

Staff and offender perspectives of Integrated Offender Management and the impact of its introduction on arrests and risk of reoffending in one police force region

Sleath, E. & Brown, S.

Author post-print (accepted) deposited by Coventry University's Repository

Original citation & hyperlink:

Sleath E, Brown S. 2017. Staff and offender perspectives of Integrated Offender Management and the impact of its introduction on arrests and risk of reoffending in one police force region. *Policing and Society*. 29:511-529.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2017.1410148>

DOI 10.1080/10439463.2017.1410148

ISSN 1043-9463

ESSN 1477-2728

Publisher: Taylor and Francis

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in Policing and Society on 30/11/2017, available

online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/10439463.2017.1410148>

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's post-print version, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

Staff and offender perspectives of Integrated Offender Management and the impact of its introduction on arrests and risk of reoffending in one police force region.

Emma Sleath¹ and Sarah Brown¹

¹Coventry University, UK.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Emma Sleath, School of Psychological, Social and Behavioural Sciences, Coventry University, Priory Street, Coventry, CV1 5FB. Email: emma.sleath@coventry.ac.uk. Telephone number: 44(0)24 7688 8688.

Disclosure statement: The authors received no financial benefit and have no conflicts of interest in relation to this piece of research.

The authors would like to acknowledge the valuable assistance of Joanne Allen, Yan Jin Loo, Daniel McFadden, and Heather Murphy in the data collection for this research.

Abstract

The Integrated Offender Management (IOM) framework was introduced in England and Wales in 2009. The aims of the research outlined in this paper were to examine the impact of the introduction of an Integrated Offender Management (IOM) approach in one large police force region and the perceptions of it by offenders and staff. There were two parts to the study. The first involved the use of a within-participant approach to establish whether IOM supervision reduced the level of arrests and risk of reoffending in a sample of offenders. The second involved interviewing offenders and staff involved in IOM regarding their perceptions of it with a focus on effectiveness. The findings showed that the level of arrests (medium effect) and the risk of reoffending (large effect) reduced in the 18 months following the introduction of IOM in comparison to the 18 months prior to the introduction of IOM. Six superordinate themes were identified from staff and offender interviews that highlighted the *core elements of IOM, the effectiveness of IOM in reducing offending, how reoffending is reduced, communication, the offender manager role, and the challenges of IOM*. The findings offer tentative support for the effectiveness of IOM provision in this geographic region in reducing offending and in identifying factors that staff and offenders believe contribute to the effectiveness of this approach and can improve future IOM provision.

Key words: Police; Probation; Offender; Effectiveness.

Over the last two decades, offender management in England and Wales has largely adopted a reparative and risk management approach, with increased use of multi-agency working (Raynor and Maguire 2006, Robinson 2013). Similar changes have occurred internationally with countries such as Australia adopting multi-agency partnership working in the management of offenders (Day *et al.* 2014). In England and Wales, there has also been a transition from offender management being under the control of central government to a focus on local provision (Carter 2003), with an emphasis on using local resources to address local problems (Farrall 2002). These changes were formalised in the Integrated Offender Management (IOM) framework, which was introduced by a government policy statement in June 2009 and described as an ‘overarching framework for bringing together agencies in local areas to prioritise interventions with offenders who cause crime in the locality’ (Home Office 2009, p. 6). This framework is underpinned by six key principles: (1) the importance of cohesive collaborative working between agencies to (2) make best use of existing offending behaviour interventions, (3) targeting all offenders, (4) delivering a local response for local problems, (5) to ensure offenders take responsibility for their offending, and are (6) supported in maintaining long term desistance (Home Office 2015). Agencies involved in IOM usually include: the police, probation, Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRC)¹, social services, and substance abuse workers with the aim of collaboratively addressing factors associated with offending (Home Office 2013).

As can be seen, desistance from offending is a key principle of the IOM framework and as such, there is a body of research that has sought to establish the key components that may facilitate desistance within offender management settings (e.g. McNeil, 2003; 2006), alongside broader literature that outlines desistance frameworks (e.g., Laub & Sampson,

¹ Under the ‘transforming rehabilitation’ strategy (Ministry of Justice, 2013), a reorganisation led to the dissolution of Probation Trusts, which were replaced from February 2015 with a National Probation Service responsible for high risk offenders and Community Rehabilitation Companies responsible for the majority of offenders on community sentences or release from prison.

2001) and processes of desistance (e.g., Maruna, 2001). Some differentiation has been made between primary and secondary desistance in that primary desistance is considered an offence-free period of time, whereas secondary desistance represents change in self-identity where an offender now labels themselves as an ex-offender (Maruna & Farrall, 2004). For the purpose of the IOM, it is likely that offender managers will be working within a primary desistance phase, although it is obviously desirable to promote long-term desistance within these processes (McNeil, 2006). Eight central themes have been broadly identified as being important in offender management in relation to desistance (see McNeil, Farrall, Lightowler, & Maruna, 2012). Firstly, it is important to emphasise that this is a process of change and not a static one-off event, which is, secondly, an individualised and subjective process where, thirdly, the maintenance of motivation and hope are important components. Fourthly, human relationships and networks surrounding the offender and fifthly, the offender's personal strengths and resources are important in the desistance process, and can facilitate/hinder this process. The final three components emphasise that desistance will involve the development of self-determination and capacities and skills of the individual (including opportunities to apply these skills), and finally emphasises the importance of language that recognises these potentials.

Although the key principles provide a framework to IOM, a detailed structure of how IOM should be implemented in local areas was not developed. This was deliberate to enable local agencies to tailor their responses to the key issues within their geographic area (Home Office 2010, Wong 2013). Initially, IOM provision was targeted towards specific types of offenders such as Prolific and other Priority Offenders² (PPO) and High Crime Causing Users³ (HCCU), however, this has recently broadened to further enable individual areas to

² PPO: offenders who commit frequent but less serious crimes.

³ HCCU; substance misusers who continue to commit crime and submit positive tests for substance misuse

select offenders that they consider appropriate (Criminal Justice Joint Inspection 2014, Home Office 2015). IOM tends to be headed by a police force IOM lead, who then coordinates with associated partners such as CRCs. Once offenders are identified, the response differs according to whether the offender is under supervision by the CRC or whether they are invited to voluntarily engage with IOM. If there is no statutory supervision, a police offender manager usually seeks a meeting with the individual to determine and then offer what is described as enhanced services to tackle his/her offending. These services usually have a rehabilitative focus such as training or initiatives to find and maintain employment and housing. These can be combined with more enforcement focussed strategies such as curfews, regular drug testing, and electronic tagging (Criminal Justice Joint Inspection 2014; Senior *et al.* 2011). Offenders who do not engage with these enhanced services are usually subject to additional scrutiny, with swift police attention should they engage in further offending or behaviours that indicate a high risk of reoffending. This is known as the “carrot and stick” approach of IOM where compliance by the offender results in rewards such as interventions and support, but non-compliance results in additional scrutiny and swift policing responses (Annison, Bradford, and Grant, 2015).

The collaborative working that is part of IOM work has been identified by Mawby and Worrall (2004) as leading to the development of ‘polibration’. This term is used in relation to the blurring of traditional roles held by Probation and the Police. Although this is usually applied in reference to the movement of probation services towards those roles or actions undertaken by police officers, IOM has also involved the divergence of police officers away from their traditional policing roles. The findings from Mawby and Worrall’s (2004) study identified that police and probation staff can work together effectively and appreciate each other’s roles in responding to offenders. Police managers also highlighted elements of crossover where there was perceived value in building relationships and rapport with

offenders, although this was considered something that could then be exploited (i.e., to determine whether offending was occurring). In conclusion, Mawby and Worrall (2004) felt that collaborative working could challenge the organisational culture of probation and police services but that effective communication was a key component of effective working. Mawby and Worrall (2011) later elaborated on the collaborative working of probation workers with police officers, and identified significant shift towards positive working relationships between the probation and police service. Although good working relationships were identified amongst the participants, there was also evidence of poorer working relationships and tensions with police officers perceived to be engaging in traditional arrest processes with an associated lack of empathy and understanding.

