A conceptual model on reintegration after prison in Norway.
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Abstract

Many offenders struggle when attempting to reintegrate into society after release from prison, and the conditions they face after release often lead to reoffending. Internationally, there is limited understanding about how to improve these conditions and thereby reduce recidivism rates. In particular, offenders’ own perspectives on the challenges they face and how to overcome these are absent.

This paper presents a conceptual model that has the potential to guide practitioners in their understanding of the relationships between welfare services and the agency of the offender. The model was developed from a small-scale study in the Norwegian Criminal Justice system, which is well known for its emphasis on rehabilitation and crime prevention. Data collection aimed to explore the reintegration process from the perspective of the hard-to-reach and vulnerable population of serial offenders. Nine prisoners in two different prisons were interviewed. A thematic analysis identified two main themes that related, first, the personal challenges offenders faced in the rehabilitation and reintegration process and, second, factors in the welfare services that interacted with the prisoners’ psychosocial issues in the reintegration process. Findings suggest that the interaction between the psychosocial needs of prisoners and organization of welfare services is complex and not harmonized. The model developed from the insights of this study can serve as a reflective and analytical tool for developing new approaches to support offenders in their reintegration into society from prison in the future. The model underpins the argument that current reintegration strategies for prisoners needs to be questioned and challenged.
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Introduction

Large numbers of prisoners are released from prison every year. For instance, in 2018, the U.K. had a prison population of approximately 92,500 (Sturge, 2018). At some point, these prisoners will be released, often, however, without the health and welfare support they need, a
risk factor that can result in their reoffending (Skeem and Peterson, 2011). However, despite
high levels of recidivism internationally (Fazel and Wolf, 2015), little is known about
offenders’ reintegration processes and how offenders deal with these problems before and
after release (Chikadzi, 2017, Schinkel, 2014). Poor relationships with families as well as with
welfare systems have been shown to contribute to the struggles faced by offenders upon their
release and to the failure of their rehabilitation and reintegration processes (Chikadzi, 2017).
To better understand and address the problems of offender reintegration, it is important that
the voice of the prisoner is heard and kept central to the development of future interventions
designed to improve reintegration. Some of the few research studies that present this point of
view, such as Chikadzhi’s (2017), highlight the lack of support received by support services,
and it is therefore important for practitioners to better understand the experiences of the
offenders these services work with and the impact such services have upon offenders’ life
conditions upon release. In another qualitative study (Morse et al., 2014) on women in drug
treatment court, the women reported experiences of an “evil cycle” of relapse and recidivism
among other challenges. In addition, it was found (Binswanger et al., 2012; Cepeda et al.,
2015) that overdosing was considered by offenders after release as “a way out” of a stressful
life.

The aim of this paper, therefore, is to present a conceptual model which has the potential to
guide practitioners in their understanding of the relationships between welfare structures and
the agency of the offender. It explains the development of the model from a small-scale study
conducted in the Norwegian Criminal Justice system, which is well known for its emphasis on
rehabilitation and crime prevention.

The Norwegian Context
In Norway, for example, with a population of 5.1 million, around 10,000 prisoners are
released each year (Dyb and Johannessen, 2013). Six out of 10 of these prisoners are reported
to be dependent on drugs, two thirds have a childhood characterized by some form of trauma,
3 out of 10 have been in contact with child welfare services before the age of 16, and
educational attainment is low. One third of the prisoners will become homeless, and only 8%
of the prison population show no sign of mental illness (Friestad and Skog Hansen, 2004; Dyb
et al., 2006; Cramer, 2014; Revold, 2015). Reoffenders report that they feel stigmatized and
excluded from society on release (Amundsen, 2008). It is perhaps unsurprising that 20% of
prisoners released will reoffend within two years, with this figure rising to over 70% among
certain groups (75% among males aged 25 to 44 sentenced for theft) (Graunbøl et al., 2010). Although 20% is low compared to international statistics (Fazel and Wolf, 2015), this still represents significant human and economic costs for Norway (Nystrøm and Jess, 2002; Jess, 2005; Bakke, 2011).

Offering adequate support is central to the Norwegian Criminal Justice System’s underlying philosophy of rehabilitation and reintegration of prisoners into society, as exemplified in their statement that:

reduced recidivism demands many different measures. It is necessary to both do something about the living conditions and to offer measures that help transform the convicted persons themselves. It is emphasized that the measures do not have to be either in prison or afterwards – there must be continuity and a coordinated effort from all affected parties, often over the long haul. If this is done, success is possible. (The Norwegian Ministry of Justice and the Police, 2008, p. 13)

The general approach to reintegration and rehabilitation in Norway is operationalized through the offender participating in a process of staged release (Bjørkly, 2004; Dyb, 2006; Olsen, 2012). Prisoners work their way “up the ladder,” starting in a closed facility with high security, moving to lower security prisons, and ending up, potentially, in the last phase of their sentence, under home supervision. A failure to comply with regulations, as, for example, testing positive for alcohol or drug use, will cause the prisoner to take one or several steps backwards in this process. In other countries, offenders’ rehabilitation in prison may be managed through specialized reintegration programs that further manage their transition from prison to the community (UNDOC, 2012), but these kinds of programs do not currently exist in the Norwegian system.

The Norwegian welfare state and the Scandinavian welfare model are also well known for fairly generous income systems for the whole population accompanied by a higher level of taxation compared to other countries. The aim is to offer a broad spectrum of social security including housing, employment, and healthcare (Kautto et al., 2001).
Method

The main aim of the study from which the conceptual model discussed below was developed was to explore prisoners’ experiences of the reintegration process. A critical realist stance was taken in the study with the perspective that though a reality of health and welfare services exists outside of the offender, this reality is individually interpreted (Bhaskar, 2008). Empirically, offenders’ experiences with the health and welfare services were explored qualitatively using semi-structured interviews as the method of data collection.

Sample

Serial reoffenders were the target population of the study. This is a hard-to-reach population. A small sample size of 9 eventually participated in the study. This makes the report of their voices all the more important. The prisoners were selected by the first author for convenience. Respondents were all men, ranging in age from 25 to 56. In the findings section, they are numbered from 1 (the youngest) to 9 (the oldest). Repeated reoffending was a selection criterion, and the final sample had been in and out of prison from 2 to 20 times. The participants all consented in writing to take part in the study. The periods in prison ranged from one month to one year, with all respondents being from a single county in Norway. Six respondents were serving at two different prisons in this county at the time the interviews took place, while the remaining three were on probation. The sample was selected through a dialogue with Norwegian Criminal Justice Staff about whom they saw as potential respondents matching the above criteria. The suggested prisoners then received an information letter about the study and were asked to participate.

