

Metadata of the chapter that will be visualized online

Chapter Title	The Prison-Based Model of CoSA and Its Application in Transitioning to the Community	
Copyright Year	2018	
Copyright Holder	The Author(s)	
Corresponding Author	Family Name	Kitson-Boyce
	Particle	
	Given Name	Rosie
	Suffix	
	Division	
	Organization/University	Nottingham Trent University
	Address	Nottingham, UK
	Email	rosie.kitsonboyce@ntu.ac.uk
Abstract	<p>The barriers to successful reintegration those convicted of sexual offences face, often lead to social isolation and prevent desistance from crime being achieved (Tewksbury & Mustaine, <i>Journal of Public Management & Social Policy</i>, 15(2), 215–239, 2009). Of those who commit these offences, the elderly and intellectually disabled face even greater barriers, often finding the transition from prison to community the most difficult. In 2014, a prison-model of CoSA was established to support these individuals specifically. A qualitative evaluation was commenced at the same time, involving interviews with the Core Members to explore their personal experience of the prison-based model. This chapter will explore some of the key themes derived from the data in relation to the support the prison-based model of CoSA provided the Core Members during their transition from prison to community.</p>	
Keywords (separated by “ - ”)	Sex offenders - Reintegration - Prison - Re-entry - CoSA	

4

The Prison-Based Model of CoSA and Its Application in Transitioning to the Community

Rosie Kitson-Boyce

Introduction

In society today, those who commit sexual crimes are portrayed negatively and sensationally by the media, often provoking anger, fear and even hatred towards them from the general public (McAlinden, 2006). It is widely established within the literature that individuals who have been convicted of sexual offences face increased levels of stress, difficulties in finding employment and housing, and problems maintaining social and familial relationships (Tewksbury, 2012; Tewksbury & Connor, 2012; Tewksbury & Copes, 2013). These barriers to successful reintegration often lead to social isolation and prevent desistance from crime being achieved (Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009).

Göbbels, Ward, and Willis (2012) expand on this further stating that, negative social capital, such as the loss of relationships, inability to gain employment or housing and stigmatisation (Lussier & Gress, 2014;

R. Kitson-Boyce (✉)
Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, UK
e-mail: rosie.kitsonboyce@ntu.ac.uk

20 Tewksbury, 2012), can be a barrier to successful re-entry in to the
21 community for those convicted of sexual offences. They point out that
22 even ex-offenders who have worked hard to undergo significant identity
23 changes do not always re-enter communities that reinforce these new
24 non-offender identities. In addition, the lack of support those who com-
25 mit sexual offences receive during this transitional period from prison to
26 community makes the process difficult and uncertain (Elliott & Zajac,
AUT 27 2015).

28 This is concerning due to the early stages of release being a particularly
29 sensitive period in terms of achieving this desistance (Aresti, Eatough, &
30 Brooks-Gordon, 2010). Furthermore, when considering the wellbeing of
31 offenders recently released from prison, Fox (2015) acknowledge how
32 individuals can quickly become overwhelmed, particularly if they have
33 served a long sentence in prison. Interestingly, Van den Berg, Beijersbergen,
34 Nieuwbeerta, and Dirkzwager (2017) reported from their sample of
35 Dutch offenders that there was no difference between those who were
36 convicted of sexual offences and those convicted of all other offences, in
37 terms of their level of loneliness whilst in prison. Upon release therefore,
38 the differential negative treatment those convicted of sexual offences
39 receive once in the community, could lead to even further feelings of
40 being overwhelmed and maybe even shock.

41 One suggestion Göbbels et al. (2012) make to assist those convicted of
42 sexual offences through the transition of re-entry is artificial mentoring.
43 An artificial mentor they argue, is someone who can provide social mod-
44 elling to the individual but also sustained and empathetic support to
45 promote and encourage the motivation to maintain desistance. The vol-
46 unteers who make up CoSA are exactly this type of mentors. They can
47 offer support to the Core Member, helping them maintain their non-
48 offender identity but also encouraging them to build social networks,
49 outside of the CoSA, which verify the ex-offender's change in identity
50 and behaviour. The CoSA model however, is a community one, meaning
51 that support for the Core Member commences once they have been
52 released into the community, sometimes with delays of several weeks
53 (Höing, Vogelvang, & Bogaerts, 2015). This therefore requires the Core
54 Members, who are normally experiencing a severe lack of social support,
55 to still transition from the prison to the community alone.

A prison-based model of CoSA however, can provide 'through the gate' support to those convicted of sexual offences as will now be considered in more detail. 56
57
58

Early Prison-Based CoSA 59

A project that has successfully implemented a continuum of support from prison to the community, for individuals convicted of sexual offences, is MnCoSA in the US. In 2008 a CoSA project was implemented in Minnesota, US (MnCoSA), involving individuals convicted of sexual offences who were due to be released from prison. As Duwe (2012) explains, MnCoSA developed from the promising results of Wilson, Picheca, and Prinzo's (2005) initial evaluation study, with the design and operation being very similar to that of the Canadian CoSA. One fundamental difference however, was that unlike in Canada whereby CoSA begins after the offender has been released from prison, MnCoSA was systematically designed to begin at least four weeks prior to the offender's release (Duwe, 2012). Offered through the Minnesota Department of Corrections, MnCoSA focuses upon the successful transition from prison to community for individuals convicted for sexual offences (MnCoSA, 2017). The volunteers meet with the Core Member approximately 3 times whilst in prison before the sessions move in to the community as the Core Member re-enters society (MnCoSA, 2017). 60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76

Duwe (2012) highlights the importance of the continuum of social support from prison to community and believes it to be a central factor in why MnCoSA has been successful in reintegrating those who commit sexual offences back in to the community (see the previous chapter for more detail on his RCT of MnCoSA). Indeed, Maguire and Raynor (2006) believe that for offenders to re-settle effectively on release, through care is needed involving the establishment of a close relationship with the offender while they are still in prison, which is then continued in release. It is believed that this relationship should be well-established, involve trust and a willingness to travel together on the path towards desistance (McNeill & Weaver, 2010). 77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87

88 When considering offenders, who are still residing in prison, Rocque,
89 Biere, and MacKenzie (2011) have highlighted how increasing the attach-
90 ment and improving social bonds to prosocial individuals results in a
91 positive outcome. Within their study attachment and social bonds were
92 defined as a feeling of closeness to significant others with their impact on
93 the intention to conform being explored. For individuals who have com-
94 mitted sexual offences, achieving and developing an attachment or social
95 bond with members of the community is difficult, particularly when fam-
96 ily and friends may have cut ties due to the nature of their crime or
97 restraining orders are in place preventing contact (Lussier & Gress, 2014).
98 This therefore highlights a clear need for the prison-based model of CoSA.

99 It is important to consider however, that the volunteers involved in a
100 prison-based model of CoSA will have met the old (criminal) self as well
101 as the new desisting self. It is argued that to desist from crime successfully
102 offenders need to develop a new pro-social identity separate to their past
103 self (Maruna, 2001). It is therefore possible that some potential Core
104 Members will want to leave their past behind completely and not want to
105 be involved with anyone who knew them during their past life. As Serin
106 and Lloyd (2009) point out, however desistance from crime takes time,
107 with the offender gradually committing themselves to prosocial lifestyles.
108 They go on to explain that because of this there will therefore be a transi-
109 tional period whereby the offender and the ex-offender overlap. The
110 MnCoSA, unlike the community model of CoSA, can provide social
111 support to the Core Member through this transitional stage thus in turn
112 encouraging and motivating them to continue on their journey to
113 desistance.