Only a small number of studies have been conducted regarding IOM, with a focus on examining the views of the staff involved in IOM and/or the offenders who are subject to IOM supervision (Cambridge City Council 2010, Criminal Justice Joint Inspection 2014, Senior *et al.* 2011). For the offenders, a largely positive view of IOM has been reported; for example, 13 of the 16 offenders interviewed in the Criminal Justice Joint Inspection (2014) noted benefits including employment gain and tackling drugs related issues. Voluntary participation in IOM was perceived to increase engagement and compliance with supervision and enhanced services (Hallam Centre for Criminal Justice 2014; Haggard *et al.* 2001). A caveat to this was that offenders emphasised the importance of making a clear decision to engage with IOM (and thus not offend), but that once this decision had been made, IOM was considered to assist and maintain engagement through the support it offered (Haggard *et al.* 2001, Senior *et al.* 2011). Offenders found engaging with police officers as offender managers challenging, particularly when working with police officers that had arrested them previously. This practice, however, influenced their perceptions of the police, leading to more positive views of the organisation and more trust in police officers (Senior *et al.* 2011).

Offenders valued their relationships with their offender managers, particularly in having individuals whose key role was to assist and help them (Criminal Justice Inspection 2014). These findings are echoed by Annison *et al.* (2015) who reported that police officers, involved in IOM, discussed spending considerable time building effective working relationships with offenders. This links back to the desistance literature where McNeil (2006) emphasises the importance of relationships in effective interventions, with important components comprising “sustained and compassionate support from trusted sources” (p.49).

With regards to staff involved in IOM, Senior *et al.* (2011) found that IOM staff (e.g., the Police, Probation, Voluntary Community Services) had supportive views of IOM, focussing on the improved sharing of information and expertise, particularly through co-location; increased effectiveness of management process and work efficiency; and opportunities for staff to understand better each other’s management styles. Challenges were identified, such as an increased likelihood of conflict during collaborative working, which was perceived to lead to increased workload due to the additional time needed to resolve issues. Furthermore, some staff did not believe that IOM improved management procedures, but instead highlighted the differences between organisations in relation to individual training and management approaches. Outside of the IOM literature, probation officers are often found to be keen to work with other agencies (e.g. Burnett and McNeil 2005, Kemshall and Maguire 2001, Millie and Erol 2010, Rex 1999, Schwalbe and Maschi 2012, Shapland *et al.* 2012) and to have positive attitudes towards offender rehabilitation (Eckhardt *et al.* 2008, Graffam *et al.* 2004, Sapouna *et al.* 2011). Similarly, Millie and Erol (2006) found that police officers were generally supportive of offender rehabilitation but also identified several challenges when offenders were not ready to change or engage, and/or had problematic lifestyle factors relating to housing, employment and education.

Given that IOM has only recently been introduced in England and Wales, there has been little published research focussed on its effectiveness, or the components of it that may be linked to effectiveness. An evaluation of offenders who participated in the IOM Diamond Initiative in London found that after one year, there was very little difference in the levels of reoffending between the offenders referred to be managed under IOM (42.4%) and a control sample of offenders (41.6%)(Dawson n.d.). Williams and Ariel (2012) compared the frequency and seriousness of arrests in Bristol after a six month follow up period between a group of offenders who received IOM supervision and interventions and a group of offenders who received IOM supervision but who did not receive any specific interventions. The analysis found that receiving specific interventions reduced the level of reoffending and there was a 67% drop in seriousness of offences in those receiving interventions compared to a 15.8% increase in those receiving no intervention. However, given the groups being compared, this does not provide clear findings regarding the effectiveness of IOM supervision alone. Given these equivocal findings, it is clear that more research is required to examine the impact of IOM on recidivism.

The aim of this study, therefore, was to examine the effectiveness of IOM in one large police force region in England and the perceptions of it by offenders and staff (police and probation/CRC officers). To achieve this aim, the study used mixed methods. The first part of the study attempted to quantitatively assess whether IOM could be shown to be effective in reducing offending. Two measures were used to assess this: (i) a comparison of the number of arrests in the 18 month period prior to the introduction of IOM was compared with the number of arrests in the 18 months following the introduction of IOM in a single sample of offenders and (ii) a comparison of risk scores at the time of the introduction of IOM and risk scores 18 months later in the same sample of offenders (the police force had developed its own measure of risk, which was routinely calculated for each offender). Although these

methods are open to cohort effects in that other changes (in addition to IOM) might have taken place in both the services and offenders, finding suitable comparison groups in which there are no differences other than the intervention in question is notoriously difficult.

Random allocation to IOM was not possible in this study/context, and it was hoped that this approach would provide an addition to the literature, particularly given the conflicting findings reported to date. It was hypothesised that the level of risk and number of arrests would be significantly lower 18 months after the introduction of IOM.

The second part of this study, in a similar manner to many of the qualitative studies published to date, investigated the views of staff and offenders in one local area of the larger force who were engaged in IOM provision/supervision, focussing on identifying factors participants felt were associated with the effectiveness of IOM in reducing offending. To ensure a range of perspectives are considered and provide triangulation of findings, it was appropriate to consider the views of both staff members engaged in IOM as offender managers and also those being supervised, however in reporting the findings there is a focus on policing related themes. The purpose was to explore what aspects of IOM were considered to contribute to reduced offending, the benefits of the approach, and its challenges, particularly in relation to police officers undertaking the IOM role.

Method

Design

The current study uses a mixed methods design. For part one, a within participants approach was employed on a sample of offenders who were supervised using the IOM approach following its introduction by the police in May, 2012. For part two, a qualitative examination of staff and offenders' perceptions of intervention effectiveness has grown, given its usefulness for developing practice (e.g., see Koons et al., 1997; Lea, Auburn, & Kibblewhite 1999; Marino, 2009; McCartan, 2012). To obtain real-life insight of individuals

involved in the IOM provision, it was necessary to employ a qualitative methodology using face-to-face semi-structured interviews.

Materials and Variables

For part one, the total number of arrests (all arrests listed in the data) in the 18 month period prior to the introduction of IOM (November 2010 to April 2012) were calculated and compared with the total following the introduction of IOM (May 2012 to October 2013). Risk scores at the time of IOM introduction (May 2012) were compared with risk scores 18 months later (October 2013). The risk measure, developed by the police force, was calculated using a range of offence and offender information from recorded and intelligence sources. No validity/reliability information is available for this force specific measure. Other data extracted included offender characteristics (e.g., gender, ethnicity) and arrest data for each of the offenders.

For part two, two similar semi structured interview schedules were developed (one for OMs and one for offenders) based upon the limited prior literature regarding IOM (e.g., Wong, 2013) and broadened to ensure that it addressed the research questions of this study. Feedback was provided and the schedules approved by a police gatekeeper to ensure that questions were relevant to the force's IOM approach and methods. The schedules included four broad sections with content being adjusted according to whether it was for the OMs or offenders. The first section assessed participants' understanding of the IOM framework, how long they had been involved with it, and what their general opinion of it was. The second section focussed upon identifying the perceived strengths of IOM; e.g., *what is the most effective thing that an offender manager can do or provide?* (OM question) *What parts of offender management do you find most helpful?* (offender question). The third section sought to examine the perceived challenges of working or being supervised within the IOM

framework. The final section examined whether participants thought IOM could be improved and if so, how.

Participants

For part one, data were extracted from the police database for 225 offenders, which included 189 males and 36 females. No significant gender differences were found between risk scores and numbers of arrests, therefore findings are reported for the entire sample. The age at last recorded offence ranged from 13 to 60 years ($M = 30.43$, $S.D. = 8.09$). Most of the sample were White European (85.3%), with the remainder Afro-Caribbean (9.3%) and Asian (4.9%). There was missing ethnicity data for one offender.