Data collection

A semi-structured interview guide explored inductively participants’ current life conditions and how they experienced welfare services, both while in prison and when re-entering life outside prison. Typical questions included: Have you been homeless? What is that like? What is most difficult in the process of reintegration after prison? All interviews were conducted by one researcher (first author) and took place over three months. All interviews were also audio recorded and lasted approximately one hour. Six of the interviews were conducted in the visitor room in prison, and the other three at a criminal justice service office outside prison. All interviews were conducted in Norwegian and later translated into English.
Analysis
Interviews were transcribed verbatim, and an inductive thematic analysis of the interviews was conducted in four steps. First, all interview transcripts were read to get an overall impression of the material and to identify meaning units, for example, central concepts or sentences. Second, the interviews were coded independently by the first and third author, and central sub-themes were identified and merged into two main themes. Third, the sub-themes were discussed by the first and third author, in order to reach a common understanding of the main content of the interview and the trustworthiness of the common themes arising from the data (Kvale and Brinkman, 2012, Lykkeslet and Gjengedal, 2007; Pope et al., 2000). Two main themes arose from the data and quotations from offenders’ comments were found and used to illustrate each of these. Fourth, through abstraction, the two main themes were seen in relation to each other and resulted in the creation of Figure 1, presented in the discussion below. The number of subjects and interviews was driven by saturation of the concepts leading to the subthemes and the two main themes. The description of the two main themes was checked, confirmed, and adapted with the second author of this paper who was consulted during the reporting process.

Ethics
The study was approved by both the Norwegian Social Science Data Service (38278/3/KH) and the Norwegian Correctional Service Region West in February, 2014. Six of the nine respondents were known to the interviewer (first author) through his earlier work in the criminal justice system as a practicing professional. Although every attempt was made to emphasize the neutrality of his role as researcher, prior relations between the researcher and participants may have influenced the nature of the data collected and their willingness to participate in the first place. To avoid this, the first author did not directly ask the respondents to attend, but, instead, respondents were asked through a letter presented by the prison staff, and it was clearly emphasized that participating in the study was voluntary.
Findings

The two main themes that arose from the interviews with the offenders were (1) personal needs and crime and (2) reintegration after prison - needs being met (or not) by the welfare services. It is the overlap between the personal needs of the offender (Theme 1) and the interaction of the offender and the welfare system (Theme 2) that was the stimulus for the development of the conceptual framework proposed later in this paper.

(1) Personal needs and crime
We identified three subthemes within this main theme: first, drug abuse and mental health; second, homelessness and antisocial networks; and the third, we identified as crime.

Drug abuse and mental health.

All but one of the respondents stated that they were problematic drug users. The use of drugs was described as unavoidable, with physical addiction being very strong and drug use a part of their lifestyle. They failed to change this condition and re-entered the cycle of substance abuse:

*There’s such power in addiction. It goes far beyond a human capability of understanding* (respondent 7, age 49).

*All in all, it’s drug abuse that is my biggest problem* (respondent 1, age 25).

Two of the respondents (respondents 4 and 7) especially expressed concerns regarding their mental health and antisocial behavior:

*I say yes to all the help I can get now….There is a physiologist here. Why didn’t I get the information? The priest is fantastic….It is these thoughts. If they don’t get turned off the right way when you are in prison, they become complete chaos when you are released* (respondent 7, age 49).

*I didn’t get any money from the social service. I ended up smashing the furniture at NAV [Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration] (respondent 4, age 45).*
Homelessness and antisocial networks.
Furthermore, respondents described homelessness as a severe problem (8 out of 9 responded that they had been homeless at least once) and reported having been homeless for long periods in general. They reported having slept on couches belonging to friends with substance use disorders, lived on the street, or, as one of them reported, stayed in a shed:

"You must stay with others, and that causes lots of crime" (respondent 2, age 27).

"If you have no home, then you will not find a reason to do anything right either .... Home is the place where you are safe. You can lock the door, and it is your job to keep the house clean" (respondent 8, age 52).

"Yes, I’ve been without a home earlier. It’s been for periods from 3 to 4 months. I’ve then been living on a couch with friends or something like that" (respondent 9, age 56).

Crime.
The respondents had been in and out of prison from 2 to 20 times, often on drug-related offences, in which the longest sentence among the respondents was one year. The reasons given for their crimes were described as being everything from being financially driven to a boy's dream and easy money to a lifestyle that was inevitable because of their problematic substance use:

"It's business. Money is always the motive. Which type of crime depends on what state I’m in then and there, but it all comes down to cash" (respondent 5, age 47).

"My dream since I was eight was to be a gangster. And I always kind of tried to follow that road" (respondent 2, age 27).

"It’s the excitement, but I really don’t do things like that when I’m sober" (respondent 3, age 38).
(2) Reintegration after prison

Two subthemes led us to this main theme: the will to change and needs being met (or not) by the welfare services.

The will to change.

All respondents stated that they had tried to change their lives at least once, for example, by trying to stop using drugs. These periods lasted from a few months to five years. Their family -- often their own children -- were their main motivation for wanting to make positive change. However, a failure to change and re-entering the cycle of substance abuse and reoffending was attributed to a series of small coincidences, with one thing leading to another or their being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Their previous networks, or “old friends,” often accounted for their not staying clean. At the time of the interview, 7 out of 9 said that they were willing to change their life (respondent 5 and 9 did not):

I’m sick of prison. I want a life without crime. The biggest obstacle is myself
(respondent 2, age 27).

One was ambivalent:

I must say I am a bit ambivalent regarding this. When I look at the older ones here in prison, I don’t want to become like them. I don’t want to look back at my youth spending more than half of it in prison. On the other hand, when I see how much work it is to straighten things out, it just seem f*.. impossible (respondent 1, age 25).

Respondent 9 was happy in prison and did not picture himself free of crime or drugs after prison. He could not see any reason for changing and was comfortable in prison. He knew the staff, how to get food, and had things to do. He tried to change once, though. But he claimed that a lack of economic support from the welfare system returned him to the negative cycle.

Needs being met (or not) by the welfare services.

