the information provided is accurate and complete, and to make the interview process more efficient. All interviews will be transcribed to assist analysis at a later date and also for referencing purposes. A copy of the transcription will be open for you to review afterwards should you wish to do so.

As a participant in this study, it is important that you are aware of your rights. Firstly your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary, and you are free to end the interview at any time. You are also free to decline to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable answering. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions that you will be asked. I am here to find out what you think about the use of sport within the area of crime. I would like you to answer these questions honestly. If there is a question that you do not fully understand or are uncomfortable answering, please ask, or decline to comment rather than answering the question anyhow. If you do not wish to answer a question, just state ‘no comment’ and no further questions related to that topic will be asked.

If you have any queries as we go through the interview please ask and I will attempt to clarify them. Just before we proceed, could I ask you to sign the voluntary consent form.
SECTION 1B
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
(To be covered)

1. Interviewer introduction:
   - Maria Galdes from the School of Sport, University of Wales, Institute Cardiff.
   - Thank you for agreeing to be a participant in this interview study and research process.
   - I am talking to individuals who are involved in the reduction of crime and criminal behaviour patterns to increase understandings of views on sport in the community and how it might assist aspects of crime prevention and/or rehabilitation.
   - I am interested in the specific views and opinions of you the participant on your specific role and awareness of current strategies that are in place; perceptions and attitudes towards sport and recreation for crime reduction; joined-up thinking and partnership setups currently operating; your personal philosophy and thoughts towards offenders; and apparent barriers to community integration.

2. Use of research:
   - The information gained from this study will be used in two ways; PhD thesis and the results may be published in journals to allow others to benefit from the information gathered.
3. Information confidential:

- Information that you provide in this interview will remain completely confidential. Any information that is of particular relevance will be presented, where selected quotes from the interview will be extracted to illustrate particular points. These quotes will maintain absolute anonymity and your identity will be protected, to ensure that individuals cannot be identified through the material.

4. Voluntary participation - your participation in this interview is entirely voluntary, and you are free to end the interview at any time. You are also free to decline to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable answering by simply stating 'no comment'. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions.

5. Consent form - If you have any queries as we progress through the interview please ask. Just before we proceed, we will both read through the voluntary consent form, which I will then ask you to sign should you wish to take part in the interview.

Please draw upon your own experiences. Don’t worry about pauses; take as much time as you require considering the question in detail. Please do not guess the answer or tell what you think is wanted from your response.

At the end of the interview there will be an opportunity for you to add anything that you feel is important but was not covered within the interview.
Before we start do you have any questions relating to any of the areas we have just discussed?

Ok then let’s begin.
SECTION 2

INTERVIEW

Themes

- Individuals’ role and awareness of current strategies in place
- Perceptions and attitudes towards sport and recreation for the purpose of; crime reduction, enhancing lifestyles, employment and volunteering
- Joined-up thinking and partnership work
- Personal philosophy and thoughts towards offenders
- Apparent barriers to community integration

Questions

1. Can you tell me about your specific role and area of work?

   Probing: - Please explain what is involved in your position/role?
   - Can you explain which area of work you are more closely involved in (rehabilitation or prevention)?
   - Can you tell me about the individuals that your work is involved with? (Ex-offenders; ‘at-risk’; youth/adults; community fear)

2. What strategies do you currently have in place? Please explain and where possible could you provide examples.

   Probing: - Why are those believed to be the best approaches?
   - What are the current interventions that you as an individual and/or organisation have implemented and what is the thinking behind them?
Where is the focus of your attention at the present moment?

3. What are your overall perceptions and attitudes towards sport and recreation as a tool to assist aspects of crime prevention and/or rehabilitation? Please explain.

**Probing:**
- In your opinion does sport currently appear on the continuum of crime reduction (prison/probation/conditional discharge/bound over/police caution)?
- Where does it appear and in what capacity (rehabilitation/prevention)?
- In your opinion is there a best time to use sport and recreation?