114 **CoSA: The UK Prison-Based Model**

115 In 2014, the first ever UK prison-based model of CoSA was established
116 at HMP Whatton, a category-C treatment prison for men convicted of a
117 sexual offence and who are prepared to address their offending through
118 participation in a treatment programme. This was the first time CoSA
119 that began in the prison, before moving out in to the community, had
120 been operationalised in the UK.

The CoSA prison-based model initiative was set up by the Safer Living Foundation (SLF); a charitable organisation involving prison, Nottingham Trent University, probation and police as trustees. There was a concern felt by the trustees of the SLF that some individuals serving sentences for sexual offences, particularly those who were elderly (55+) or who had intellectual disabilities (ID), were leaving prison without any family or community support. Individuals with ID who commit sexual offences have received a specific focus within the literature, with ID often being described as overrepresented amongst this group of offenders (Hayes, Shackell, Mottram, & Lancaster, 2007; Lambrick & Glaser, 2004). Indeed, Craig and Hutchinson (2005) calculated that the reconviction rate for ID offenders convicted of a sexual offence was 6.8 times, at two years follow up, and 3.5 times, at four years, that of non-ID offenders convicted of similar sexual offences. It must be acknowledged however, that the research on this group of individuals is extremely flawed, with methodological differences between the studies being so great that conclusions regarding the true prevalence of sexual offences by men with ID are difficult to state (Craig & Hutchinson, 2005; Lindsay, 2002). With regard to elderly individuals who commit sexual offences, the decrease in societal tolerance, along with a greater readiness for the police and prosecutors to pursue and secure more 'late-in-life' convictions for non-recent sexual offences, has seen a growth in the amount of elderly individuals in prison for a sexual offence (Crawley & Sparks, 2005; Hart, 2008). For example, in 2006, Fazel, Sjöstedt, Långström and Grann reported that around half of all male offenders aged 60+ in England and Wales were serving custodial sentences for a sexual offence.

In addition to both groups being highly represented within prison settings, elderly and ID men are particularly vulnerable during the transition from prison to community (Crawley & Sparks, 2006; Cummins & Lau, 2003). For elderly offenders, the fear of isolation on release can be even greater, with many nursing homes and elderly care facilities reluctant to accept these individuals due to the type of offences they have committed (Hart, 2008). Individuals with ID are reported to have a lack of social networks and resultant lack of feelings of connectedness, both of which are required for successful community integration (Cummins & Lau, 2003). This, combined with a severe lack of social support on

157 release, means social isolation is almost inevitable for elderly and ID
158 offenders. Loneliness and isolation, often caused by problematic or
159 unsuccessful reintegration, can exacerbate the risk of reoffending for
160 those convicted of sexual offences (Clarke, Brown, & Völlm, 2015; Fox,
161 2015). It was acknowledged therefore, that a continuum of support was
162 needed for these individuals, through the transition from prison to com-
163 munity, thus leading to the establishment of the first UK prison-based
164 model of CoSA.

165 This prison-based CoSA focuses on individuals convicted of a sexual
166 offence with determinate prison sentences (i.e. a fixed release date) who
167 were elderly (55+) or intellectually disabled (ID) and were deemed
168 medium to very high static risk using the RM2000 risk assessment tool
169 (Thornton et al., 2003). There is no universal definition of 'elderly', how-
170 ever within criminal justice literature 'older' is defined as starting any-
171 where between 45 and 65 years old (Bows & Westmarland, 2016). Most
172 US research on offenders use 50 as the starting point for the 'older' cate-
173 gory, which Howse (2003) suggests may be the point at which offenders
174 begin to view themselves as 'old'. In the UK, 50 is also used in some cases
175 as the age at which someone is classed as older, for example Evergreen
176 50+, a project to support older prisoners in the England and Wales. Until
177 recently, retirement age in the UK was 65 years old (Gov.uk, 2017).
178 However, as Howse (2003) acknowledged in his report for the Prison
179 Reform Trust, individuals residing in a prison setting tend to have a bio-
180 logical age of 10 years older than individuals in the community, due to
181 the chronic health problems. Bows and Westmarland (2016) have more
182 recently agreed, stating that the mental and physical health problems
183 offenders in prison experience results in a more rapid onset of age related
184 issues, compared to their counterparts outside prison. This provides an
185 argument for a lower threshold for an 'elderly' category and indeed Age
186 UK, the largest charity in the UK to work with older individuals includ-
187 ing prisoners, have 55 as the starting age of their 'elderly' category. Based
188 on these considerations the prison-based model of CoSA determined the
189 age at which individuals could be considered for a Core Member place to
190 be 55 years old. Individuals were also required to have little to no social
191 support on release, due to the increased risk these individuals pose on
192 release.

The CoSA in the UK prison-based model begin around 3 months prior to the Core Member's release from prison and continue with the Core Member for up to 12 months in the community. The volunteers visit the prison weekly for the CoSA meetings whilst the Core Member is still residing there and are therefore required to undergo criminal security checks before beginning their role. The CoSA meetings continue through the transitional period from prison to community, with the meetings continuing in the first week of the Core Member's release. Once in the community the CoSA meetings can take place at either the approved premises the Core Member is being housed at, the SLF offices at Nottingham Trent University or in certain situations nearby Quaker rooms or the Core Members' own home.

Prison Model Evaluation

As has been outlined above a prison-based model of CoSA provides potential positive benefits for those convicted of sexual offences in the UK. In particular those who are categorised as elderly or ID and are facing release from prison with a severe lack of social support. It is crucial that any new process, such as the prison-based model being established in the UK, is evaluated from its commencement. As the previous chapter outlined, there have been substantial criticisms of the quantitative data reported from CoSA research. Clarke et al. (2015) have stated that, whilst good quality evaluations of recidivism are important, they do not capture the full extent of the impact participating in CoSA can have. This has led to a demand for qualitative studies involving the Core Members and volunteers taking part in CoSA (Bates, Williams, Wilson, & Wilson, 2014; Wilson, Bates, & Völlm, 2010).

A qualitative evaluation was therefore commenced at the same time the UK prison-based model of CoSA began, involving interviews with the Core Members to explore their personal experience of the prison-based model. The rest of this chapter will explore some of the key themes derived from the data in relation to the support the prison-based model of CoSA provided the Core Members during their transition from prison to community.

226 **Demographics**

227 The Core Member places on the prison-based model of CoSA were allocated
228 according to a number of criteria. These are briefly outlined below,
229 along with the main demographic details of the participants within this
230 research.

231 *Conviction for sexual offence.* The first criterion was that the individual
232 must have committed a sexual offence and currently be residing in the
233 prison where the CoSA prison-based model was established. Offence
234 histories of the participants were predominantly of contact sexual
235 offences against children. The skew towards this offence history is rela-
236 tive to the general population at the prison the participants were
237 recruited from.