Offenders spoke of a desire to be, first and foremost, autonomous and independent of the welfare system (8 of 9 respondents wanted to be independent of the welfare system and change their lives for the better). When asked what should ideally be in place if they were to
live a life without crime, they identified increased contact with close family, children, a job, and a hobby as means to making this change:

My goal is not to be dependent on the welfare system to survive. That is an ideal state for me. It is most dangerous for me when I need to go through NAV and those people (respondent 8, age 52).

But when asked about the role of the welfare services, respondents reported a lack of support from the public welfare system, on the one hand, and, on the other, the support offered not matching their problems:

Training, family, housing. But I have little faith that will be settled when I get out (respondent 5, age 47).

They had negative experiences with the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration and felt powerless and hopeless in relation to their dealings with the welfare services:

If you are going to make it, you have to have a big system that can support you. If not, you will be alone quarrelling with NAV. That is how it has been the last times I’ve been released from prison. Released to nothing, and no money (respondent 2, age 27).

One of the respondents described the support system as a static system where there is little room for flexibility. Either you fit into the welfare system, or you do not:

They have to know we are people with different challenges. We are just as different as everybody else. You cannot put everyone in one kind of model and expect them to fit in, and if you do not fit in, there is no help for you (respondent 1, age 25).

I started selling (drugs) when I was in treatment…. to get some extra cash, and I got caught. It was like a phase system. So after one and a half years in treatment, and without drugs, I was back to phase 1 where I started. It felt like a disproportionate intervention, a violation, and it really led to a loss of motivation for me, totally (ibid).

Another of the respondents described discrimination within the system:
If the system is not with you, it is against you. They evaluate you as a person based on your past (respondent 8, age 52).

They talk about how this lack of suitable support from the welfare system on their release from prison led to their rapid reoffending -- in one case, only two hours after release:

Once, I was one year at [XX] prison. Then I came out and was arrested again two hours later, wasted on drugs. They wanted me back in prison (respondent 6, age 46).

The degree of help they get varies a lot, the respondents report:

Yes, the difference is huge. You have the factory-like prisons. It is shit. You have jam on your bread every day, and the people working there are arrogant and authoritarian (respondent 5, age 47).

They actually listen to you [at the respondent’s new welfare office]. The difference is big, but maybe it has something to do with my name and reputation [at the former welfare office] (respondent 3, age 38).

I’ve been extremely unlucky with NAV this time. They have long waiting lists, and they won’t help me. There is no will to help. When I realize that, I understand where this is going. I’m 100% addicted to them (respondent 8, age 52).

Respondents did report positive experiences with the welfare services, but this was often in terms of contact with specific individuals, local outreach services, and a specific housing project:

Yes, it was the safety, and I had a job I could handle...I felt ownership of the apartment. It is the first time that has happened. I have never felt at home so strongly before (respondent 8, age 52).

I think it is very good, the ambulant team, in fact. Even if there is not much they can do, they help me a little bit with this and that. Join me in meetings and stuff like that (respondent 4, age 45).
Offenders often rely on single individuals within the welfare services, individual professionals willing to give extra and often go beyond their own authority for the offender:

*She has probably done more than she is allowed to for me, so she could manage to help me in get further along. The commitment she has makes me think I don’t want to let her down* (respondent 8, age 52).

**Discussion**

Findings from this study present complex life situations for the nine offenders, demonstrating that every offender has unique needs and experiences. Factors at the level of the individual prisoner, such as drug abuse, lack of housing, mental health issues, the perceived inevitability of falling back into negative social networks, vicious cycles of substance misuse and repeated crime are common themes in the rehabilitation process. In describing these individual factors, prisoners recognize in themselves some of the main risk factors associated with reoffending found in many studies. Andrews *et al.* (2006) list the “big eight” factors included in risk assessment tools, the four greatest predictors being an established history of offending, antisocial personality patterns, cognition, and antisocial associates.

Although our respondents did not use this terminology, their feelings of powerlessness and the inevitability of falling back into negative networks and criminal activity suggest that they too recognized the factors associated with their own reoffending. Andrews *et al.* (2006) also list an additional four moderate risk factors that include substance misuse, employment instability, low engagement in pro-social leisure pursuits, and family and marital problems. These again are all factors alluded to by our respondents indicating that they share, together with the correctional and welfare services that surround them, an understanding of the key factors that may lead to them reoffending. However, it is not clear from our interviews how offenders have developed this shared understanding, and it may be speculated as to whether their own exposure to the risk and needs assessment tools used by correctional services with offenders at the beginning of their sentences may have made these issues more salient for them. This is perhaps no bad thing, as problem identification would be the first step towards empowering them to break the cycle of offending behaviour. It also suggests that making the
The link between the needs assessment tool and reoffending explicit during the assessment process at the beginning of a prisoner’s sentence may be important for their affecting change in their life. This paper suggests that offenders are aware of the presence of key risk factors in their reoffending, but, more importantly, it highlights how these individual-level variables then interact with the welfare systems around them. Findings suggested that the prisoners have rather ambivalent relationships with the welfare system and revealed great variation in respondents’ experiences. These experiences of Norwegian prisoners mirror those of prisoners in other countries (e.g., Chikadzhi, 2017; Morse et al., 2014; Binswanger et al., 2012; Cepeda et al., 2015; Lattimore and Visher, 2014.) suggesting that these are universal struggles experienced by offenders internationally, although an understanding of the actual processes behind these outcomes remains elusive. A better analytical tool is needed, one that can identify and analyse these elusive processes.

A new analytical model

The interaction of the offender with the welfare system is key to their addressing and minimizing the risk factors associated with their reoffending. We therefore present a model for consideration that we believe can be used as a cognitive tool for analyzing and developing testable hypotheses regarding the complexity and variation in potential outcomes for an offender. The model is informed by the small-scale study reported above, but this does not mean that all hypotheses presented and discussed below appear in the findings section. Instead, the model (Figure 1) was created by the researchers and should be regarded as an illustration inspired by the findings in the present study and as a model that now requires further testing.

We propose, hypothetically, that personal circumstances (related to variables such as drug use, housing, motivations to change, and mental health) lie on a horizontal continuum from negative to positive life circumstances. Poor personal life situations are related to reoffending, and positive life situations, with desistance behaviours. On the vertical axis, system effort lies on a continuum from high effort to minimal or no involvement with the service user.