**Further Questioning:** *What is your opinion on the use of sport with offenders whilst within prison?*

*In your opinion can sports based qualifications gained whilst in prison positively/negatively impact on an offenders rehabilitation and resettlement? Please explain*

*What's your opinion on the use of sports based mentoring programmes through offender's rehabilitation and resettlement? Please explain*

4. In general what are your perceptions of those individuals who commit crimes? Please explain.

**Probing:**
- What are your attitudes and views towards offenders?
- What is your view on changing the behaviour patterns of such individuals? How do you think this might be done? Please explain
- In your opinion what are the difficulties when dealing with individuals who have offended? Please explain.
Further Questioning: *What do you think are the potential Risk Factors in childhood and adolescence that heighten the likelihood of problems later in life?* (family/education, training and work/community/individuals, friends and peers)

5. **When considering specifically the ex-offender population, what is your opinion on the ability to change? Please explain.**

   **Probing:** - Do you think there is potential to have a greater impact on a certain age group? Please explain
   - What is the outlook when considering the younger generation and adult population?

6. **What do you perceive to be the main barriers that exist in the rehabilitation and resettlement of offenders?**

   **Probing:** - What do you think needs to be done to minimise the impact of such barriers? Please explain

Further Questioning: *In your opinion what are the potential barriers to employment and volunteering amongst the offender population?*

   **Do you think employers personal beliefs about offenders affect their decisions on their recruitment?**

7. **What do you think are the main factors for ex-offenders to make a successful transition back into the community after spending time in prison?**
Probing: - In your opinion does sport have the capacity to support this transition? Please explain
   - In what capacity?

8. Can you explain your current set-up and any partnerships that are established? (please discuss in terms of formal and informal partnerships)

Probing: - Who do you currently work with?
   - What is your opinion on partnership work? Please explain
   - In your opinion is there a successful way forward? Please explain

9. Would you like to add anything that you feel is important but was not covered within the interview?
Appendix G:

Example thematic output
Ex-offender Initial Interview (pre-programme) – Example of a Thematic Output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POST-RELEASE SPORTS-BASED PROGRAMME</th>
<th>PHASES OF DATA COLLECTION</th>
<th>DIRECTION</th>
<th>THOUGHTS</th>
<th>REASONING/REFLECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Interview (pre-programme)</td>
<td>Thoughts whilst within prison</td>
<td>Participation in sport and/or physical activity</td>
<td>- Positive use of sport within prison for a release/escape from prison environment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities available</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Lack of meaningful opportunities outside of those sport/gym based</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PE department within the prison</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Gym orderly position and qualifications attained within the PE department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-release sports programme</td>
<td>Initial expectations</td>
<td>- Courses completed – mainly gym specific, also assessing the motivation(s) behind undertaken programmes/courses within prison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns</td>
<td>- Discussion surrounding the PE department and staff members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sporting background and views held</td>
<td>Within school</td>
<td>See narrative A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post schooling</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Initial expectations to gain employment after the completion of the programme and provide structure and direction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td>- No major concerns, just feeling nervous initially and financial constraints seen as potential difficulty in completing programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General background</td>
<td></td>
<td>See narrative B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transition process and rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
<td>- heavily involved in school sport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- elite sporting background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- believes sport can give young people an opportunity to keep away from crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Ideally aims to use sport to give something back to the community and assist community integration. Sees no limitations in using sport for offender rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- during teens years commitment to sport tapered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instances leading to criminal behaviour</td>
<td>Sport and community integration</td>
<td>See narrative C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post schooling</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Grew up within deprived neighbourhood with many family issues. Unsteady background with anger issues developing from early age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- currently living with Nan as needed permanent address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- enjoyed school, however wishes studied harder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- numerous jobs post schooling experiencing financial difficulties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- lack of money and unemployment raised as key determinants for own criminal behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- often displaces blame when discussing crimes that have been committed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Systems and structures for rehabilitation process</td>
<td>Systems and structures for rehabilitation process</td>
<td>See narrative D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- sport viewed as way back into community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- sees no limitation in using sport throughout the rehabilitation process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- feels there is a lack of support for prisoners once released from prison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- consistent difficulties with probation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- not enough being done in terms of offender rehabilitation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See narrative E</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thematic Narratives
Ex-offender Initial interview (pre-programme) – Thematic output narratives

Narrative A

Thoughts whilst within prison

When discussing participation in sport and/or physical activity whilst in prison sport were viewed very positively often seen as a form of release/escape from the prison environment;

“...I couldn’t wait to get in the gym...I think when you’re locked in a cell, that ah getting out of the cell I think and and going into the gym gets a lot of frustration ...it’s actually when I’ve taken part in sport I didn’t felt like I was actually in in prison. It’s it’s a form of escape; ...”