238 *Elderly or intellectually disabled.* The second criterion was that these indi-
239 viduals must either be elderly or be defined as having an intellectual
240 disability. Using the IQ tests already carried out by the prison in order
241 to determine treatment suitability, individuals were considered as a
242 potential Core Member if they had an IQ of >80 or were over the age
243 of 55 years. Using an IQ of below 80 ensured those with borderline
244 ID were also considered for a place. However, for individuals whose
245 IQ was in the borderline range, an Adaptive Functioning Checklist
246 (AFC) (created by Dr Lorraine Smith at Nottingham Trent University)
247 was also used to assess adaptive and social functioning. Forty percent
248 of the participants included in the research were defined as having
249 mild-borderline ID and 80% were 55 years of age or older (see
250 Table 4.1).

251 *Risk of reoffending.* It was essential that the resources of the CoSA prison-
252 based model were allocated to those who were most at risk of recidi-
253 vism. The most widely used actuarial risk assessment tool in the English
254 and Wales prison and probation services is the Risk Matrix 2000
255 (RM2000; Thornton et al., 2003). This risk assessment tool measures
256 static risk of reoffending and is used to help inform decisions about
257 appropriate treatment pathways and management of offenders in the
258 community. As Barnett, Wakeling, and Howard (2010) state, the use
259 of such assessment tools enables effective allocation of resources to

Table 4.1 Core Member participant information

Participant number	Participant age	Intellectual disability	Health issues	Risk level (RM2000)
1	60	Yes—mild	Yes—physical	Medium
2	60	No	Yes—physical	Medium
3	60	Yes—mild	Yes—physical	Very high
4	45	Borderline	No	Medium
5	58	No	Yes—mental	Medium
6	78	No	Yes—physical and mental	Medium
7	73	No	No	Very high
8	64	Yes—mild	No	High
9	52	No	No	Very high

those at a higher risk of reoffending and the same applies for the prison-based model of CoSA. Using the RM2000, 60 percent of the participants involved in the research were assessed as a medium risk of sexual reoffending, 10 percent were placed in the high risk category and 30 percent in the very high risk category (see Table 4.1).

Individuals who had been offered and accepted a Core Member place on a prison-based model CoSA (December 2014–August 2016) were approached regarding their participation in the research project. Those who consented were asked to participate in data collection at three time points during their CoSA prison-based model journey, as shown in Table 4.2.

As stated previously the prison-based model of CoSA in the UK is designed to begin approximately 3 months before the Core Members release from prison. This process is flexible however and varies with each individual CoSA as can be seen in Table 4.3 below. There are several reasons for this with the main one being that a referral for a potential Core Member with high need may not be received by the coordinator until later in their sentence. As is stated above however, in the US prison-model of CoSA the volunteers meet with the Core Member only 3 times before their release. This still provides enough time for a social bond to at least have begun to be developed thus providing additional support over the transitional period of release as is highlighted in the findings below.

t2.1 **Table 4.2** Time point of data collection with Core Members

t2.2	Time		
t2.3	point	Position in the CoSA prison-based model journey	<i>N</i>
t2.4	1	Prior to the Core Member meeting the volunteers involved in their CoSA	9
t2.5			
t2.6	2	After the prison sessions of the CoSA, just before release into the community	6
t2.7			
t2.8	3	Once in the community but still taking part in the CoSA	7

t3.1 **Table 4.3** Planned and actual number prison CoSA sessions

t3.2	Participant	Planned time for prison	Actual number of prison
t3.3	number	sessions	sessions
t3.4	1	2 months, 1 week	6
t3.5	2	2 weeks	2
t3.6	3	3 months, 2 weeks	7
t3.7	4	1 month, 1 week	6
t3.8	5	1 month	4
t3.9	6	1 month	3
t3.10	7	IPP sentence (parole date not confirmed)	IPP sentence (parole date not confirmed)
t3.11			
t3.12	8	3 weeks	2
t3.13	9	1 month, 2 weeks	6

283 **Transition from Prison to Community**

284 The purpose of this research was to explore the experiences of the Core
 285 Members throughout their journey on a prison-based model CoSA. As
 286 stated previously, data was collected at 3 different time points to capture
 287 their transition from prison to community.

288 *Data Collection*

289 Semi-structured interviews were chosen as the method for data collec-
 290 tion, to capture both the richness and complexity of the individuals'
 291 experience (Aresti et al., 2010). Semi-structured interviews involve a set
 292 of questions used by the researcher to guide the interview, rather than
 293 dictate it, meaning the participant is viewed as the expert on the topic
 294 discussed (Smith & Osborn, 2003). In addition, due to the participants

potentially having ID, the interview schedules were written in suitable language with a Flesch readability score of 2.9. This meant the questions posed could be understood by an individual with the reading ability of a seven year old and therefore suitable to be used with those who had borderline to mild ID.

Each interview lasted on average 1–1.5 hours. Questions for the Core Members explored their expectations and aspirations for the future. Example questions included: ‘What do you think it will be like when you leave prison?’, ‘Who will be there to support/help you when you leave prison?’, ‘What were the good/bad things about being in a circle when you moved from prison to the community?’ For the volunteers, topics included motivations for volunteering, perceived impact on the ability of CoSA to support and hold the Core Member accountable and specific benefits/issues of the prison-based model.

Four Analysis

The interviews were analysed using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) which is concerned with a detailed examination of the individuals’ subjective experience (Brocki & Wearden, 2006); in this case their experience of being involved in a prison-based model CoSA. Several themes were derived from the data regarding the support a prison-based model of CoSA could provide to the Core Members during their transition from prison to the community, as are highlighted in Table 4.4.

The following analysis will explore and unpack these themes in detail to provide a rich understanding of the participants’ experiences on a

Table 4.4 Themes from the interview data with corresponding time point the data collected

Theme	Time point (T)
Knowing they will have support	1
Building relationships	1, 2
Preparation	2
Immediate support	3
Barriers to successful reintegration	3

320 prison-based model of CoSA. For further discussion of the findings from
321 the research project discussed here see Kitson-Boyce, Blagden, Winder,
322 and Dillon (2017a, 2017b).

323 **Findings**

324 *Knowing They Will Have Support*

325 The first theme was derived from the data collected prior to the CoSA
326 starting in the prison (T1). The Core Members identified that, aside from
327 the prison-based CoSA, they would have little to no support on release
328 from prison.

329 They (prison-based model coordinator) approached me yeah because I
330 haven't got any erm support network out there at all, there's no family,
331 friends or anything. (CM Participant 2, T1)

332 Here the Core Member is explaining how he is facing a life in the com-
333 munity with no friends or family to support him, a situation that is not
334 uncommon for those convicted of sexual offences (Tewksbury & Copes,
335 2013). This is particularly concerning due to the research demonstrating
336 loneliness and social isolation as risk factors of sexual reoffending (Hanson
337 & Morton-Bourgon, 2005; Marshall, 2010). The Core Members involved
338 in the prison-based model recognised that individuals with a severe lack
339 of pro-social support on release from prison are prioritised for CoSA and
340 were aware of the potential benefits being involved could offer.