*** Figure 1 about here ***
In Quadrant 1, the prisoner experiences the personal life situation as positive, and system efforts are high. In Quadrant 2, the prisoner experiences the life situation as negative, although system efforts are high. In Quadrant 3, the prisoner experiences the life situation as positive, and system efforts are low. Lastly, in Quadrant 4, the prisoner experiences the life situation as negative, at same time as system efforts are low.

Applying this conceptual model to our findings would suggest that prisoners struggle for independence from the welfare system. For some, total independence and a positive living situation (Quadrant 3) is a future aim. But for others, their vulnerability in the early days after release means that substantial input from the system may be necessary before and after release (Quadrant 1). For example, those with severe substance use issues may in fact need lifelong healthcare. This means that some will never make the transition from Quadrant 1 to Quadrant 3. Acceptance of this fact is important in a society where negative attitudes toward both offenders and problematic substance use are strong (Amundsen, 2008). In particular, severe substance use disorders should be considered a long-term disability and treated as equal to the long-term care offered to those with a physical disability. It is also important to take into consideration motivation as a factor. For instance, do the welfare services contribute more to individuals who are highly motivated? Can motivation affect respondents’ views of the welfare services, and then create a positive circle of social support? It is hard to measure in what degree motivation affects the welfare system and vice versa, and we did not ask the respondents directly about this.

If Quadrant 3 is the ideal, Quadrant 1 is a partial ideal: a well-functioning welfare system that meets the needs important to the prisoners themselves -- their actual needs -- which can affect a positive change in their life situation. A long-term overdependence on welfare support is not positive for either the prisoner or society and prisoners should be encouraged to move toward Quadrant 3 where possible. A high-system effort does not necessarily mean the outcomes for the prisoners’ life situations are always positive and may in some cases make the situation worse (Quadrant 2). In this quadrant, prisoners receive a high system effort from the welfare system, but still experience their personal situations as negative. In our study, specifically, two respondents claimed that the welfare system was static and unresponsive to their individual changing needs (respondent 1), and it was either with you or against you (respondent 8). It is possible that if the welfare system is poorly adapted to the prisoners’
needs, it can result in a destructive rather than constructive development for the prisoner. It has been argued that this inflexibility may originate from a continued focus on control and discipline in the system, instead of on rehabilitation (Christie, 1987).

Our findings demonstrated that prisoners’ experiences of support from the welfare services during vulnerable periods varied, both within and between services. At times, they found themselves floundering in the gap that opened up between prison and community support as they made the transition from one environment to the other. In prison, they may have received high levels of structured support (Quadrants 1 and 2), but 8 out of 9 of the interviewed prisoners experienced being abandoned upon their release (Quadrant 4); they failed to access public services such as housing, jobs, economic support, and treatment. They may demonstrate a motivation to change, but, for some reason, the welfare system is not able to meet their needs upon re-entering society.

Poor communication between prison, community services, and other organizations in the welfare system may be responsible for some of this shortfall. Prisoners reported housing to be a particular area in which the system failed to support them and gave this as a central reason for reoffending. Housing needs are one of the primary risk factors associated with reoffending (Andrews et al., 2006), but, like mental health, it may also mediate the expression of the main risk factors mentioned (Skeem and Peterson, 2011). For instance, as mentioned by our respondents, a lack of housing may lead to offenders falling in with previous antisocial associates who have access to illegal substances and finding regular pro-social leisure pursuits difficult to establish. A lack of housing may also result from poor marital and family relations and is not conducive to rebuilding these relationships. On the other hand, the welfare services may have contracts and demands attached to the housing being offered, which the prisoners cannot fulfil. Also, the application process for getting public housing may be too demanding for prisoners. This leads us to question the degree to which the welfare system should adapt to prisoners -- or vice versa. When talking about their experiences of rehabilitation when in prison, most prisoners described themselves as being either in Quadrant 1 (high system effort-personal situation experienced as positive) or in Quadrant 2 (high system effort-personal situation experienced as negative). In other words, the tightly controlled environment of prison represents a high system effort or input, though this could have positive or negative impacts on their life situations. When they left prison, however, most of our respondents claimed to fall into Quadrant 4 (low system effort-negative individual situation) when they
were released. They reported having been released to nothing, in some cases, going from 24/7 monitoring and care to no support at all. The respondents reported that homelessness did not explicitly lead to more crime, but was an easy way of connecting with “old friends,” which again led to drug abuse and crime. Although professionals may believe that there is a well-functioning rehabilitation plan in place, our findings from the experiences reported by the prisoners do not seem to support this.

**Limitations and future directions**

The above is a conceptual model, intended to provide a lens from which to reinterpret offenders’ experiences of reintegration and was applied only to the small and exploratory study described in this article. As such, it requires further testing and substantiation. The model, and the study’s findings, should be regarded as tentative and cannot be generalized to a larger population. The prisoners were selected by the first author for convenience, and it is possible that this influenced the findings. Other prisoners may have described different experiences. Adding domains to the model, such as underlying physical or mental illness, or socio-demographic factors could increase the model’s utility for practitioners in the field who are responsible for planning transitional services for people leaving prison. Incorporating risk factors that may indicate whether an individual would be more likely to end up in Quadrants 1, 2, 3, or 4 could help practitioners to better tailor their level of support to each individual. We suggest further investigation of this proposal is undertaken in future research.

**Conclusion**

This paper offers a model with which to view the interaction of an offender with welfare services during the reintegration process as offenders move from prison back into the community. Based on offenders’ perspectives, it offers a range of tentative hypotheses about the relationship between welfare support and offender reintegration and rehabilitation that now requires testing. The model serves as an analytical tool for developing new approaches to supporting offenders in their reintegration into society from prison. The model underpins the argument that the current reintegration strategies for certain groups of prisoners need to be questioned and challenged.
References


Current Difficulties and Recommendations for Best Practice“, available at
http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/file?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0130390&type=printable
(accessed June 4, 2018).

inmates)”, available at http://www.nsd.uib.no/data/individ/publikasjoner/NSD1478FAFO.pdf
(accessed June 4, 2018).

Graunbøl, H. M., Kielstrup, B., Muilvuori, M.-L., Tyri, S., Baldursson, E.S.,
undersøgelse af recidiv blandt klienter i kriminalforsorgen (The Return- A nordic study of
reoffending)”, available at
https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11250/160672/retur.pdf?sequence=1(accessed
June 4, 2018).