“So I’ve taken part in the gym up there [prison] and basically the general interest of uh sport in general, I I’ve always had that but but by going to the gym weight lifting got a lot of frustration of being penned up locked up in a cell really.”

Views held surrounding non-sporting based opportunities available within the prison system were often negative, such that they provide a lack of meaningful purpose and often result in limited future prospects;

“There are other activities in there I could have undertaken, well work wise...but uh dead end jobs really...um you know menial jobs dead ends...They do hardly any work they sit in one room supervised play cards they might do some work maybe one, two days a week and they got no other work on for the rest of he week and so you’re sat around all week doing nothing. I couldn’t handle doing that I couldn’t.”

Further into the conversation the individual points out that there were opportunities that could have been followed across the educational aspect within the prison including IT. However it is thought that the non-sporting opportunities although available may not have appealed to this particular individual as oppose to there being a possible deficiency;

“...I had chances to go, if I wanted to go on the education side of it, do IT and things like that...”
It appears that the individual felt privileged and fortune to have been given the sport/gym based activities within the prison, suggesting a lack of opportunities outside of the PE department. Through discussions it was also implied that there is a discrepancy between the opportunities available to prisoners in accordance to their location within the prison, thus the prospects appear not to be standard throughout the entire prison system;

“...I was lucky enough to be given a gym orderly job uh as a job orderly I had privileges I had use of the gym every day...so the it depends on which part of the prison you were in and what wing you were on and things like that.”

“But uh the other opportunities [non-sporting] within the prison is uh really uh lacking, they don’t give you a lot of opportunity. Uh I’m glad I just had the gym to go to...”

When discussing the gym orderly position it was clear that various sport/gym specific qualifications and awards were undertaken in compliance with the job opportunity;

“...I sat the OCN...sat uh Youth Achievement Awards...I sat YMCA level two in anatomy and physiology, which it makes me a qualified instructor, so uh the the opportunities for that was brilliant so the gym department in the in the prison.”

“...my name was down on for the course prior to me being a gym orderly...I trained everyday as often as I could up there got to know the staff and uh I had a recommendation from a wing officer, said look he’s a hard worker...”

Overall the courses completed within the prison were mainly sport/gym specific however during the individuals first prison sentence GSCE in maths and English were attained in addition to a British Industrial Cleaning course. When questioned about any motivations behind enrolling on programmes/courses within prison, education was the principal incentive and the desire to learn more;

“...a BIC which is a British Industrial Cleaning course which uh I had to do because I was a landing cleaner first and so health and safety...”

“I sat my GCSE in maths and English in uh prison.”

“...education I wanted to know more about anatomy, physiology the body, how it uh all works like basically and uh around exercise.”
When considering the PE department the individual notes how relaxed he felt within that environment, including the difference between the gym staff and uniformed staff within the prison, and the feelings and reactions between the two. The lack of uniform by the PE staff appeared to portray a relaxed atmosphere and feelings of belonging;

“...the gym’s brilliant I got I got no complaints and the staff were good there. It was really weird because when you haven’t got a uniform on the staff there is like ah what do you call it, you don’t see them like staff they were just like one of the lads like my mate or whatever…”

“...and I got really friendly with them, but when they got you know if they had a uniform and they’re on the landing it’s an entirely different environment.”