341 I realised that circles offers you something that some people get from their
342 families but if you've no family err or not in contact with your family,
343 you've not support out there. (CM participant 9, T1)

344 Here the Core Member explains how for him, a prison-based model
345 CoSA would go some way to providing the support that others may receive
346 from their families, both whilst in prison and once released back into the
347 community. This is particularly important due to the role social support
348 provided by family members can provide in reducing the likelihood of

future criminal behaviour on release from prison (Willis & Grace, 2008). 349
For example, from their research into social ties, re-entry and recidivism, 350
Berg and Huebner (2011) found that good quality ties to relatives, and the 351
social support they provided, was what motivated ex-offenders to reintegrate 352
back into society successfully and live a pro-social life. As the Core 353
Member acknowledged however, such support does not always have to be 354
provided through family relations. Weaver and McNeill (2015) reported 355
from their research that the social relations influential in supporting desistance 356
could be friendship groups and faith communities, as well as families. 357
It was the sense of solidarity and 'we-ness' that characterised these 358
social relations that assisted the ex-offender in realising their pro social 359
aspirations the most. With this in mind, it is possible that the social support 360
offered through a prison-based model CoSA may be enough to 361
encourage and promote desistance from Core Members. 362

As explained in the previous chapter (and Chap. 2), CoSA can provide 363
benefits to communities through the reduction of potential future victims. 364
In addition to this however, the findings demonstrate how the prison-based 365
model CoSA can provide benefits to the Core Members 366
also. Knowing they would have the support of the CoSA leads to improvement 367
in their wellbeing, particularly due to the knowledge that this support 368
will come from 'normal' members of the community. 369

The support, knowing there was that amount of support out there for me, 370
you know, just a like sad, lonely old git you know with nowhere to go, 371
suddenly I don't need to bury my head in the sand, I know there's people 372
there to support me, so from that point of view I feel a lot more confident. 373
(CM Participant 5, T1) 374

Because you know, they're volunteers, they come all this way to see a prisoner 375
but they want to come and see you for a purpose...we talked a lot 376
about it and it's wonderful. (CM Participant 7, T1) 377

As the last extract in particular highlights, having someone to talk to 378
who is not a professional appears important to the Core Members. The 379
volunteers are not paid to work with Core Members; they are there 380
because they choose to be, resulting in their actions being perceived as 381

382 genuine. Indeed, research in to the perceptions of those who commit
383 sexual offences have concluded that the publics' attitude is generally
384 negative and punitive towards this group of offenders (Levenson,
385 Brannon, Fortney, & Baker, 2007). It is unsurprising therefore that hav-
386 ing 'normal' members of the community meet with them on a weekly
387 basis with a non-judgemental attitude is viewed so positively for Core
388 Members.

389 This theme is consistent with research on CoSA in general, whereby
390 Core Members attribute the success of CoSA to the involvement of mem-
391 bers of the community who are 'not doing it to get paid, it's something
392 they wanna do' (Hanvey, Philpot, & Wilson, 2011, p. 105). Similarly,
393 Thomas, Thompson, and Karstedt (2013, p. 194) reported, from their
394 interviews with Core Members on a community CoSA, that having 'nor-
395 mal people' who were able to see past their offences was 'life-changing'
396 for the individuals. This is an important finding; if the volunteers' actions
397 and behaviours are perceived as genuine then they are more likely to be
398 successful in reinforcing any emerging pro-social narratives that are essen-
399 tial for desistance to be achieved (King, 2013).

400 This acknowledgement and acceptance from the Core Members of the
401 support the CoSA will offer them, along with the perceived genuineness
402 of the volunteers' actions, enables rapport and subsequent relationships
403 to be built, as will now be discussed.

404 *Building Relationships*

405 Even from the data derived from time point 1 it was evident that the
406 prison sessions would be beneficial in providing time and space for rela-
407 tionships to be built between Core Members and volunteers, before the
408 reality of re-entering the community set in. Prior to starting the prison-
409 based model CoSA, all but one of the Core Members interviewed stated
410 that they were nervous and wary of meeting the volunteers.

411 Cause it feels like, how do I explain it, you're in a room like this and you
412 feel a bit nervous cause I don't know them and they don't know them and
413 I'll be a bit on edge, a bit thinking 'are you judging me or something. (CM
414 Participant 4, T1)

The Core Member here describes being wary, nervous and on edge until they have had the time and opportunity to get to know his volunteers. Due to the Core Members currently being in prison, the highly sensational media representation of those who commit sexual offences and the anger and hatred felt towards them (McAlinden, 2006) is likely to be their view of the general public as a whole. As Nellis (2009) explains, the stereotype the media has created, of those who commit sexual offences, completely overlooks those who are motivated to start new lives and desist from sexually reoffending. This leads to the question therefore of whether Core Members, particularly those who have high levels of paranoia or low levels of self-esteem, are more likely to make the step to meet the volunteers whilst they are still in the safety of a prison setting. Although more research is required to compare directly the prison-model with the community model, in the prison-based model at least, the Core Members viewed meeting the volunteers whilst they were still in their 'comfort zone' as a positive aspect to their experience. This meant rapport and relationships could be built, and any nervousness overcome, whilst they still felt in a 'safe' environment.

Well I'm in comfortable surroundings, I've got used to this place, it's my comfort zone so it will be ideal for me, you know I can always retreat back in (to my cell), sort of thing so I've got my comfort zone, out there it could be a bit more difficult, a bit more erm cause it's going to be a whole shock to the system, I've been in prison now nearly 6 years, there's a lot changed out there, it's going to be quite a shock to the system going out on my own and no support apart from my probation officer. (CM Participant 2, T1)

Here, the Core Member is explaining how it would be more difficult to meet a group of volunteers and begin to form relationships with them on release from prison, particularly considering the institutionalisation he is likely to have experienced from being in prison for several years. Despite this demonstrating the benefit of the prison model, the nature of the establishment where this CoSA project is ran cannot be overlooked. A prison sentence for someone convicted of a sexual offence is often characterised by stigmatisation, feelings of anxiety and fear of being 'ousted' as a 'sexual offender' (Schwaebe, 2005). Even when segregated

449 on a vulnerable offenders' wing, those convicted of sexual offences have
450 reported physically frightening events, such as having insults and objects
451 thrown at them, resulting in damaged self-esteem (Ievins, 2013). The
452 all-male prison in focus here however, is one of the largest sex offender
453 treatment prisons in Europe, specialising in both rehabilitative pro-
454 grammes and sex offender treatment, and only housing those convicted
455 of sexual offences. The prison has been described by offenders themselves
456 as a place of acceptance, generating a feeling of safety they had never
457 experienced before (Blagden, Winder, & Hames, 2016; Ievins, 2013).
458 This feeling of being 'safe' and the reduction in anxiety has been docu-
459 mented as creating additional 'head space' for the offenders to reflect
460 upon the self, work through problems and contemplate change. This
461 leads to the question therefore of whether similar prison-based models of
462 CoSA would work as beneficially under different circumstances. For
463 example, in a prison whereby potential Core Members were held on a
464 separate vulnerable prisoner's wing. Or indeed, whether the need for this
465 type of project would be even greater.

466 By the time the Core Members were about to transition from prison
467 and to the community (T2) the dynamics of the CoSA had begun to
468 settle.

469 I: How do you feel about the meetings as they've been going on then, lead-
470 ing up to each meeting, how does it make you feel?