For part two, twenty-three participants took part: eight police Offender Managers (OMs; three men and five women), five probation⁴ OMs (five women and one man) and ten offenders, all White British men between the ages of 18-40 years old supervised via IOM from 0 to 12 months. The sample of offenders were randomly selected from all Priority and Prolific offenders that were currently being managed under the IOM team. Specific data on offence histories were not collected but their PPO status indicates frequent offending, though not necessarily for serious and/or violent offences. All offenders were asked by their offender manager whether they would consider taking part in the research. They were then given more detailed information about the project. If they were interested in taking part in the study, their contact details were then passed on to the research team, who arranged the interviews at suitable times. A gatekeeper at the local police force facilitated access to participants by providing information about the project to police officers and members of the probation team. If professionals were interested in taking part, their contact details were then forwarded to the research team. The police OM role involved working with a wide range of

⁴ The reorganisation of community provision from the Probation Trust to the National Probation Service and CRC took place during the study. The CRC came into effect in February 2014; however, significant staff changes and planning took place prior to this date. For ease, probation is used throughout to refer to staff who eventually became employed by the CRC.

offenders (e.g., low to high risk, low level to serious offences), while the Probation OMs worked within a substance misuse team dealing with PPOs and HCCUs. As with all research projects that recruit participants in this way, there is potential for sampling bias. For example, offenders who volunteer to take part in the project may have been motivated to change from an offending lifestyle, and were thus motivated to engage in IOM and therefore, had a more positive view of the effectiveness of IOM.

Procedure

Ethical approval for the study was granted by the University's Research Ethics Committee and the police force for both parts of the project. Further ethical approval was sought and gained from the Probation Trust and the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) for the second part of the project. For part one, data were extracted from the police database and anonymised by a database analyst. This data was analysed by the first and second authors, with the findings reported to the police force. For the second part, all participants were provided with full details of the study, information about confidentiality, and their right to withdraw from the study. Participants were interviewed by the third, fourth, fifth or sixth author, between March and May 2014 on a one-to-one basis at the local police station using the semi-structured interview schedule. All interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim. All participants were thanked and debriefed. A report and presentation was provided to staff on completion of the study.

Data analysis

For part two, a process of both inductive and deductive Thematic Analysis (TA) was used to analyse the data. As there are some prior research about the benefits and challenges of IOM, evidence of these were searched for within the current data. However, given that these data are limited, the predominant analysis approach was inductive where key themes were identified within the data regardless of prior knowledge of the topic area. The process

of analysis followed the six step guidelines developed by Braun and Clarke (2006). Initial codes were generated and then grouped according to similarity. These initial codes were refined and revised to ensure distinctiveness, and then organised. This process established the superordinate themes and sub-themes were grouped within these. This process continued the structure of the themes was clearly established. At this point, the original data was re-read to ensure that meaning had not been lost and that data represented the thematic structure. The authors who conducted the interviews, conducted analyses on sub-groups of data (police OM, probation OM or offenders) and this was reviewed and combined by the first two authors, who triangulated the findings to establish the themes and sub-themes as presented here.

Results

Part one

In the 18 months prior to the introduction of IOM, the number of arrests for each offender ranged from 0 – 23 ($M = 6.84$, $S.D. = 4.75$). In the eighteen months following the introduction of IOM, the number of arrests for each offender ranged from 0 – 15 ($M = 3.61$, $S.D. = 3.66$). A paired t test revealed a significant decrease in arrest levels from pre-IOM to post-IOM, $t(224) = 11.64$, $p < .001$, $r = .38$ (medium effect size).

Initial risk scores were available for 225 offenders and ranged from 220 – 1100 ($M = 328.89$, $S.D. = 142.71$). Risk scores 18 months after the introduction of IOM were available for 187 offenders and ranged from 20 – 900 ($M = 238.61$, $S.D. = 174.04$). A paired t test was conducted on the sample of 187 for whom both initial and post scores were available. This revealed that post scores were significantly lower than the initial risk scores $t(186) = 8.10$, $p < .001$, $r = .51$ (large effect size).

Part two

In total, six superordinate themes (each with sub-themes) were identified (see Table 1). In the reporting of the results below, there is a focus on the themes that were highlighted by police participants. This was completed as the introduction of IOM represents a change in role for police officers, which is why it is important to specifically highlight themes that were important or reflected that context. These are outlined below under the superordinate theme and subtheme labels.

Effectiveness of IOM in reducing offending

Two contrasting themes were evident regarding the effectiveness of IOM: *IOM is effective in reducing offending* and *questioning of effectiveness*. Both OMs and the majority of offenders demonstrated the belief that IOM could be effective in reducing reoffending. For OMs this was evidenced through examples of success stories; e.g., ‘I have had a couple of success stories as well which is really good. I mean one of them has like been offending for thirteen years and now he’s drug free’ (Police1). For offenders, they discussed this in relation to a reduction in their own offending (e.g., ‘I’ve offended for like twenty years now, but these last two years since offender management it’s been non-existent’ [Offender1]) and also in the context of what would happen if IOM was removed: ‘Yeah I reckon there would be a lot of re-offending again’ (Offender3); ‘I think a lot of PPOs would be going back to jail.’ (Offender6). A smaller number of offenders held a a negative view of IOM ‘if this wasn’t here it would be alright but I would have more chance of reoffending.’ (Offender10) and were *questioning of effectiveness* of IOM in having an impact on their offending, e.g., ‘I think it’s a waste of time.’ (Offender7).

How reoffending is reduced

Within this theme, there were five sub-themes: *offenders choosing to change*, *importance of engagement*, *close supervision/monitoring*, *contact levels with offenders*, and *addressing triggers to reoffending*. There were contrasting views in relation to the *close*

supervision/monitoring theme. For some Police OMs the intensive nature of the monitoring of offenders was perceived to be very important in reducing reoffending opportunities e.g., ‘I just think it’s a new way of monitoring these offenders, whereas before they’d just come out and be allowed to get on with it now we’re just we’re all over them.’ (Police4),

It benefits because they know they are being monitoring by police, probation, recovery partnership because they know that I think it makes think it makes them more aware of offending, more aware of their offending, I don't think it necessarily stops them but it makes them think it lets them know that everybody is looking at them if that makes sense (Police8, L28-31)

This close monitoring was perceived to be effective in two ways: (i) the police could catch offenders committing crime more quickly; and, (ii) close monitoring was a deterrence to offenders. Some offenders agreed with this viewpoint in that they suggested that the close monitoring led some offender to reconsider whether they would offend:

Having people under that sort of supervision helps, them think first...I know a few PPOs when it come to crime they use to be zealous and they would just steal anything but they think first now (Offender4).

Another offender explained that the techniques, such as curfews, had helped lower his chance of re-offending as they gave structure to his daily life, ‘I’m the person like—I need a routine, I need to do certain things at certain times and if I don’t I just stray away from the plan and just go off the rails a bit, so yeah it’s [his curfew] just a bit of stability for me’ (Offender3). It was also suggested that IOM monitoring could have an unintended

consequence when it was removed: ‘Things like tagging and curfews...when you finally get off them you are just going to go wild for the night aren’t you? Because you have no supervision every night you can just do whatever you want it’s pointless...’ (Offender4).

The above more positive views of the strategies of IOM were not shared by some probation OM’s who thought that IOM was not always helpful in enabling engagement in rehabilitation, since offenders felt that they were ‘still a criminal’ (Probation5) because of the intense nature of IOM supervision. Probation2 stated that ‘[the supervision] increase[s] clients’ alert that they are being watched and controlled too much...They are then being influenced and see themselves as an offender...it creates some hindrance on stopping offenders from fully participating in rehabilitation’. For example, one Probation OM reported that an offender often claimed that he ‘didn’t like all other agencies knowing his problems and behaviours, knowing his everything, aware of his thing, he told he doesn’t have own privacy’ (Probation5), which led him to feel ‘frustrated’ and ‘he told me he doesn’t want to come in and see anyone’ (Probation5).