It should be noted however that there could be a risk of becoming over friendly in such environments where boundaries become blurred.
Narrative B

Post-release mentoring programme

The prime focus of undertaking the post-release mentoring programme appeared to revolve around gaining employment afterwards and increasing the individual’s knowledge base around the industry. It seems that the post-release mentoring programme was viewed as a means of raising the chances of job opportunities within the leisure environment;

“…[Hoping] it [post-release mentoring programme] will lead to work. Yeah definitely lead to work uh I don’t think it would have been a lot harder me getting a job without this. Because…Dave said uh that uh like he’s going to write a report on what I do here and everything and that’s that’s a right step in the right direction as far as looking for jobs…”

“…the more knowledge I learn by being in this environment I think I can only carry on later…”

When asked about any concerns surrounding the post-release mentoring programme no major concerns were raised there was simply a slight apprehension in terms of the unknown aspect of the programme, with the only factor raised that could potentially affect continuation of the programme being financial constraints. This said the individual appeared to be thinking positively about the whole mentoring process and determined to attend the weekly sessions;

“…I’m playing it as it comes at the moment…I was a bit nervous coming here at first but uh they’ve [mentors] made me feel really welcome and uh I’ll get my head into it…what I put into it I’m only going to get out of it…I’ll give it my best shot that’s all I can do…”

“uh my money I’m finding, I like since I’ve got out I’ve had what £46 to live on since I been out I’ve had nothing for the last three weeks that’s what I’ve had to live on for the last three weeks. Uh just my money side of it is the only thing that I could that stops me getting here, but I’ll always get here…I’m determined to get here actually I’ve got to get get on with it…”
Narrative C

Sporting background and views held

Heavily involved in school sport as a youngster participating in a variety of different activities, constantly pushed by his father to become involved in sport;

“I was in ah school rugby team, ah athletics team, ah run for ah the Gwent schools, played rugby for district ah Welsh under nineteen’s and uh I was always been into it as my father was ah pushed me into sport he had a bit of ah crushed leg and uh I think he sort of looked at me to do achieve what couldn’t achieve…”

The individual continued this involvement in sport prior to leaving school particularly in rugby, however soon after this period and at the age of seventeen ended up in prison for his first offence. Following the completion of his prison sentence and a little while later the individual was selected to play semi-professional rugby until a critical injury ended his career. It is commented that the main motivational factors behind participating in sport and physical activity changed over time with commitment for sport tapering once the teen years were reached and the prime focus turned into a more fun social aspect, as the individual became involved in alternative activities. Now the central incentive is education and to learn more;

“…rugby yeah but I ended up in prison then ah just after ah my mother died, an it discontinued then for a while for the time I was in…”

“…I was getting paid for playing rugby…it was semi-professional…and then uh I got a bad injury had to retire from uh rugby so I lost that income…”

“As a youngster I wanted to do really well at it [sport], but uh once I started hitting my teens ah that that started to die off…I think you get into other things as a teenager.”

“…now I want to put something back into rugby maybe do some coaching in rugby at some point…I’m involved with a rugby club now and I’ve already been asked to do some fitness training for them and things like that and write out programmes for the rugby lads.”
When asked his opinion on whether sport might be used to provide young people with a means of getting involved in activities and deterring them away from crime there was strong support for such a method;

“Definitely…uh give them a right angle to work at and then it’s also it’s an outlet as well…”

Narrative D

General background

The individual discusses his adolescence and growing up in deprived neighbourhood areas as a youngster with copious family issues. Clearly an unsteady and unsettled background with apparent anger issues developing from an early age. It appears that the individual attributes criminal behaviour patterns to particular incidents that influenced the pathways chosen;

“Rough area…a council estate um father was a bit of an alcoholic, well turned into an alcoholic uh mother died when I was seventeen. Was murdered in front of me and ah I ended up in jail within eight months of that happening, so uh that’s where it all stopped with sport…”

“…few behaviour problems after that I had a lot of anger problems…violence like…but uh I think that stems from years back…”

“…pushed form pillar to post, I’ve lived all over the country, um just moved house to house, town to town.”

Currently living with Nan as the prison required a permanent address before they would release the individual. When asked about schooling in general this period appeared to be an enjoyable experience however in hindsight there is a desire to have studied harder whilst in school;

“I wish I sat more…I wish I’d studied a little harder in school…paid attention more.”
Post schooling attempts were made to attend college however got banned due to aggressive behaviour towards a member of staff at the college. In and out of numerous jobs including; ambassador conservatories; security guard; factory worker; bar worker; window cleaner. Jobs were interrupted by stints within prison for committing various crimes.