471 P: it's making me feel, how can I explain it, a bit more relaxed and slowly
472 I'm starting to build up that relationship and also that trust and that's how
473 it's gotta be. (CM Participant 4, T2)

474 Here you can see how the prison sessions enabled relationships and
475 trust to be built between the Core Member and their volunteers, over-
476 coming the nervousness and anxiety they previously expressed during
477 timepoint 1. By the time the CoSA moves into the community the Core
478 Members feel more comfortable with the volunteers, enabling deeper
479 discussions to take place. Research that has considered how probation
480 officers are best able to assist ex-offenders in the desistance process high-
481 lights the importance of relationships involving this type of rapport
482 (Barry, 2007). Ex-offenders are reported as being more receptive to direct

guidance from probation officers when relationships are formed through 483
receptively listening to one another (McCulloch, 2005). This highlights 484
the benefit of the Core Members having established relationships with 485
the volunteers prior to release, as they are more likely to accept the sup- 486
port and guidance towards desistance once in the community. 487

In addition to building rapport, all those involved in the prison-based 488
model CoSA had the opportunity to learn and practice how to work 489
effectively with one another so that they could 'hit the ground running' 490
in the community. This links specifically with the next theme of prepara- 491
tion; providing the Core Members with additional time to build relation- 492
ships with the volunteers also enabled preparation for life on release to 493
begin. 494

Preparation 495

The data derived from the second time point highlighted how, in relation 496
to offence related behaviour specifically, the prison sessions were used by 497
the volunteers to help prepare the Core Members for possible risky situ- 498
ations on release and to discuss management strategies in relation to their 499
restrictions. For some Core Members, this involved acting out role-plays 500
for the potential risky situations, for example if they came across an 501
injured child in the street and there was no one else around. 502

It's like if a little gal got knocked over by a car obviously I would phone the 503
police and let them deal with it, cause I wouldn't go up and touch her cause 504
if I did that and then the police knew I'd just come out of prison for a sex 505
offence well I'd be back in again wouldn't I so I'd phone the police or if 506
there was somebody else walking by I'd tell them to get the police, I mean 507
I'd stop well away. It's like one instance you know I take the dog on the 508
park, what happens if the kids come up and stroke the dog and I said 'well 509
you know, all I've got to say to the kids, is do not stroke the dog cause I 510
don't want the dog to bite you' and I'll just carry on walking, you know and 511
stuff like that and err I got it all right, it was stuff like that so you know 512
that's one thing I've got out of it (the prison sessions of the CoSA). (CM 513
Participant 1, T2) 514

515 Here the participant 1 is highlighting how the prison sessions are help-
516 ing to prepare for situations he may face on release. Integrated within his
517 concerns for release is an anxiety regarding the stigmatisation he will face
518 for being convicted of a sexual offence; the police would believe his
519 actions to have a sexual motive. This issue of stigmatisation on release is
520 explored in more detail in the final theme of this chapter.

521 so like I knew my what I've got to and what I aint got to do but when I
522 went back, I was thinking all the time and I said to them, I says well 'where
523 I live', I says 'it's about half an hours walk up to the town' but up at the
524 top of the town you've got outside toilets, ladies and gents and there's
525 many a time I've passed there when I've gone shopping with my partner,
526 daughter, many a times I've gone up town, had a cup of tea in a café and
527 have a walk round the market and that and I've come out and I've told
528 them that I've got a weak bladder, I've only got to drink what a cup of
529 water and I'm running to the toilet and I went to these toilets, ladies and
530 gents obviously I went in to the gents but I could hear kids, I could see
531 little lads like that (shows how tall they were) and I've seen them day in,
532 day out, day in, day out and they have these balloons, you can buy these
533 balloons and you fill they up with water and they chuck them at each
534 other and I turned round and I said 'well say for instance you know I've
535 done me shopping and that and I said to me wife, wait there and I'm just
536 going to the toilet', I said 'can I go to that toilet where the little lads are or
537 do I have to wait outside and pee myself or if I want to have a sit down.
538 (Core Member Participant 1, T2)

539 This extract illuminates how discussing the Core Members' licence
540 conditions during the prison sessions ensured that they understood
541 areas or situations they would be restricted from on release This was a
542 particular benefit to those Core Members assessed as having ID, due to
543 their tendency to feign understanding. For example, individuals with
544 ID may acquiesce when not understanding questions asked, due to both
545 their cognitive impairment and also their desire to comply socially with
546 the perceived demands of an authority figure (Shaw & Budd, 1982). In
547 the case of the extract above the participant (who was assessed as ID)
548 had read that he could not use public toilets when they were occupied
549 by children on release but did not fully understand the details of this.

The prison sessions enabled in depth discussions to ensure this was understood clearly including what he could do instead should the situation arise.

Err explaining things to me in a different light, how I deal with like err somethings I don't grab and they're on about doing like role-plays, I don't mind doing that, they talk to me and everything so that's a good thing. (CM Participant 4, T2)

Here the Core Member is explaining how the volunteers helped him to understand information by explaining it in a different way. Individuals with ID often experience a range of cognitive deficits, which can affect the way they process information, for example, concentration on and comprehension of what is being said to individuals with ID is likely to be limited (Craig & Hutchinson, 2005). The volunteer training for the prison-based model of CoSA involves specific guidance for how to work most effectively with these individuals. For example, breaking information down into small chunks, reducing the speed of what is being said and the use of pictures and drawings to help explain complex concepts (Craig & Hutchinson, 2005). The above extract indicates that the guidance appears to have been taken on board by the volunteers and being used effectively in the prison sessions.

Some Core Members were even able to reach the point where they were comfortable in discussing the coping strategies they use to manage offence related thoughts and feelings, often learnt previously on Sex Offender Treatment Programmes.

I took all my stuff from HSP and they read it and so on, it was lovely to disclose it. You know it makes you feel better, you don't hide anything inside yourself and you think 'ooh what will they think of me if I tell them what I've done' and so on but none of that, they were superb. (CM Participant 7, T2)

Here the Core Member highlights the benefits of disclosing his previous offence related thoughts and behaviour. It appears that the absence of judgement from volunteers, even after sharing his darkest thoughts, and

582 the behaviour that evolved from them, enables the him to feel accepted
583 rather than vilified as is so often the case in society today (McAlinden,
584 2006). Not only are the volunteers able to reinforce the Core member's
585 use of coping strategies to successfully manage offence-related thoughts
586 and behaviour, by offering acceptance and inclusion upon hearing this
587 information they are in fact reinforcing this new pro-social identity also
588 (Weaver & McNeill, 2015).

589 The preparation for and practicing of their new, pro social identity
590 highlighted in this theme, encourages the Core Member to become
591 accountable for their own thoughts and behaviour, even before they are
592 released from prison. Both the additional support and encouraged
593 accountability offered through the prison sessions can continue with the
594 Core Member through the transitional period of release into the com-
595 munity, as is discussed in the following theme.

596 *Immediate Support*

597 The prison-based model of CoSA enables the Core Members involved to
598 be supported through the transitional period of release, whereby they
599 move from prison into the community. The Core Members discussed
600 their appreciation for the support they received immediately on release,
601 particularly for those re-settling in an area that is new to them.

602 I mean **** (one of the volunteers) picked me up from prison so he bought
603 me to the hostel so they had some hands on straight away. (Core Member
604 Participant 6, T3)

605 Participant: "Erm a good base, I think when you come out you need a base
606 and if you're away, like me away from family and I think that's one of the
607 important things, it has it's been a good consistent base to get me kind of
608 kick started."