Jess, K. (2005), “Att rakna med nytta-samhallsøkonomisk utvådering av socialt arbete (The
economical benefits of social work)”, Phd thesis, Institutionen for socialt arbete
Socialhøgskolen, Stockholms University, Stockholm, May 28th.


Kvale, S. and Brinkmann, S. (2012), Det kvalitative forskningsintervju (The qualitative
research interview), 2. utgave, Gyldendal Akademisk, Oslo.

Service Strategy document 2014-2018)”, available at
http://www.kriminalomsorgen.no/getfile.php/2642723.823.qbpfstdbeb/Virksomhetsstrategi+2

274-313.


Abstract

Many offenders struggle when attempting to reintegrate into society after release from prison, and the conditions they face after release often lead to reoffending. Internationally, there is limited understanding about how to improve these conditions and thereby reduce recidivism rates. In particular, offenders’ own perspectives on the challenges they face and how to overcome these are absent.

This paper presents a conceptual model that has the potential to guide practitioners in their understanding of the relationships between welfare services and the agency of the offender. The model was developed from a small-scale study in the Norwegian Criminal Justice system, which is well known for its emphasis on rehabilitation and crime prevention. Data collection aimed to explore the reintegration process from the perspective of the hard-to-reach and vulnerable population of serial offenders. Nine prisoners in two different prisons were interviewed. A thematic analysis identified two main themes that related, first, to the personal challenges the offenders faced in the rehabilitation and reintegration process and, second, to the factors in the welfare services that interacted with the prisoners’ psychosocial issues in the reintegration process. Findings suggest that the interaction between the psychosocial needs of the prisoners and the organization of the welfare services is complex and not harmonized. The model developed from the insights of this study can serve as a reflective and analytical tool for developing new approaches to support offenders in their reintegration into society from prison in the future. The model underpins the argument that current reintegration strategies for prisoners needs to be questioned and challenged.
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Introduction

Large numbers of prisoners are released from prison every year. For instance, in 2018, the U.K. had a prison population of approximately 92,500 (Sturge, 2018). At some point, these prisoners will be released, often, however, without the health and welfare support they need, a
risk factor that can result in their reoffending (Skeem and Peterson, 2011). However, despite high levels of recidivism internationally (Fazel and Wolf, 2015), little is known about offenders’ reintegration processes and how offenders deal with these problems before and after release (Chikadzi, 2017, Schinkel, 2014). Poor relationships with families as well as with welfare systems have been shown to contribute to the struggles faced by offenders upon their release and to the failure of their rehabilitation and reintegration processes (Chikadzi, 2017). To better understand and address the problems of offender reintegration, it is important that the voice of the prisoner is heard and kept central to the development of future interventions designed to improve reintegration. Some of the few research studies that present this point of view, such as Chikadzhi’s (2017), highlight the lack of support received by support services, and it is therefore important for practitioners to better understand the experiences of the offenders these services work with and the impact the such services have upon offenders’ life conditions upon release. In another qualitative study (Morse et al., 2014) on women in drug treatment court, the women reported experiences of an “evil cycle” of relapse and recidivism among other challenges. In addition, it was found (Binswanger et al., 2012; Cepeda et al., 2015) that overdosing was considered by offenders after release as “a way out” of a stressful life.

The aim of this paper, therefore, is to present a conceptual model which has the potential to guide practitioners in their understanding of the relationships between welfare structures and the agency of the offender. It explains the development of the model from a small-scale study conducted in the Norwegian Criminal Justice system, which is well known for its emphasis on rehabilitation and crime prevention.

The Norwegian Context
In Norway, for example, with a population of 5.1 million, around 10,000 prisoners are released each year (Dyb and Johannessen, 2013). Six out of 10 of these prisoners are reported to be dependent on drugs, two thirds have a childhood characterized by some form of trauma, 3 out of 10 have been in contact with child welfare services before the age of 16, and educational attainment is low. One third of the prisoners will become homeless, and only 8% of the prison population show no sign of mental illness (Friestad and Skog Hansen, 2004; Dyb et al., 2006; Cramer, 2014; Revold, 2015). Reoffenders report that they feel stigmatized and excluded from society on release (Amundsen, 2008). It is perhaps unsurprising that 20% of prisoners released will reoffend within two years, with this figure rising to over 70% among
certain groups (75% among males aged 25 to 44 sentenced for theft) (Graunbøl et al., 2010).

Although 20% is low compared to international statistics (Fazel and Wolf, 2015), this still represents significant human and economic costs for Norway (Nystrøm and Jess, 2002; Jess, 2005; Bakke, 2011).

Offering adequate support is central to the Norwegian Criminal Justice System’s underlying philosophy of rehabilitation and reintegration of prisoners into society, as exemplified in their statement that:

reduced recidivism demands many different measures. It is necessary to both do something about the living conditions and to offer measures that help transform the convicted persons themselves. It is emphasized that the measures do not have to be either in prison or afterwards – there must be continuity and a coordinated effort from all affected parties, often over the long haul. If this is done, success is possible. (The Norwegian Ministry of Justice and the Police, 2008, p. 13)

The general approach to reintegration and rehabilitation in Norway is operationalized through the offender participating in a process of staged release (Bjørkly, 2004; Dyb, 2006; Olsen, 2012). Prisoners work their way “up the ladder,” starting in a closed facility with high security, moving to lower security prisons, and ending up, potentially, in the last phase of their sentence, under home supervision. A failure to comply with regulations, as, for example, testing positive for alcohol or drug use, will cause the prisoner to take one or several steps backwards in this process. In other countries, offenders’ rehabilitation in prison may be managed through specialized reintegration programs that further manage their transition from prison to the community (UNDOC, 2012), but these kinds of programs do not currently exist in the Norwegian system.

The Norwegian welfare state and the Scandinavian welfare model are also well known for fairly generous income systems for the whole population accompanied by a higher level of taxation compared to other countries. The aim is to offer a broad spectrum of social security including housing, employment, and healthcare (Kautto et al., 2001).
Method

The main aim of the study from which the conceptual model discussed below was developed was to explore prisoners’ experiences of the reintegration process. A critical realist stance was taken in the study with the perspective that though a reality of health and welfare services exists outside of the offender, this reality is individually interpreted (Bhaskar, 2008). Empirically, offenders’ experiences with the health and welfare services were explored qualitatively using semi-structured interviews as the method of data collection.