The *contact levels with offenders* theme referred to the number of meetings between OM’s and offenders that had to be completed each week, which were frequently perceived negatively by offenders, as reported by Police OM’s and offenders.

In my experience I think having four contacts a week with just a police officer for the people I have dealt with had a negative effect as in they would get annoyed and fed up with it and would be less likely to engage with you. (Police2)

‘It’s quite inconvenient having to come in all the time, I mean basically like today this has messed my schedule up, my day is now ruined’ (Offender5). This impact of this on employment opportunities was raised: ‘Give me less meetings [laughs]. I wouldn’t have to

come here as much, could be out there looking for work but instead the day is wasted' (Offender1).

Communication

Collaborative working requires effective communication and four subthemes were identified that concerned this crucial aspect: *communication between agencies has improved, easier, improvements in communication still needed, and leads to the better management of offenders*. The participants believed that *communication between agencies has improved* and is *easier* as a result of IOM. This was strongly linked to co-location, 'when probation are here you can just walk over and actually speak to them and you can access their system straight away and vice versa you can get information a lot quicker' (Police4), and having known individuals to communicate with, e.g., 'we always know who we need to talk to...so I do not need to explain to others about my concerns again and again and wait for the messages to be passed from one to one' (Probation3). Improved communication was perceived to *lead to the better management of offenders* through having more information available, e.g., 'we are more aware of what they are doing...have more information on who the people they are associating with, what they've been seeing and what they are doing' (Probation3); and in better communication with offenders, e.g., 'There is consistency so they know where they stand and they know that information is being shared so does that benefit the offender, helps reduce crime' (Probation7). Information sharing was believed to reduce the possibility of manipulation by offenders, e.g., 'I think they realise that we do speak to each other so maybe in the past they could play agencies off against each other a little bit but the opportunities have got a lot less' (Police2); and, enabled staff to confirm the truthfulness of information, 'it's good to get that information from different people so we know what is truth and what is not' (Probation1).

Despite this it was felt that *improvements in communication still needed* particularly between Probation and the Police, but also with other agencies. The police OMs referred to this in relation to the sharing of information between agencies with examples of what they considered to be one-way communication. This was frequently aimed at Probation:

“because sometimes I think important information can be missed I had it the other day with something and I thought I wish I would have known that I wish you would have rang and told me that because that shows this offender’s behaviour and something that happened and I was only told it by chance because I rang probation to give them some information about this offender and they only told me that by chance and I thought it was really important” (Police8)

Other organisations were highlighted, in comparison, to be better at sharing information with the police:

It’s like seeing the bigger picture isn’t it whereas I know with recovery partnership coz we’re constantly ringing each other constantly emailing so we know exactly what’s going on. But with probation once an offender’s been in here say on a Tuesday say for his police visit then we say bye then they go off to probation and I wouldn’t have a clue then what happened there and I suppose they don’t know what happened here so.
(Police1)

However, this tended to be attributed to individual differences in that some staff were perceived to be very good at sharing information, whereas others were not:

No I wouldn't say it is equal but again that is all down to the individual so sometimes you just have to phone and keep saying I have just seen so and so and what's happening with him or drop an email have you got an update no it's more us phoning them then us phoning them. (Police3)

you've got some probation officers that are really good at communicating with you and you've got those that don't like the police offender management thing they believe their way is the way that it should be done and won't disclose anything (Police4)

“dependent on the individual because we have all got different ways of working, some won't answer your emails and that gets frustrating but then I don't know what's going on at that end they are snowed under they are worried about losing their jobs, they have got a heavy caseload perhaps they don't feel they have got anything to say” (Police6)

Furthermore, a small number of offenders discussed specific incidents that had particularly aggrieved them (and had a detrimental impact on their view of IOM) that concerned communication between OMs and offenders.

The offender manager role

The OM role is a core feature of IOM and is therefore crucial to its effectiveness. Accordingly, the characteristics and skills of effective OMs and successful working with offenders were discussed a great deal by OMs from both agencies. The subthemes were: *importance of building trust and rapport with offenders, conflict in the relationship between the OM and the offender, role is like being a parent, providing support/being supportive, individual/tailored response, differing approaches used by OMs, being involved in the arrests of offenders being managed, and training.* This was a considerable area of focus for Police OMs, particularly as for the police officers this represented a cultural shift and blurring of

their role, representing their recognition that the OM role was different to that of a ‘traditional’ police officer role.

The importance of building trust and rapport with offenders was felt to be critical in successfully engaging offenders in IOM. However, it was clearly recognised by both offenders and police officers that trust and rapport were not usually components of their relationships. Therefore, for police officers, there was considerable emphasis made on the additional effort that they had to put into their work to build these relationships, an aspect that was not referenced by Probation Officers. In constructing these relationships, police officers focussed upon key components such as honesty, consistency, trustworthiness, perseverance, and hard-work. These components were emphasised in the context of overcoming stereotypes that offenders held about police officers and anticipated treatment by police officers (e.g., arrest)

“I think the main thing is honesty and no false hopes” (Police3)

“it goes back to the trust thing but if they can see that you really mean what you intend to do ... but if you can show them that what you say you mean you know then a bit perseverance will come out of it in the end.” (Police3)

“I suppose it’s just then some are hard word because like you say they don’t want to know and you’ve got to try and build try and knock down those barriers that they’ve got you know even to the simple thing like trying to make them laugh even going on about something silly so they crack a smile and then you think I’ve got you know it’s just working with some it’s harder to get started with than others.” (Police1)

The challenges of building trusting relationships with police officers was also highlighted by offenders, who referenced this as a change from prior experiences e.g., ‘I

actually trust them [the police] a little bit now because like I say she [police OM] has actually gone out her way, above and beyond for me more than once' (Offender5). This underpins the emphasis that police officers put upon building a trusting relationship in facilitating change and linked to second theme of *role is like being a parent*; e.g., 'sometimes you have to like a mother and and they are like children so you constantly have to be at them' (Police1) and "like a child like they won't listen, you have to wait for them to calm down a little bit." (Police4). However, this groundwork in building the relationships is perceived to be beneficial in the long term by police OMs, as important for underpinning desistance and change in offenders.

just to be there really to be there for them when they want to phone you, keep visiting them, they have always got some issues, something they need to ask for something that needs doing, so I think just being there for them and it when they decide it's time that they want to change and if you are there and everything is in place then it's easier for them for it to happen. (Police8)

In some cases, this resulted in a shifting of the perception of police officers by offenders e.g., 'I class them as.... It's like a friend at the end of the line. I can open up to [OM] and [OM].' (Offender9). These strong relationships were valued in ensuring that they did not reoffend, e.g., 'Even if you feel like you are in a relapse they are there to like tell you, you don't need to go back to that way you know what I mean? It keeps you grounded' (Offender4).

This positive view of the relationships that could be built between police OMs and offenders was contrasted with the theme when there was *conflict in the relationship between the OM and the offender*. Difficulties were attributed to a clash of personalities, OM gender,

or specific incidents perceived negatively by offenders. In these situations, since good relationships were linked to offender engagement, participants emphasised that change was needed. Alternatives were considered in terms of whether the management of an offender should be changed to a different OM, or whether different strategies should be used to attempt to (re)build the relationship; e.g., ‘it might be clash of personalities or that person doesn't get on with you so may be try a different offender manager or different approach’ (Police3). Police officers also discussed the complexities of the relationships between the offender and probation and the offender and police officers, reflecting that relationship breakdown was not just a feature of police OM and offender relationships e.g., “this chap just couldn't interact, couldn't get on with his probation officer so there was a real brick wall from his side ... so I have invited myself along in order to facilitate communication and as a result of that I was almost a mediator” (Police6). Offenders used specific examples where the relationship between the OM had become difficult: ‘they [OM] turned up at my office... How did they know my gaffer knew I was an ex-con?... they had my address, they knew where I lived, they had my phone number, they didn't have to come to my place of work’ (Offender5). This was linked to a weakening of the relationship between the offender and the OM ‘luckily my boss knew I was an ex-con so I got away with it but I think that's what created the barrier [between offender and police OM] I was quite stand offish’ (Offender5).