609 Interviewer: "How did it make you feel having those volunteers off the
610 train?"

611 Participant: "It was good because we'd already met inside **** (prison) I
612 think we met for 6 months inside before so it was good to have a couple of
613 familiar faces... I think the bond needs to be there before you leave prison

because if it's not there, if you're not fully committed before you leave then 614
there's always a chance that someone might just say no it's not working on 615
the outside. You won't be committed unless you're bonded and you need 616
that bond on the inside I think. (CM Participant 10, T3) 617

In the case of these participants, the volunteers were able to meet the 618
Core Member on their first day of release from prison and go with them 619
to their hostel. Due to the relationships already formed in the prison ses- 620
sions, as have been described earlier, the Core Member felt comforted, by 621
'familiar faces', in a situation that could easily have created anxiety. 622
Interestingly Core Member 10 describes the bond he had formed with 623
the volunteers whilst in prison and how this gave him a base to 'kick start' 624
him in to the crime-free life he hoped to achieve. Those convicted of 625
sexual offences routinely find it difficult to form social bonds with mem- 626
bers of the community (Lussier & Gress, 2014). The relationships devel- 627
oped within the prison-based model of CoSA however, enabled a sense of 628
support and togetherness to be present immediately on release from 629
prison. In turn, these social bonds are argued to have a positive impact on 630
the individual's motivation to achieve desistance (Weaver & McNeill, 631
2015). 632

with the group yeah I found them very supportive, they were always there 633
straight away swapping phone numbers and stuff like that and then they 634
explained to me who was going to be on duty that weekend you know if 635
anything happened I could get in touch with them and they're still doing 636
that now. (Core Member Participant 2, T3) 637

Here the participant is highlighting how the volunteers met him 638
immediately on release and explained how someone would be on call all 639
weekend if he needed support; his first weekend in the community after 640
6 years in prison. Providing support immediately on release from prison 641
is vital, due to an increased risk to individuals recently re-entering the 642
community. For example, a fifth (21%) of suicides in the first year taking 643
place during the first 28 days (Pratt, Piper, Appleby, Webb, & Shaw, 644
2006). As Tewksbury and Connor (2012) concluded from their research 645
however, when positive, stable and pro-social relationships are provided 646

647 to those convicted of sexual offences, both while in prison and upon re-
648 entering society, a sense of belonging is created and law-abiding conduct
649 promoted.

650 Rather than focus on the additional support for the Core Members
651 however, CoSA have been criticised in the literature for attempting,
652 through the use of volunteers, to provide statutory supervision 'on the
653 cheap' (Armstrong, Chistyakova, Mackenzie, & Malloch, 2008). From
654 this perspective a prison-based model of CoSA would provide additional
655 supervision during the early stages of release; a particularly sensitive
656 period in terms of risk of reoffending (Aresti et al., 2010). This is strongly
657 contested by CoSA organisations (Thomas, Thompson, & Karstedt,
658 2014). Although CoSA within the UK support risk management through
659 the accountability element, they do not duplicate or seek to replace statu-
660 tory supervision of those convicted of sexual offences released from
661 prison. Instead, they aim to complement and work in addition to the
662 supervision that already exists for these individuals in the community
663 (McCartan, Kemshall, Westwood, MacKenzie & Pollard, 2014).
664 McCartan (2015) supported this, stating that all those involved in CoSA
665 internationally must remember that volunteers are indeed volunteers and
666 not probation officers; the aim of CoSA is not solely risk management,
667 support also reduces the risk of reoffending.

668 *Barriers to Successful Reintegration*

669 As outlined previously, those who commit sexual offences face consider-
670 able barriers to successful reintegration when released from prison. For
671 the Core Members interviewed in this research three main issues reported
672 were; problems finding suitable housing, health concerns and perceived
673 stigmatisation.

674 With regard to the first issue, all of the Core Members interviewed
675 reported problems securing suitable (i.e. for mobility issues) and perma-
676 nent (i.e. not an approved premises) housing on release from prison.

677 Oh I've been messed about with **** (housing association) from the word
678 go. (Participant 2, T3)

The Prison-Based Model of CoSA and Its Application...

P: “(Probation) not letting me look for accommodation when I’ve already proved I can hold tenancy for two years, I think it’s just not justified stopping me doing that....” 679
680
681

I: “How long have you got left there?” 682

P: “I don’t know, obviously I’m in their hands now. I can’t look for places.” 683
684

I: “Is it the same area, they’re going to keep you in ****?” 685

P: “I really don’t know, no body’s interviewed me from **** or **** or you know, the only thing he’s said is I can start looking for places after about 6 months in either **** or ****. (CM Participant 8, T3) 686
687
688

Here the Core Members are expressing their frustrations regarding their accommodation, creating feelings of restriction and of being unsettled. In addition, Willis and Grace (2008) have argued that factors such as low quality accommodation are specifically related to reoffending. In relation to this, Northcutt Bohmert, Duwe, and Hipple (2016) documented from their study on CoSA in the US that Core Members struggled to overcome the barriers to finding housing deemed suitable by the courts, which in some cases resulted in the Core Member returning to prison.

Although CoSA are not involved directly with housing organisations, the volunteers were able to provide the Core Members with a safe space to vent their frustrations. With regard to the effectiveness of CoSA Northcutt Bohmert et al. (2016) defined this type of ‘friendship’, expressive support offered by the volunteers as critical in terms of CoSA success. Expressive support is harder for the Core Members to access without the support of the CoSA and as has been evidenced previously in this chapter the participants valued having ‘normal’, non-professional individuals to talk to greatly.

In addition, the CoSA sessions provided an opportunity to discuss pro-active behaviour the Core Members can engage in, in order to ensure the processes ran as smoothly as possible.

My problem is that I got home last week from the taxi (after the circle meeting) and I’ve never been out the house since cause I can’t, I live in a bungalow, great, no problems but I can’t even get out my drive because I’ve got a rotator, both rotator cuffs but this one is shattered and I can’t push (wheelchair) up hills so my thing is that I’m locked at home all the time. (CM Participant 6, T3) 708
709
710
711
712
713

714 The participant here is discussing the impact his mobility and housing
715 issues have on his daily life. The location of the house he currently resides
716 in, combined with his confinement to a manual wheelchair which he is
717 unable to operate, means the CoSA sessions are the only time he leaves
718 his house each week. As is reported within the literature, social isolation
719 such as this, works against those convicted of sexual offences reintegrat-
720 ing successfully back into the community (Tewksbury & Mustaine,
721 2009). However, it can be argued that CoSA are going some way to pre-
722 vent complete isolation from society, as without the weekly CoSA ses-
723 sions the Core Member may not have interacted with outside civilisation
724 at all.

725 The third issue concerning participants once released from prison was
726 their continuous anxiety and worry of the public's opinions of them.

727 Because of the nature of my crime, I'm very nervous about meeting new
728 people, going out on my own anywhere and when I'm on the tram they've
729 got some of those disabled seats, so I'm sitting side wards and you know
730 people behind me, I'm very nervous of it, even on the bus I sit on the side-
731 ways seats, I'm always looking out but meeting new people on the group
732 (CoSA) as I have done it's slowly bringing me out of that sort of stage so
733 I'm venturing out a bit more and not so much trusting people but just get-
734 ting out and about. (CM Participant 2, T3)

735 In the first half of the extract participant two is talking about a per-
736 ceived threat of physical violence he constantly experiences when out in
737 the community, which creates feelings of anxiety. The Core Member's
738 fears are not unfounded due to the media's representation of those who
739 commit sexual offences as sexual predators who should be hated and
740 loathed (McAlinden, 2006). Although acts of violence towards those
741 convicted of sexual offences are relatively uncommon (Tewksbury &
742 Lees, 2006), the Core Members still have to deal with the fear of this
743 stigmatisation. Being a Core Member on CoSA however, means they do
744 not have to face it alone. In the second part of the extract, the Core
745 Member is explaining how being part of CoSA has encouraged him to
746 'venture out' in the community more. Although he admits his trust of
747 others has not increased, he is striving not to isolate himself.