“Um I left school in hope of a job down the pit uh but uh it closed, so then I ended up going to ah college…sit uh constructing industry building course. Uh I got half way through the course and was kicked off the course ah basically the teacher threw a shovel at me to get me to do some digging and all that and I planked him around the head with it basically and uh I was thrown off the course…”

When asked whether it was felt that there were any particular instances that had lead to the individuals’ criminal behaviour, lack of money and unemployment were the main determinants raised;

“Um out of work I think is one of the biggest things…being skint you’re desperate…”

Interestingly when commenting about his criminal behaviour and crimes that were committed often there is a displacement of blame from oneself to the circumstances and conditions he was in, claiming there was no other option but to commit the crime;

“…I only committed the crime my first time I went to jail…because uh I’d come home from work…and because father used to drink heavy I jumped in the bath after work left my wages on the side…he’d upped and gone off with the wages, I come out and all my money’s gone and I ended having to walk into a petrol station basically and uh I held up the place…so uh I had no option really. I just felt I was driven into that situation then…”

Even when discussing the most recent offence that was committed there are statements express where again there was no alternative available, with no control over the situation;

“…I’ve been done for ABH and GBH before and assault and all that but uh, this was an incident that uh how do you out it I had no control over this incident. I was out with a quiet drink with my brother…a guy tried bottling me in the face…so I stopped tried to stop him and uh sort of hit him he went down onto the ground and was unconscious and uh his mate jumped on my back and bit me…and I just went nuts then and threw him over and I bit him on the face and uh that’s what I was done for biting him.”
“So uh I ended up four year sentence…I had no option but defend myself…”
**Narrative E**

**Transition process and rehabilitation**

When questioned about the concept of using sport to get involved in a community, there was strong support for this approach and a method of which would allow the individual personally to give something back to both sport and the community as well as a means of providing direction into his own life;

“I think its my way in it’s my way back in, definitely its my way back in its also my way of giving something back to sport and maybe the community which I’ll get involved in, and uh I think that’s the way, the right way for me to go really…at least I’ve got a direction with this way.”

When asked to consider the transition process from the prison system and back into the community following the completion of sentences, it was claimed that there was a definite lack of support for prisoners when they are released from prison and this is a principal determinant in prolific offending and recidivism;

“There’s not enough done for people coming out of prison I really do believe that…if I hadn’t had our Nan’s I would have had to do another eight months, I’m kicked out I’m on the road, I have no home I’m homeless then, and then part of the way down the line at some point I’m going to be skint and its going to force me into a situation where a crime will either be committed…where you have no option but to feed yourself…”

“…I see saw many guys go through that in prison…uh times I’ve been on my one sentence and I’ve seen the same faces go in, come in, go out come back in go out come back in…”

When asked whether he thought there were any limitations in using sport to assist his personal rehabilitation no limitations were highlighted;

“…I don’t see that there could be no…as long as I’m willing to give it a good crack…I think more things like this [post-release mentoring programme] should be given to prisoners, opportunities.”
The opinion is expressed that not enough is currently being enforced as far as offender rehabilitation is concerned, and this is a principal issue that needs addressing in order to have any impact on recidivism;

“...the government should help be aiming uh more towards uh rehabilitation for prisoners than rather just trying to get a statistic of numbers out...no wonder they're overcrowding they can't deal with the problem of rehabilitation that's why they're always going back, and uh I think they should do a lot more to uh help prisoners get a proper fresh start in life...”

An issue highlighted by the individual was the difficulties adapting to the change of routine from the prison system when back in the community. Struggling immensely within the initial two weeks where often thoughts of wanting to be back inside prison were experienced, the change of routine and lack of structure appearing to be the main factors influencing this thought process;

"My first uh two weeks was hard it was strange at one point in the first week I wanted to go back to prison...it took me about two weeks before I realised and thought right this it."

“...because of the routine I was used to...it's totally strange its it totally a different environment...I was let out for one day and then I was let out for five days prior to that on parole release...but once you come out and then reality hits you think right this is it your out, it's a it's a heck of a different thing...to have out in your head like to thinking oh is that where I belong...I realised now that this is the direction I got to be heading and uh you know hopefully flourish...”

Throughout the individual raised the difficulties that he continued to experience with probation in terms of the lack of consistency with the probation officers available and support on offer;

“and I've seen what one, two, three, four different probation officers and I'm supposed to be under one and I seen four...they don't help in any way...”