The emphasis on this need to build a relationship between police OMs and offenders reflected in the importance of other skills that were emphasised as part of the OM role. Specifically, flexibility was emphasised in two themes: *individual/tailored response* and *differing approaches used by OMs*. Police OMs believed that they had to tailor the way in which they worked with offenders; e.g., ‘I think people have to be treated as an individual the way that somebody is going to respond to you will determine from their personality and you

have to adjust to that really' (Police5). This was perceived to be particularly important in relation to addressing the individual needs of that offender:

You have got to tailor it to their needs this role is all about support and getting them to change their ways with a view to crime reduction and you need to do that you can't go in with a structured approach it has got to be flexible in many ways. (Police6)

The second theme highlighted the variation in the way in which the police OMs approached the management of offenders.

I think there are some offender managers that are very much, their main focus would be on support and there would be other offender managers whose main focus would be catch and convict and then there's offender managers in the middle who try and do a bit of both. (Police2)

This was occasionally viewed negatively, e.g., 'they'll work a totally different way there's certain things that they do that I don't agree with and there's probably certain things that I do that they don't agree with' (Police4). Largely, however, this theme reflected an understanding that the police officers were adopting different methods of working and that these reflected individual differences, e.g., 'I feel that everyone deals with differently but everyone does a good job they have just got their own way of dealing with them. So it's not like anyone does anything wrong' (Police8)

The importance of *providing support/being supportive* was consistently emphasised by all OMs, since it was felt that it was essential to ensure that the offenders did not return to offending. Support was also valued by the offenders, 'I just like support, to be fair, cause like I know that whatever I'm doing I'm not alone in it you know' (Offender4), and 'Yeah it's good to know they are there, if you wanted help...' (Offender2). This theme was linked with the *importance of engagement* theme, in that it was perceived that once an offender willingly engaged in IOM, then OMs would commit to supporting the offender; e.g., 'it is very

important the ones that need help and support and want help and support yes the more time you put in the more likely you are to reduce their offending and get them away from their offending lifestyle.’ (Police7). However, police officers experienced conflict in their framing of the OM role as a supportive one, particularly in relation to *Being involved in arrests of offenders being managed* e.g., “We still want to be the jack of all trades the catch and convict, I know that term has been changed quite recently, but we still feel that we need to do that that we need to target people, and I think the role was set up for support” (Police5). In particular, this was perceived to be damaging to the rapport and the relationship that they had built with the offender e.g., “I wouldn’t tend to arrest somebody I deal with I’d get someone else to do it because otherwise you lose that rapport” (Police1)

“personally I don’t think it is right for me to be arresting them, the people I am dealing with arresting them. There are circumstances and I tell my offenders I don’t want to arrest you but if you do something stupid in front of me, then I will have to arrest you I am a police officer but that is not what I want, it is not how I want to deal with them, I don’t want to them to see me as a threat if I go round and knock on the door I want them to answer the door and invite me in.” (Police7)

However, other police OMs, whilst recognizing this role conflict, believed that arresting their offender could be reframed in a positive way e.g., “I wouldn’t have any problem going arresting them and again that can be a positive thing because if you arrest them and deal with the fairly and squarely then they know they have done wrong and you can turn it around” (Police3). Furthermore, some police OMs believed that the breakdown of the relationship between the OM and offender was not a foregone result following being involved in their arrest, but that this was dependent on the type of relationship that had been built between the OM and offender again referencing honesty.

“there will be some offenders where if you have managed to have a good rapport with them they will be ok with that they will say hands up I did the crime and I know that you're a police officer and you have got to do that role as well and then there is some offenders that would take a very negative view of their offender manager being involved in their arrest and prosecution so I guess it comes down to individual's personality and sort of the level of, type of relationship you have managed to build up with them.” (Police2)

A small number of police OMs reported issues related to *training* for the IOM role with subthemes that related to a perception that there was a *lack of training* (‘no one's ever offered me training for that part of it, the integrated part’ [Police1]); that there were *innate skills as an OM* (‘Now I have actually done the role ... I don't think you can train somebody to be a good communicator ... it is something you have got in you.’ [Police6]); and *learning as you do* (‘it's been quite a lot of learn as you go and find your feet as you go’ [Police2]). The final subtheme discussed *where training could help*, which largely focussed on learning about the work of other agencies that could offer support and/or interventions for offenders. It was noted that this information was learned on an ad hoc basis and that formal training sessions would be useful, particularly if regularly delivered and updated:

it's all through word of mouth it's all like the family support groups, social services or social care or you know family whatever it but that's all because we talk to each other but we could do with input from social services and you know other agencies that we got a bit more understanding and also so they know what we can offer. (Police3)

Challenges of integrated offender management

Some challenges in relation to IOM were identified including the *negative perception of the police, differing approach/culture of agencies, changes in Probation impact on IOM* and administrative issues that related to *difficulties in managing confidential information* and

IT systems. Police OMs tended to focus upon the challenges of working with offenders given their *negative perceptions of the police*: ‘when you’re an offender you don’t tend to like the police because you’re the one enemy you don’t want to get involved in’ (Police1). This was perceived by police OMs to be a barrier to effective working with offenders, as they had to overcome these preconceptions before they could work effectively/engage with offenders. This was echoed by Probation OMs who noted that the police were seen by offenders as being for ‘arresting them and locking them up but not assisting them for their future’ (Probation1). This had an impact on engagement with IOM: ‘some of those [offenders] are quite anti-police...they will still go to the police station but will not talk to [the police]...so [the offenders] will physically go but they won’t engage’ (Probation3).

A substantial multi-agency issue noted by OMs from both agencies concerned the *different cultures/approaches of agencies*. Police OMs felt that probation (CRCs) were ‘offender focussed’ (Police4). This was linked with views that probation were lenient in dealing with some offenders:

I would say frustrations in as much as again curfew checks and breaches like if we say oh they have breached it and done a statement and then they overstep the mark again and probation say oh we will give them a warning or a written warning I think the frustrations come. (Police3)

if we want to put someone back in prison, probation and recovery partnership are saying we want to give them another chance (Police4)

“I can’t always say that I agree with whether someone has their licence recalled or not. You know if there is clear evidence that they are still committing offences whilst out on licence then that’s my view (Police5)

In contrast, some police OMs identified themselves as having a traditional focus of catching offenders or as being ‘victim focussed’ (Police4):

we also do the catch and convict side as well whereas if they were not engaged with us but we believe they are doing crime then it’s our job as a police officer to arrest them or inform other departments what’s going on with them and who they are associating with I mean probation will feed that back to us but we are police officers at the end of the day so we are here to enforce (Police3)

I find with probation and recovery partnership they are very offender focused they are very offender focused and don’t think very much of the victims out there whereas the police are very victim focused so there can be a little bit of a clash sometimes as in they’ll say things don’t worry about this we will give them a warning for this and stuff like that when actually no we’re paid by the public and we are there to protect the public and we are very victim focused.” (Police4)

It was argued that there was limited support for victims, e.g., ‘I think a lot is chucked at the offender there is a lot of help out there for them and sometimes victims don’t tend to get that’ (Police8) and that a key role of the police was to protect the public. Participants noted conflicts that occurred due to the differing approaches to offender management from each agency: ‘sometimes there can be some conflicts...Some agencies may take a softer approach, some agencies may want to take a more hard-line approach’ (Probation4).