Sample

Serial reoffenders were the target population of the study. This is a hard-to-reach population. A small sample size of 9 eventually participated in the study. This makes the report of their voices all the more important. The prisoners were selected by the first author for convenience. Respondents were all men, ranging in age from 25 to 56. In the findings section, they are numbered from 1 (the youngest) to 9 (the oldest). Repeated reoffending was a selection criterion, and the final sample had been in and out of prison from 2 to 20 times. The participants all consented in writing to take part in the study. The periods in prison ranged from one month to one year, with all respondents being from a single county in Norway. Six respondents were serving at two different prisons in this county at the time the interviews took place, while the remaining three were on probation. The sample was selected through a dialogue with Norwegian Criminal Justice Staff about whom they saw as potential respondents matching the above criteria. The suggested prisoners then received an information letter about the study and were asked to participate.

Data collection

A semi-structured interview guide explored inductively participants’ current life conditions and how they experienced welfare services, both while in prison and when re-entering life outside prison. Typical questions included: Have you been homeless? What is that like? What is most difficult in the process of reintegration after prison? All interviews were conducted by one researcher (first author) and took place over three months. All interviews were also audio recorded and lasted approximately one hour. Six of the interviews were conducted in the visitor room in prison, and the other three at a criminal justice service office outside prison. All interviews were conducted in Norwegian and later translated into English.
Analysis

Interviews were transcribed verbatim, and an inductive thematic analysis of the interviews was conducted in four steps. First, all interview transcripts were read to get an overall impression of the material and to identify meaning units, for example, central concepts or sentences. Second, the interviews were coded independently by the first and third author, and central sub-themes were identified and merged into two main themes. Third, the sub-themes were discussed by the first and third author, in order to reach a common understanding of the main content of the interview and the trustworthiness of the common themes arising from the data (Kvale and Brinkman, 2012, Lykkeslet and Gjengedal, 2007; Pope et al., 2000). Two main themes arose from the data and quotations from offenders’ comments were found and used to illustrate each of these. Fourth, through abstraction, the two main themes were seen in relation to each other and resulted in the creation of Figure 1, presented in the discussion below. The number of subjects and interviews was driven by saturation of the concepts leading to the subthemes and the two main themes. The description of the two main themes was checked, confirmed, and adapted with the second author of this paper who was consulted during the reporting process.

Ethics

The study was approved by both the Norwegian Social Science Data Service (38278/3/KH) and the Norwegian Correctional Service Region West in February, 2014. Six of the nine respondents were known to the interviewer (first author) through his earlier work in the criminal justice system as a practicing professional. Although every attempt was made to emphasize the neutrality of his role as researcher, prior relations between the researcher and participants may have influenced the nature of the data collected and their willingness to participate in the first place. To avoid this, the first author did not directly ask the respondents to attend, but, instead, respondents were asked through a letter presented by the prison staff, and it was clearly emphasized that participating in the study was voluntary.
Findings

The two main themes that arose from the interviews with the offenders were (1) personal needs and crime and (2) reintegration after prison - needs being met (or not) by the welfare services. It is the overlap between the personal needs of the offender (Theme 1) and the interaction of the offender and the welfare system (Theme 2) that was the stimulus for the development of the conceptual framework proposed later in this paper.

(1) Personal needs and crime

We identified three subthemes within this main theme: first, drug abuse and mental health; second, homelessness and antisocial networks; and the third, we identified as crime.

Drug abuse and mental health.

All but one of the respondents stated that they were problematic drug users. The use of drugs was described as unavoidable, with the physical addiction being very strong and drug abuse being a part of their lifestyle. They failed to change this condition and re-entered the cycle of substance abuse:

- There’s such power in addiction. It goes far beyond a human capability of understanding (respondent 7, age 49).
- All in all, it’s drug abuse that is my biggest problem (respondent 1, age 25).

Two of the respondents (respondents 4 and 7) especially expressed concerns regarding their mental health and antisocial behavior:

- I say yes to all the help I can get now….There is a physiologist here. Why didn’t I get the information? The priest is fantastic….It is these thoughts. If they don’t get turned off the right way when you are in prison, they become complete chaos when you are released (respondent 7, age 49).
- I didn’t get any money from the social service. I ended up smashing the furniture at NAV (Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration) (respondent 4, age 45).
Homelessness and antisocial networks.
Furthermore, respondents described homelessness as a severe problem (8 out of 9 responded that they had been homeless at least once) and reported having been homeless for long periods in general. They reported having slept on couches belonging to friends with drug addicted/substance use disorders friends, lived on the street, or, as one of them reported, stayed in a shed:

- You must stay with others, and that causes lots of crime (respondent 2, age 27).
- If you have no home, then you will not find a reason to do anything right either .... Home is the place where you are safe. You can lock the door, and it is your job to keep the house clean (respondent 8, age 52).
- Yes, I’ve been without a home earlier. It’s been for periods from 3 to 4 months. I’ve then been living on a couch with friends or something like that (respondent 9, age 56).

Crime.
The respondents had been in and out of prison from 2 to 20 times, often on drug-related offences, in which the longest sentence among the respondents was one year. The reasons given for their crimes were described as being everything from being financially driven to a boy’s dream and easy money to a lifestyle that was inevitable because of their problematic substance addiction use:

- It’s business. Money is always the motive. Which type of crime depends on what state I’m in then and there, but it all comes down to cash (respondent 5, age 47).
- My dream since I was eight was to be a gangster. And I always kind of tried to follow that road (respondent 2, age 27).
- It’s the excitement, but I really don’t do things like that when I’m sober (respondent 3, age 38).
(2) Reintegration after prison

Two subthemes led us to this main theme: *the will to change and needs being met (or not) by the welfare services.*

The will to change

All respondents stated that they had tried to change their lives at least once, for example, by trying to stop using drugs. These periods lasted from a few months to five years. Their family -- often their own children -- were their main motivation for wanting to make positive change. However, a failure to change and re-entering the cycle of substance abuse and reoffending was attributed to a series of small coincidences, with one thing leading to another or their being in the wrong place at the wrong time. Their previous networks, or “old friends,” often accounted for their not staying clean. At the time of the interview, 7 out of 9 said that they were willing to change their life (respondent 5 and 9 did not):

*I’m sick of prison. I want a life without crime. The biggest obstacle is myself*  
(respondent 2, age 27).