I suppose I'm under, I feel under pressure, I feel that I'm an outsider I 748
suppose in how I feel...I don't feel that I'm relaxed, I can't relax, I don't 749
know how...I feel I've lost my place like in the community. (Participant 750
6, T3) 751

Here the Core Member is describing how he now construes himself 752
as an outsider in his old community with the new 'sex offender' identity 753
overruling any previous identities. Unfortunately, this is not uncom- 754
mon for those who have committed sexual offences. For example, 755
Mingus and Burchfield (2012) reported from their research with those 756
who commit sexual offences that the 'sex offender' label is the most 757
highly stigmatised label in modern societies such as the UK. They argued 758
that the 'sex offender' status often becomes the master status above all 759
other identities the person may have, such as a father or, in the case of 760
this Core Member, a respected member of the local community. Within 761
the literature, an internalisation of this stigmatisation towards ex- 762
offenders is thought to predict both reconviction and re-imprisonment, 763
even after controlling for the social problems they would face on re- 764
entry in to the community (LeBel, Burnett, Maruna, & Bushway, 765
2008). Although this research involved offenders convicted of all offence 766
types it still provides concerning findings for those who have previously 767
committed sexual offences but are attempting to now live a crime-free 768
life in the community. 769

Despite this fear of stigmatisation some of the Core Members describe 770
their experience of how being part of CoSA has encouraged them to open 771
up emotionally to other people. 772

Circles helped as well but just realising that I needed to be able to talk more 773
or to be more open with people cause I used to kind of like there was a 774
brick wall round me and when anybody got too close I would just, what- 775
ever I needed to send them away I'd do it. (CM Participant 10, T3) 776

For this core member specifically, this is the first time they have ever 777
taken the step to lower their emotional barriers, and being part of CoSA 778
enables him to practice this before their Circle ends. This resonates with 779
research on UK and Dutch CoSA, whereby Core Members developed 780

781 their openness to communication within the CoSA which lead to a posi-
782 tive ripple effect in the quality of their relationships outside the CoSA
783 (Höing, Bogaerts, & Vogelvang, 2013). Improving the psychological
784 wellbeing is an important aspect of CoSA success that should not be
785 overlooked when considering the effectiveness of CoSA projects (see
786 Chap. 3 for more discussion on this). Offering support in this way, to
787 help the Core Members develop new social bonds with the wider com-
788 munity is reported to help counteract any feelings of disconnectedness
789 that may be felt through perceived stigmatisation from society (McNeill,
790 2009). In addition, encouraging the Core Members to overcome poten-
791 tial social isolation and loneliness by forming relations with others will
792 hopefully help to lower their risk of reoffending (Marshall, 2010). What
793 is unclear however, is whether this, along with the additional benefits
794 described previously, is enough to enable desistance to truly take place.

795 **General Discussion**

796 From the research findings discussed, it can be argued that being part of
797 a prison-based model CoSA enables individuals to receive pro-social sup-
798 port from a network of non-professionals, that they would otherwise be
799 without. The additional prison sessions, allowed time for relationships
800 between the Core Member and volunteers to be built and therefore extra
801 support to be provided before the point of release. The benefit of this, in
802 addition to improving the Core Members' wellbeing, is that individuals
803 who have committed offences are more likely to accept specific guidance
804 regarding desistance from individuals they have already established a rela-
805 tionship with (McCulloch, 2005).

806 Another benefit highlighted in the data was the role the additional
807 prison sessions played in enabling the Core Member to be as prepared as
808 possible for release. This was with regard specifically to the restrictions
809 involved in their licence conditions and some of the possible risky situa-
810 tions they may find themselves in, all of which encouraged the Core
811 Member to be accountable for their thoughts and behaviours. It is impor-
812 tant to note here that whilst some Core Members felt comfortable in
813 discussing the details of their sex offender treatment experiences, includ-

ing any strategies they had developed to prevent reoffending in the future, 814
this is not a necessary requirement. The sessions involved in CoSA of any 815
type are unique and specific to the needs of the individual Core Members, 816
and are not intended to replace sex offender treatment programmes in 817
any way (Bates et al., 2014). In fact, Ward and Langlands (2009) warn 818
against trying to combine or blend restorative justice practices such as 819
CoSA with rehabilitative treatment, due them being complimentary but 820
very different components of crime reduction, designed to deal with dif- 821
ferent tasks. 822

With regard to the Core Members' release from prison, being part of a 823
prison-based model CoSA enabled support to be provided by the volun- 824
teers immediately on re-entry into community. This not only reduces 825
anxiety for the Core Member, but also helps prevent them slipping back 826
into old offending behaviour, during this heightened period of risk (Aresti 827
et al., 2010). In addition, the CoSA sessions once in the community 828
encouraged the Core Members to integrate with society, something they 829
may not partake in otherwise due to health issues and the perceived stig- 830
matisation of those around them. 831

Whilst the benefits to the additional sessions in the prison-based 832
model have been documented, it is not clear whether these are in fact 833
enough to ensure that desistance from crime is reached. As has been 834
stated at several points throughout the chapter and argued in much more 835
detail elsewhere (Graffam, Shinkfield, Lavelle, & McPherson, 2004; 836
Tewksbury & Copes, 2013; Tewksbury & Mustaine, 2009), those who 837
are convicted of a sexual offence face many barriers to successful reinte- 838
gration. As LeBel et al. (2008) have reported, social problems experi- 839
enced after release from prison, such as employments, housing and 840
relationship issues, have a large and significant impact on the probability 841
of both reconviction and re-imprisonment. Further research is therefore 842
required in order to determine whether the benefits of the additional 843
prison sessions in this new model of CoSA were sufficient enough to 844
enable the Core Member to overcome the barriers to reintegration and 845
reintegrate successfully back into the community. Returning to the Core 846
Members once their time with the prison-based model of CoSA had 847
ended would enable the true effectiveness of the model to be considered, 848

849 with regard to how successful they had been in becoming a pro-social,
850 active member of the community.

851 In conclusion, the findings suggest that a prison-based model of CoSA
852 provides additional support to Core Members during their transition
853 from prison to the community. Relationships can be established prior to
854 release from prison ensuring the CoSA 'hits the ground running' when
855 reaching the community. In addition, preparing them for life as an ex-
856 offender, previously convicted of a sexual offence, ensures they are held
857 accountable for their thoughts and behaviour. Further research is now
858 required in order to establish how effective the benefits of a prison-based
859 model of CoSA are in enabling individuals to overcome the barriers to
860 successful reintegration.