The *changes in Probation impact on IOM* related to the reorganisation that resulted from the ‘transforming rehabilitation’ strategy, with a clear concern that this would have an impact on effective working: ‘I think basically the probation service will get a real mess I don’t know how the re-structuring and the privatisation is going to affect our relationship’

(Police7). Finally, administrative issues related to *difficulties in managing confidential information* and *IT systems* were focussed upon by Police OMs in terms of sharing confidential data and how this was managed and the challenges of the *IT systems* of each agency and using these to share information.

Discussion

Overall, the findings from both parts of these study provide tentative evidence that IOM may be a successful approach in reducing offending. From the first part of the study, a reduction in arrests and a large reduction in the offenders' risk of offending were found within the data. This is in contrast to the findings of the study of the Diamond Initiative (Dawson, n.d.), though the follow-up period in that study was 6 months shorter. As the way in which IOM is implemented varies between each force, this may also account for the difference in the findings, though further research is needed to confirm this. Due to limitations in the police dataset, we were not able to examine the impact of different interventions received in addition to IOM supervision received by each offender. This means we cannot determine which aspects of IOM contributed to this finding and therefore compare our findings with those of Williams and Ariel (2012). Nevertheless, our findings suggest that IOM may be effective in reducing the number of arrests and also in reducing the risk of reoffending via a number of strategies, some aimed at rehabilitating offenders (e.g., housing, substance abuse and employment interventions) and others aimed at monitoring individuals at risk of reoffending.

Part two of the study revealed that police and probation OMs and offenders generally believed that IOM can be effective in reducing offending, which was achieved particularly through the supportive role of OMs, collaborative working, and offenders engaging with IOM and choosing to change. The importance of the OM role in ensuring success was emphasised by both OMs and offenders, particularly in terms of the strong relationship built on trust and

rapport that needed to be established between offenders and OMs. The OM role was crucial in providing support and encouragement, providing both practical (e.g., accessing substance misuse help) and emotional support (e.g., in reinforcing successes and positives).

These findings reflect those of Criminal Justice Inspection (2014), which also found that offenders who viewed IOM positively valued the relationships they had with their OMs. The current study adds to our understanding of the importance of this relationship by highlighting the mutual trust/rapport that is required between OMs and offenders. Whilst this was seen as the basis of effective working, it was clear that OMs developed relationships in different ways, being flexible according to the specific attitudes/requirements of the offender. Although, not stated as such by the participants in this study, this is an important responsiveness issue, highlighted in the RNR model and linked to effective interventions (Bonta and Andrews 2007). Although more research is required to determine this, this individualistic approach could be crucial in the effectiveness of IOM and hence, is an important practice issue, as it is founded on achieving a good relationship and providing a tailored response.

A good OM/offender relationship was seen to promote offender engagement and the importance of offender engagement has been highlighted previously (e.g., Graffam *et al.* 2004). In the current study, we highlight the reciprocal nature of this, in that good engagement promoted a good relationship and a good relationship promoted engagement. This reciprocal relationship and the importance of engagement of both staff and offenders reflects the model of engagement developed by Holdsworth *et al.* (under review). In forensic settings, the importance of this issue is often overlooked, despite the fact that the results of this study suggest that it is the foundation on which effective IOM is built. Consequently, if this relationship could not be developed or broke down, this was believed to reduce the effectiveness of IOM and necessitated a swift response to repair/rebuild the relationship, or change the OM to start the relationship building process again.

Some routine practices (e.g., arrest of offenders) could have a negative impact on these relationships and strategies to deal with this issue in police IOM teams in a manner that limits the impact on OM relationships should be considered. These findings highlight the tensions that can be produced by the ‘carrot and stick’ approach, that was evident in the practices in this region and supports the work of Annison, Bradford, and Grant (2015). In the current study, it was noted that the ‘stick’ aspect could have significant impact on offenders. Although this is clearly the intention to some extent, this potentially also damaged the IOM approach and perhaps the future likelihood of this approach being successful with offenders for whom the ‘stick’ had been used. This was not always felt to be the case, however, with some police OMs arguing that this was an important aspect of their role that could be managed. In some cases, however, police OMs who had developed a relationship with an offender and had to carry out a ‘stick’ activity (e.g., arrest an offender) felt uncomfortable and this also was perceived negatively by some offenders and damaged relationships that had been carefully cultivated. It is therefore important to understand, with further research, how offender engagement (or lack of engagement) is managed by OMs, and how ‘stick’ processes/actions are delivered and by whom, and how these are linked (or not linked) with reoffending. For example, it is usual practice that offenders who do not engage with IOM supervision are subject to increased police attention and monitoring reflecting a more traditional catch and convict approach (Home Office 2015), still working within the IOM framework. It is important to explore how this approach may relate to reoffending, particularly how different offender pathways for those who engage/do not engage in IOM relates to the effectiveness of this approach.

OMs perceived IOM positively through the changes in their working practices. Some of these benefits have been identified previously, such as the positive impact of co-location of partnerships agencies (e.g., Senior *et al.* 2011). The close working relationships generally

developed between the police and probation and the considerable efforts of police OMs to develop relationships and change their traditional roles provides support for Mawby and Worrall's (2004) concept of 'polibation'. The considerable time that the police put into building relationships with offenders identified by Annison et al. (2015) was also clearly evident in this study.

Increased communication and collaborative working between agencies were identified as key strengths of IOM and the evidence of good relationships supports the findings of Mawby and Worrall (2011). In fact, in this study OMs were keen to increase the number of type of partner agencies with which they worked. Collaborative working was associated with agencies providing complementary practices that resulted in the more comprehensive management of offenders, a more consistent approach to offenders, and reduced the difficulties that might arise due to different agencies having different and incomplete information about offenders. This required effective communication between agencies, which was believed to result in a cohesive response to offenders and better management overall. Mawby and Worrall (2004) identified that effective communication was key to 'polibation' and this was echoed by the participants in the current study.

Although IOM was generally felt to have improved collaborative working and effective communication, it was felt that additional work was still required, particularly in relation to information sharing. Somewhat unsurprisingly, increased collaboration and communication had led to conflict between agencies, as identified in other studies (see Mawby & Worrall, 2011; Senior *et al.* 2011). For example, police OMs tended to identify themselves as being responsible for protecting the public and/or the victims, while probation OMs were seen to be more offender focussed. This led to conflicts in decision making about the offenders that required additional time and energy to resolve. Nevertheless, these

problems were seen to be ‘tensions’ and isolated incidents and it was felt that with continued co-location and collaborative working, many of these issues could be addressed.

Collaborative working is a core principle of IOM (Home Office 2013), and a feature of criminal justice and public protection systems more widely, therefore it will be useful to assess in the future whether conflict between agencies continues, the impact of this barrier to effective working, and strategies that can be adopted to enhance collaboration and effective communication and information sharing. This is particularly important given that Senior *et al.* (2011) reported that the overall effectiveness of IOM is strongly linked to how well stakeholders worked together.