One was ambivalent:

*I must say I am a bit ambivalent regarding this. When I look at the older ones here in prison, I don’t want to become like them. I don’t want to look back at my youth spending more than half of it in prison. On the other hand, when I see how much work it is to straighten things out, it just seem f*.. impossible* (respondent 1, age 25).

Respondent 9 was happy in prison and did not picture himself free of crime or drugs after prison. He could not see any reason for changing and was comfortable in prison. He knew the staff, how to get food, and had things to do. He tried to change once, though. But he claimed that a lack of economic support from the welfare system returned him to the negative cycle.

Needs being met (or not) by the welfare services

Offenders spoke of a desire to be, first and foremost, autonomous and independent of the welfare system (8 of 9 respondents wanted to be independent of the welfare system and change their lives for the better). When asked what should ideally be in place if they were to
live a life without crime, they identified increased contact with close family, children, a job, and a hobby as means to making this change:

> My goal is not to be dependent on the welfare system to survive. That is an ideal state for me. It is most dangerous for me when I need to go through NAV and those people (respondent 8, age 52).

But when asked about the role of the welfare services, respondents reported a lack of support from the public welfare system, on the one hand, and, on the other, the support offered not matching their problems:

> Training, family, housing. But I have little faith that will be settled when I get out (respondent 5, age 47).

They had negative experiences with the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration and felt powerless and hopeless in relation to their dealings with the welfare services:

> If you are going to make it, you have to have a big system that can support you. If not, you will be alone quarrelling with NAV. That is how it has been the last times I’ve been released from prison. Released to nothing, and no money (respondent 2, age 27).

One of the respondents described the support system as a static system where there is little room for flexibility. Either you fit into the welfare system, or you do not:

> They have to know we are people with different challenges. We are just as different as everybody else. You cannot put everyone in one kind of model and expect them to fit in, and if you do not fit in, there is no help for you (respondent 1, age 25).

I started selling (drugs) when I was in treatment…. to get some extra cash, and I got caught. It was like a phase system. So after one and a half years in treatment, and without drugs, I was back to phase 1 where I started. It felt like a disproportionate intervention, a violation, and it really led to a loss of motivation for me, totally (ibid).

Another of the respondents described discrimination within the system:
If the system is not with you, it is against you. They evaluate you as a person based on your past (respondent 8, age 52).

They talk about how this lack of suitable support from the welfare system on their release from prison led to their rapid reoffending -- in one case, only two hours after release:

Once, I was one year at [XX] prison. Then I came out and was arrested again two hours later, wasted on drugs. They wanted me back in prison (respondent 6, age 46).

The degree of help they get varies a lot, the respondents report:

Yes, the difference is huge. You have the factory-like prisons. It is shit. You have jam on your bread every day, and the people working there are arrogant and authoritarian (respondent 5, age 47).

They actually listen to you [at the respondent’s new welfare office]. The difference is big, but maybe it has something to do with my name and reputation [at the former welfare office] (respondent 3, age 38).

I’ve been extremely unlucky with NAV this time. They have long waiting lists, and they won’t help me. There is no will to help. When I realize that, I understand where this is going. I’m 100% addicted to them (respondent 8, age 52).

Respondents did report positive experiences with the welfare services, but this was often in terms of contact with specific individuals, local outreach services, and a specific housing project:

Yes, it was the safety, and I had a job I could handle… I felt ownership of the apartment. It is the first time that has happened. I have never felt at home so strongly before (respondent 8, age 52).

I think it is very good, the ambulant team, in fact. Even if there is not much they can do, they help me a little bit with this and that. Join me in meetings and stuff like that (respondent 4, age 45).
Offenders often rely on single individuals within the welfare services, individual professionals willing to give extra and often go beyond their own authority for the offender:

“She has probably done more than she is allowed to for me, so she could manage to help me in get further along. The commitment she has makes me think I don’t want to let her down” (respondent 8, age 52).

Discussion

Findings from this study present complex life situations for the nine offenders, demonstrating that every offender has unique needs and experiences. Factors at the level of the individual prisoner, such as drug abuse, lack of housing, mental health issues, the perceived inevitability of falling back into negative social networks, vicious cycles of substance misuse, and repeated crime are common themes in the rehabilitation process. In describing these individual factors, prisoners recognize in themselves some of the main risk factors associated with reoffending found in many studies. Andrews et al. (2006) list the “big eight” factors included in risk assessment tools, the four greatest predictors being an established history of offending, antisocial personality patterns, cognition, and antisocial associates.

Although our respondents did not use this terminology, their feelings of powerlessness and the inevitability of falling back into negative networks and criminal activity suggest that they too recognized the factors associated with their own reoffending. Andrews et al. (2006) also list an additional four moderate risk factors that include substance misuse, employment instability, low engagement in pro-social leisure pursuits, and family and marital problems. These again are all factors alluded to by our respondents indicating that they share, together with the correctional and welfare services that surround them, an understanding of the key factors that may lead to them reoffending. However, it is not clear from our interviews how offenders have developed this shared understanding, and it may be speculated as to whether their own exposure to the risk and needs assessment tools used by correctional services with offenders at the beginning of their sentences may have made these issues more salient for them. This is perhaps no bad thing, as problem identification would be the first step towards empowering them to break the cycle of offending behaviour. It also suggests that making the
The link between the needs assessment tool and reoffending explicit during the assessment process at the beginning of a prisoner’s sentence may be important for their affecting change in their life. This paper suggests that offenders are aware of the presence of key risk factors in their reoffending, but, more importantly, it highlights how these individual-level variables then interact with the welfare systems around them. Findings suggested that the prisoners have rather ambivalent relationships with the welfare system and revealed great variation in respondents’ experiences. These experiences of Norwegian prisoners mirror those of prisoners in other countries (e.g., Chikadzhi, 2017; Morse et al., 2014; Binswanger et al., 2012; Cepeda et al., 2015; Lattimore and Visher, 2014) suggesting that these are universal struggles experienced by offenders internationally, although an understanding of the actual processes behind these outcomes remains elusive. A better analytical tool is needed, one that can identify and analyse these elusive processes.

A new analytical model

The interaction of the offender with the welfare system is key to their addressing and minimizing the risk factors associated with their reoffending. We therefore present a model for consideration that we believe can be used as a cognitive tool for analyzing and developing testable hypotheses regarding the complexity and variation in potential outcomes for an offender. The model is informed by the small-scale study reported above, but this does not mean that all hypotheses presented and discussed below appear in the findings section. Instead, the model (Figure 1) was created by the researchers and should be regarded as an illustration inspired by the findings in the present study and as a model that now requires further testing.