As with all studies, there are some limitations and caveats that must be kept in mind when drawing conclusions from this data. In relation to part one, some caution is needed as arrest data may not accurately reflect the level of offending and the risk measure was not empirically validated or tested for reliability. Levels of arrests could be affected by offenders being placed under IOM supervision by either increasing or decreasing the likelihood of arrest. For example, police officers may be more arrest-averse of IOM offenders as they may view arrest as detrimental to the relationship that the offender has with their IOM manager and the programme as a whole. The alternative may also be true in that given the close supervision that IOM offenders are under, they may be more likely to be arrested when engaging in offending behaviours. Furthermore, although the findings were similar for men and women, the mechanisms may (or may not) be very different and requires further investigation. All these issues may affect the validity of using arrest data as a proxy for assessing levels of offending. Furthermore, it is possible that other variables unrelated to IOM supervision may have led to the reduction in reoffending (e.g., changes in lifestyle factors), which might be particularly relevant given the design used in the study and the increased age of offenders across the two time points. Since, it is consistently shown that

offending reduces with age (age-crime curve, Farrington 1986), some or all of the decrease might be attributed to this factor. Since the period of study was three years and the offenders targeted for IOM provision were PPO and HCCU offenders, it is unlikely that this would account for all the reduction; nevertheless more research is needed using different methodological designs to evaluate the effectiveness IOM and its different components further. The second issue affects the reliability and validity of the risk scores that are used within part one of the study. This may mean that any difference in the levels of risk found between the two time points are attributable to the potential unreliability of the risk measure. However, without further empirical validation of the risk assessment measure, it is difficult to assess the impact of this potential issue.

In relation to part two of this study, the issue of sampling bias should be considered alongside the findings. There is the potential that more positive attitudes about IOM were reported by the offenders who volunteered to take part in the study. This may reflect their motivation to change and to engage in the IOM process, to assist them in moving away from an offending lifestyle, rather than actual perceptions of the IOM process. When considering this issue, the original data from the offenders was re-examined. Broadly, six of the offenders demonstrated positive attitudes about IOM and the remaining four demonstrated more negative attitudes about IOM. Therefore, the sample is relatively balanced in terms of representing attitudes about IOM.

Conclusion

This research extends the limited literature examining the effectiveness of IOM by: (i) reporting the first quantitative analysis of police data of risk of reoffending and arrest data for offenders being managed using IOM using an 18 month follow-up; and, (ii) exploring effectiveness of IOM from multiple perspectives of police and probation OMs and offenders. The findings suggest that the IOM approach adopted in the police force area examined is

effective in reducing re-offending, with quantitative data showing reduced numbers of arrests and lower risk levels following the introduction of IOM. Furthermore, OMs and offenders involved in the IOM provision believed that it was effective in reducing offending. Although much of the successes discussed in this study represent primary desistance (Maruna & Farrall, 2004), there was evidence that many of the eight principles of desistance (McNeil et al., 2012) were being adopted. For example, there was an understanding that there was a significant process of change that takes time and commitment and that it is important to maintain motivation and hope. OMs changes their approaches to build relationships with different offenders and with the same offenders to development engagement where it was difficult. There were caveats in that the engagement of offenders' and their desire to change was seen to be crucial; i.e., if an offender chooses to continue offending, then there was felt to be little that could be done to stop them. Hence, IOM is unlikely to be effective for all offenders. Despite this, OMs clearly saw their role as intervening with offenders who were prepared to engage in the process and such offenders welcomed the support and associated interventions that they received.

Given that IOM is still relatively new and that IOM practices are constantly being updated and revised, the evidence-base needs to be developed, particularly in relation to demonstrating that IOM is effective in reducing reoffending. Furthermore, although this study has identified factors that staff and offenders believe contribute to the effectiveness of this approach, research is needed to demonstrate that these practices are important factors in reducing offending. Williams and Ariel (2012) demonstrated that receiving specific interventions in addition to IOM supervision was linked to reduced recidivism and further studies are needed to compare different combinations of IOM strategies to determine which are effective, and which the most effective to ensure the most cost effective delivery of services.

References

- Annison, H., Bradford, B., & Grant, E. (2015). Theorizing the role of 'the brand' in criminal justice: The case of Integrated Offender Management. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 15(4), 387-406.
- Bonta, J. and Andrews, D.A., 2007. Risk-Need-Responsivity model for offender assessment and rehabilitation. Available from https://cpoc.memberclicks.net/assets/Realignment/risk_need_2007-06_e.pdf
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 77-101.
- Burnett, R., & McNeill, F., 2005. The place of the office-offender relationship in assisting offenders to desist from crime. *Probation Journal*, 52, 221-242.
- Cambridge City Council, 2010. *Integrated offender management: Member – led review*. Available from <http://www.cambridgeshire.gov.uk/CMSWebsite/Apps/Committees/AgendaItem.aspx?agendaItemID=4088>
- Carter, P., 2003. *Managing offenders, reducing crime: A new approach (Correctional Services Review)*. London: Home Office.
- Criminal Justice Joint Inspection, 2014. *A joint inspection of the integrated offender management approach*. London: Criminal Justice Joint Inspection.
- Dawson, P., n.d.. Learning from the Diamond Initiative evaluation. Downloaded from http://www.policyreview.tv/document_stream.php?document_id=3963&conf_id=598
- Day, A., Boni, N., Hobbs, G., Carson, E., Whitting, L., and Powell, M., 2014. Professional attitudes to sex offenders: Implications for multiagency and collaborative working. *Sexual Abuse in Australia and New Zealand*, 6, 12-19. Available from: <http://search.informit.com.au/documentSummary;dn=775756308532845;res=IELNZ>

Eckhardt, C., Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Norlander, B., Sibley, A., and Cahill, M., 2008.

Readiness to change, partner violence subtypes, and treatment outcomes among men in treatment for partner assault. *Violence and Victims*, 23, 446-475.

Farrall, S., 2002. *Rethinking what works with offenders: Probation, social context and desistance from crime*. Plymouth: TJ International Ltd.

Farrington, D., 1986. Age and crime. *Crime Justice*, 7, 189-250.

Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A., Lavelle, B., and McPherson, W., 2004. Variables affecting successful reintegration as perceived by offenders and professionals. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 40, 147-171.

Haggard, U.A., Gumpert, C.H., and Grann, M., 2001. Against all odds a qualitative follow-up study of high-risk violent offenders who were not reconvicted. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 1048-1065.

Hallam Centre for Community Justice, 2014. *Integrated Offender Management: Pooling Resources and Expertise and Creating Effective Working Partnerships*. Available at: http://www.acjrd.ie/files/Professor_Paul_Senior_Martin_Tansey_Memorial_Lecture_2014.pdf

Holdsworth, E., Bowen, E., Brown, S. J., and Howat, D. (2016). The development of a Program Engagement Theory for group offending behavior programs. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, published online. Home Office, 2015. *Integrated offender management: Key principles*. London: Home Office

Home Office. 2013. *Integrated offender management: Findings from the 2013 survey*. London: Home Office.

Home Office, 2010. *Integrated Offender Management: Key principles*. Available from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/118043/IOM-Key-Principles-Guidance.pdf

Home Office, 2009. *Integrated Offender Management: Government policy statement*. Retrieved from

http://www.oldham.gov.uk/download/downloads/id/408/government_policy_for_managing_high_risk_offenders

- Kemshall, H., and Maguire, M., 2001. Public protection, partnership and risk penalty: The multi-agency risk management of sexual and dangerous offenders. *Punishment and Society*, 3, 237-64.
- Koons, B., Burrow, J., Morash, M., and Bynum, T., 1997. Expert and offender perceptions of program elements linked to successful outcomes for incarcerated women. *Crime & Delinquency*, 43, 512-532.
- Laub, J. H., & Sampson, R. J. (2001). Understanding desistance from crime. *Crime and Justice*, 28, 1-69.
- Lea, S., Auburn, T. and Kibblewhite, K., 1999. Working with sex offenders: The Perceptions and experiences of professionals and paraprofessionals. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 43, 103-119.
- Marino, K. M., 2009. Probation management of sex offenders: An analysis of co-facilitators' perceptions of offender progress in treatment. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34, 382-403.
- Maruna, S. (2001). Making good: How convicts reform and rebuild their lives. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Mawby, R., & Worrall, A. (2004). 'Polibation' revisited: Policing and prolific offender projects. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*, 6, 63-73.
- Mawby, R., & Worrall, A. (2011). 'They were very threatening about do-gooding bastards': Probation's changing relationships with the police and probation services in England and Wales. *European Journal of Probation*, 3, 78-94.
- McCartan, K., 2012. Professionals' understanding of government strategies for the management of child sexual abusers. *Probation Journal*, 59, 124-137.
- McNeill, F. (2003). Desistance-focused probation practice. In W. H. Chui, & M. Nellis (eds) *Moving probation forward: Evidence, arguments and practice*, pp. 146-162. Harlow: Pearson Longman.