We propose, hypothetically, that personal circumstances (related to variables such as drug use, housing, motivations to change, and mental health) lie on a horizontal continuum from negative to positive life circumstances. Poor personal life situations are related to reoffending, and positive life situations, with desistance behaviours. On the vertical axis, system effort lies on a continuum from high effort to minimal or no involvement with the service user.

*** Figure 1 about here ***
In Quadrant 1, the prisoner experiences the personal life situation as positive, and system efforts are high. In Quadrant 2, the prisoner experiences the life situation as negative, although system efforts are high. In Quadrant 3, the prisoner experiences the life situation as positive, and system efforts are low. Lastly, in Quadrant 4, the prisoner experiences the life situation as negative, at same time as system efforts are low.

Applying this conceptual model to our findings would suggest that prisoners struggle for independence from the welfare system. For some, total independence and a positive living situation (Quadrant 3) is a future aim. But for others, their vulnerability in the early days after release means that substantial input from the system may be necessary before and after release (Quadrant 1). For example, those with severe drug substance addiction-use issues may in fact need lifelong healthcare. This means that some will never make the transition from Quadrant 1 to Quadrant 3. Acceptance of this fact is important in a society where negative attitudes toward both offenders and problematic drug substance addiction-use are strong (Amundsen, 2008). In particular, severe drug substance addiction-use disorders should be considered a long-term disability and treated as equal to the long-term care offered to those with a physical disability. It is also important to take into consideration motivation as a factor. For instance, do the welfare services contribute more to individuals who are highly motivated? Can motivation affect respondents’ views of the welfare services, and then create a positive circle of social support? It is hard to measure in what degree motivation affects the welfare system and vice versa, and we did not ask the respondents directly about this.

If Quadrant 3 is the ideal, Quadrant 1 is a partial ideal: a well-functioning welfare system that meets the needs important to the prisoners themselves -- their actual needs -- which can affect a positive change in their life situation. A long-term overdependence on welfare support is not positive for either the prisoner or society, and prisoners should be encouraged to move toward Quadrant 3 where possible. A high-system effort does not necessarily mean the outcomes for the prisoners’ life situations are always positive and may in some cases make the situation worse (Quadrant 2). In this quadrant, prisoners receive a high system effort from the welfare system, but still experience their personal situations as negative. In our study, specifically, two respondents claimed that the welfare system was static and unresponsive to their individual changing needs (respondent 1), and it was either with you or against you (respondent 8). It is possible that if the welfare system is poorly adapted to the prisoners’
needs, it can result in a destructive rather than constructive development for the prisoner. It has been argued that this inflexibility may originate from a continued focus on control and discipline in the system, instead of on rehabilitation (Christie, 1987).

Our findings demonstrated that prisoners’ experiences of support from the welfare services during vulnerable periods varied, both within and between services. At times, they found themselves floundering in the gap that opened up between prison and community support as they made the transition from one environment to the other. In prison, they may have received high levels of structured support (Quadrants 1 and 2), but 8 out of 9 of the interviewed prisoners experienced being abandoned upon their release (Quadrant 4); they failed to access public services such as housing, jobs, economic support, and treatment. They may demonstrate a motivation to change, but, for some reason, the welfare system is not able to meet their needs upon re-entering society.

Poor communication between prison, community services, and other organizations in the welfare system may be responsible for some of this shortfall. Prisoners reported housing to be a particular area in which the system failed to support them and gave this as a central reason for reoffending. Housing needs are one of the primary risk factors associated with reoffending (Andrews et al., 2006), but, like mental health, it may also mediate the expression of the main risk factors mentioned (Skeem and Peterson, 2011). For instance, as mentioned by our respondents, a lack of housing may lead to offenders falling in with previous antisocial associates who have access to illegal substances and finding regular pro-social leisure pursuits difficult to establish. A lack of housing may also result from poor marital and family relations and is not conducive to rebuilding these relationships. On the other hand, the welfare services may have contracts and demands attached to the housing being offered, which the prisoners cannot fulfil. Also, the application process for getting public housing may be too demanding for the prisoners. This can lead us to a question of what degree to which the welfare system should adapt to the prisoners -- or the opposite vice versa. When talking about their experiences of rehabilitation when in prison, most prisoners described themselves as being either in Quadrant 1 (high system effort-personal situation experienced as positive) or in Quadrant 2 (high system effort-personal situation experienced as negative). In other words, the tightly controlled environment of the prison represents a high system effort or input, though this could have positive or negative impacts on their life situations. When they left prison, however, most of our respondents claimed to fall into Quadrant 4 (low system...
effort-negative individual situation) when they were released. They reported having been released to nothing, in some cases, going from 24/7 monitoring and care to no support at all. The respondents reported that homelessness did not explicitly lead to more crime, but was an easy way of connecting with “old friends,” which again led to drug abuse and crime. Although professionals may believe that there is a well-functioning rehabilitation plan in place, our findings from the experiences reported by the prisoners do not seem to support this.

Limitations and future directions

The above is a conceptual model, intended to provide a lens from which to reinterpret offenders’ experiences of reintegration and was applied only to the small and exploratory study described in this article. As such, it requires further testing and substantiation. The model, and the study’s findings, should be regarded as tentative and cannot be generalized to a larger population. Hence, the model and the parallel study findings should be regarded as tentative, and cannot be generalized to a larger population. The prisoners were selected by the first author for convenience, and it is possible that this influenced the findings. Other prisoners may have described different experiences. Adding domains to the model, such as underlying physical or mental illness, or socio-demographic factors could increase the model’s utility for practitioners in the field who are responsible for planning transitional services for people leaving prison. Incorporating risk factors that may indicate whether an individual would be more likely to end up in Quadrants 1, 2, 3, or 4 could help practitioners to better tailor their level of support to each individual. We suggest further investigation of this proposal is undertaken development on this in future research.

Conclusion

This paper offers a model with which to view the interaction of an offender with welfare services during the reintegration process as offenders move from prison back into the community. Based on offenders’ perspectives, it offers a range of tentative hypotheses about the relationship between welfare support and offender reintegration and rehabilitation that now requires testing. The model serves as an analytical tool for developing new approaches to supporting offenders in their reintegration into society from prison. The model underpins the
argument that the current reintegration strategies for certain groups of prisoners need to be questioned and challenged.
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