- McNeill, F. (2006). A desistance paradigm for offender management. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 6(1), 39-62.
- McNeill, F., Farrall, S., Lightowler, C., & Maruna, S. (2012). How and why people stop offending: discovering desistance. <https://www.iriss.org.uk/sites/default/files/iriss-insight-15.pdf> maruna
- Millie, A., & Erol, R., 2006. Rehabilitation and resettlement: A study of prolific offender case management in Birmingham, United Kingdom. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 50, 691-710.
- Ministry of Justice, 2013. *Transforming Rehabilitation: A strategy for Reform*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office. Available: <https://consult.justice.gov.uk/digital-communications/transforming-rehabilitation/results/transforming-rehabilitation-response.pdf>
- Murphy, C. M. and Meyer, S. L., 1994. Dependency characteristics of partner assaultive men. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 103, 729-735.
- Raynor, P., and Maguire, M., 2006. End-to-end in tears? Prospects for the effectiveness of the National Offender Management Model. In M. Hough, R. Allen, & U. Padel (Eds.), *Reshaping probation and prisons: The new offender management framework* (pp 21-34). Bristol, UK: The Policy Press.
- Rex, S., 1999. Desistance from offending: Experiences of probation. *Howard Journal*, 38, 366-83.
- Robinson, A., 2013. Transforming rehabilitation: transforming the occupational identity of probation workers? *British Journal of Community Justice*, 11, 91-101.
- Ruane, J. M., 2005. *Essentials of research methods*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Samuels, A., 2014, May. Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014. *Criminal Law & Justice Weekly*, 178, 284-286.
- Sapouna, M., Bisset, C. and Conlong, A. M., 2011 *What works to reduce reoffending: A summary of the evidence*. Scotland: Justice Analytical Services.

- Schwalbe, C.S., and Maschi, T.M., 2012. Probation officers' perspectives on interagency collaboration for juvenile offenders with mental health problems. *Psychiatric Services*, 63, 830-833.
- Senior, P., Wong, K., Culshaw, A., Ellingworth, D., O'Keeffe, C., and Meadows, L., 2011. *Process evaluation of five integrated offender management pioneer areas*. London: Ministry of Justice & Home Office.
- Shapland, J., Bottoms., A., Farrall, S., McNeill, F., Priede, C. and Robinson, G., 2012. *The quality of probation supervision: A literature review*. Sheffield: Centre of Criminological Research
- Silverman, D., 2000. *Doing qualitative research: A practical handbook*. London: Sage.
- Williams, A.E. and Ariel, B., 2012. The Bristol integrated offender management scheme: A pseudo-experimental test of desistance theory. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 7, 123-134.
- Wong, K., 2013 Integrated Offender Management: Assessing the impact and benefits – Holy grail or fool's errand? *British Journal of Community Justice*, 11, 59-81.

Table One

Table of Themes of Offender Managers (Police and Probation) and Offenders

	Superordinate theme	Sub-theme	Sub-theme	Definition	Sample
1	Core elements of IOM	Collaborative working		The purpose of IOM is to work together	Police, Probation
2		Reducing re-offending		The purpose of IOM is to stop/reduce reoffending	Police, Offenders
3		Addressing lifestyle factors related to offending		The purpose of IOM is to address lifestyle factors that may relate to offending behaviour	Police
4	Effectiveness of IOM in reducing offending	Questioning of effectiveness		Participants questioned the effectiveness of the IOM provision in reducing reoffending	Police, Offenders
5		IOM is effective in reducing offending		Attitudes that perceived IOM as being effective in reducing reoffending.	Probation, Police, Offenders
6	How reoffending is reduced	Offenders choosing to change		It is important that offenders choose to change their offending behaviour. Without this, it was perceived that IOM would not work.	Probation, Police, Offenders
7		Importance of engagement		Engagement is key to successfully addressing offending behaviour.	Probation, Police, Offenders
8		Close supervision/monitoring		How close monitoring is different from previous approach and that this closely links with reducing offending.	Probation, Police, Offenders
9		Contact levels with offenders		Contact levels are sometimes too much particularly as this can disengage the offender	Police, Offenders

10		Addressing triggers to reoffending	Offenders identified specific (usually lifestyle related) triggers that increased the likelihood of them engaging in offending behaviour. In identifying these triggers, the offenders reported how IOM could help.	Offenders
11	Communication	Easier	Communication was easier particularly because of office sharing by the police with partnership agencies.	Police, Probation
12		Communication between agencies has improved	The introduction of IOM was seen to have clear benefits in the sharing of information about offenders	Probation, Police
13		Improvements in communication still needed	There are still improvements to be made in relation to communication. This particularly focussed on building stronger relationships between the police and probation but also between offenders and OMs	Probation, Police. Offenders
14		Leads to better management of offenders	The benefits of information sharing were seen in the context of knowing more about the offender. This reduced the opportunity for offenders to manipulate or 'play' agencies against each other.	Probation, Police
15	The offender manager role	Importance of building trust and rapport with offenders	It was considered important to have rapport with the offender in developing trust and functional supportive relationships	Police, Offenders
16		Conflict in the relationship between OM and the offender	This is the counter to the above theme, where it was seen as non-productive when a functioning relationship could not be built between the manager and offender.	Police, Offenders

Running head: PERSPECTIVES OF INTEGRATED OFFENDER MANAGEMENT

17	Role is like being a parent		Being an IOM manager was likened to being a parent in ensuring that the offender did what was right	Police
18	Providing support/Being supportive		Emphasis on the importance of providing support or being supportive to the offender when necessary across a number of situations e.g., in connecting with partner agencies such food banks but also providing support when challenging situations occurred in the offenders' lives.	Probation, Police, Offenders
19	Individual/tailored response		The offender managers tailor how they deal with each offender according to the characteristics or requirements of that individual	Police
20	Differing approaches used by OMs		It was perceived that offender managers take different approaches as to how to manage the offenders according to their own beliefs or approach	Police
21	Being involved in the arrests of offenders being managed		There was a strong negative perception associated when being involved in the arrest of any offenders that they managed. This was seen as a breach of the relationship that was built between the manager and the offender	Police
22	Training	Lack of training	It was identified that there was a lack of training associated with undertaking the IOM role.	Police

23		Natural skill as an IOM manager	This linked with the perception that being an IOM manager could not be taught, that there were natural interpersonal skills associated with succeeding at being an IOM manager	Police
24		Learning as you do	This theme suggested that being an IOM manager involved learning as you go and finding your feet.	Police
25		Where training could help	This identified several areas where training would be helpful to assist in the IOM role. This particularly emphasised the importance of learning about the roles of other partner agencies.	Police
26	Workload/Staffing		This related to workloads being heavy or a lack of resources available to ensure that the offenders were appropriately managed.	Probation, Police
27	Challenges of IOM	Difficulties in managing confidential information	Although information sharing was perceived as a positive thing, there were specific challenges associated with working so closely with agencies but not always being able to share confidential information	Police
28		Differing approach/culture between agencies and police	This theme tended to focus on conflicts that occur between the police and other agencies. This could relate to decisions regarding offenders or the differing focus of the agencies.	Probation, Police
29		Negative perception of the police	Offenders holding a negative attitude about the police and how this can be a barrier to working with them.	Probation, Police

30	IT systems	Benefit of the IT systems in terms of intelligence but also in identifying how this system is not shared with other partners.	Police
31	Changes in Probation impact on IOM working processes	How changes in the Probation Service have impacted on the police in working practices and information sharing.	Police