AU2 861 References

- 862 Aresti, A., Eatough, V., & Brooks-Gordon, B. (2010). Doing time after time:
863 An interpretative phenomenological analysis of reformed ex-offenders' expe-
864 riences of self-change, identity and career opportunities. *Psychology, Crime &*
865 *Law*, 16(3), 169–190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160802516273>
- 866 Barnett, G. D., Wakeling, H. C., & Howard, P. D. (2010). An examination of
867 the predictive validity of the risk matrix 2000 in England and Wales. *Sexual*
868 *Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 22(4), 443–470. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063210384274)
869 [org/10.1177/1079063210384274](https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063210384274)
- 870 Barry, M. (2007). Listening and learning: The reciprocal relationship between
871 worker and client. *Probation Journal*, 54(4), 407–422. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550507083539)
872 [org/10.1177/0264550507083539](https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550507083539)
- 873 Bates, A., Williams, D., Wilson, C., & Wilson, R. J. (2014). Circles south east:
874 The first 10 years 2002–2012. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and*
875 *Comparative Criminology*, 58(7), 861–885. [https://doi.org/10.1177/03066](https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X13485362)
876 [24X13485362](https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X13485362)
- 877 Berg, M. T., & Huebner, B. M. (2011). Re-entry and the ties that bind: An
878 examination of social ties, employment, and recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*,
879 28(2), 382–410. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2010.498383>
- 880 Blagden, N., Winder, B., & Hames, C. (2016). “They treat us like human
881 beings”—Experiencing a therapeutic sex offenders prison: Impact on offend-
882 ers and staff and implications for treatment. *International Journal of Offender*
883 *Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 60(4), 371–396.

- Bows, H., & Westmarland, N. (2016). Older sex offenders—Managing risk in the community from a policing perspective. *Policing and Society*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2016.1138476>
- Brocki, J. M., & Wearden, A. J. (2006). A critical evaluation of the use of interpretative phenomenological analysis (IPA) in health psychology. *Psychology and Health*, 21(1), 87–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14768320500230185>
- Brown, K., Spencer, J., & Deakin, J. (2007). The reintegration of sex offenders: Barriers and opportunities for employment. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 46(1), 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2311.2007.00452.x>
- Clarke, M., Brown, S., & Völlm, B. (2015). Circles of support and accountability for sex offenders: A systematic review of outcomes. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063215603691>
- Craig, L. A., & Hutchinson, R. B. (2005). Sexual offenders with learning disabilities: Risk, recidivism and treatment. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 11(3), 289–304. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13552600500273919>
- Crawley, E., & Sparks, R. (2006). Is there life after imprisonment? How elderly men talk about imprisonment and release. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6(1), 63–82. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895806060667>
- Cummins, R. A., & Lau, A. L. (2003). Community integration or community exposure? A review and discussion in relation to people with an intellectual disability. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, 16(2), 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1468-3148.2003.00157.x>
- Duwe, G. (2012). Can circles of support and accountability (COASA) work in the United States? Preliminary results from a randomized experiment in Minnesota. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 25(2), 143–165. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063212453942>
- Fazel, S., Sjöstedt, G., Långström, N., & Grann, M. (2006). Risk factors for criminal recidivism in older sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 18(2), 159–167. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107906320601800204>
- Fox, K. J. (2015). Contextualizing the policy and pragmatics of reintegrating sex offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063215574711>
- Göbbels, S., Ward, T., & Willis, G. M. (2012). An integrative theory of desistance from sex offending. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(5), 453–462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.003>
- Graffam, J., Shinkfield, A., Lavelle, B., & McPherson, W. (2004). Variables affecting successful reintegration as perceived by offenders and professionals. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 40(1–2), 147–171. https://doi.org/10.1300/j076v40n01_08

- 923 Hannem, S. (2011). Experiences in reconciling risk management and restorative
924 justice how circles of support and accountability work restoratively in the risk
925 society. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*,
926 57(3), 269–288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x11432538>
- 927 Hanson, R. K., & Morton-Bourgon, K. E. (2005). The characteristics of persis-
928 tent sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of recidivism studies. *Journal of*
929 *Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(6), 1154–1163. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154)
930 [org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154](https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1154)
- 931 Hart, M. (2008). The geriatric sex offender: Senile or paedophile. *Law &*
932 *Psychology Review*, 32, 153–162.
- 933 Hayes, S., Shackell, P., Mottram, P., & Lancaster, R. (2007). The prevalence of
934 intellectual disability in a major UK prison. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*,
935 35(3), 162–167. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-3156.2007.00461.x>
- 936 Höing, M., Bogaerts, S., & Vogelvang, B. (2013). Circles of support and
937 accountability: How and why they work for sex offenders. *Journal of Forensic*
938 *Psychology Practice*, 13(4), 267–295. [https://doi.org/10.1080/15228932.201](https://doi.org/10.1080/15228932.2013.808526)
939 [3.808526](https://doi.org/10.1080/15228932.2013.808526)
- 940 Höing, M., Vogelvang, B., & Bogaerts, S. (2015). “I am a different man now”-
941 sex offenders in circles of support and accountability: A prospective study.
942 *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 1–22.
943 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x15612431>
- 944 Howse, K. (2003). *Growing old in prison: A scoping study on older prisoners*.
945 London, UK: Prison Reform Trust.
- 946 Ievins, A. (2013). *Living among sex offenders: Identity, safety and relationships at*
947 *Whatton prison*. Masters dissertation, Cambridge University, UK.
- 948 King, S. (2013). Assisted desistance and experiences of probation supervision.
949 *Probation Journal*, 60(2), 136–151. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550513478320>
- 950 Kitson-Boyce, R., Blagden, N., Winder, B., & Dillon, G. (2017a). ‘This time it’s
951 different’ preparing for release through CoSA (The prison model): A phenomeno-
952 [AU3](#) *logical and repertory grid analysis*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- 953 Kitson-Boyce, R., Blagden, N., Winder, B., & Dillon, G. (2017b). *The need for*
954 *a prison-based model of circles of support and accountability: Cognitive change*
955 *and the shadow of release*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- 956 Lambrick, F., & Glaser, W. (2004). Sex offenders with an intellectual disability.
957 *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 16(4), 381–392. [https://](https://doi.org/10.1023/b:sebu.0000043330.65936.66)
958 doi.org/10.1023/b:sebu.0000043330.65936.66
- 959 LeBel, T. P., Burnett, R., Maruna, S., & Bushway, S. (2008). The chicken and
960 egg’ of subjective and social factors in desistance from crime. *European Journal*
961 *of Criminology*, 5(2), 131–159. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370807087640>

- Levenson, J. S., D'Amora, D. A., & Hern, A. L. (2007). Megan's law and its impact on community re-entry for sex offenders. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 25(4), 587–602. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.770>
- Lindsay, W. (2002). Research and literature on sex offenders with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research*, 46(s1), 74–85. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2788.2002.00006.x>
- Lussier, P., & Gress, C. L. (2014). Community re-entry and the path toward desistance: A quasi-experimental longitudinal study of dynamic factors and community risk management of adult sex offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(2), 111–122. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2013.09.006>
- Maguire, M., & Raynor, P. (2006). How the resettlement of prisoners promotes desistance from crime or does it? *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6(1), 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895806060665>
- Marshall, W. L. (2010). The role of attachments, intimacy, and loneliness in the etiology and maintenance of sexual offending. *Sexual and Relationship Therapy*, 25(1), 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681990903550191>
- Marshall, W. L., & Marshall, L. E. (2007). The utility of the random controlled trial for evaluating sexual offender treatment: The gold standard or an inappropriate strategy? *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 19(2), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107906320701900207>
- Maruna, S. (2001). *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Books.
- McAlinden, A. (2006). Managing risk from regulation to the reintegration of sexual offenders. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6(2), 197–218. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748895806062981>
- McCartan, K. (2015, October). *Circles of support and accountability in the UK*. Paper presented at the Association of the Treatment of Sexual Abusers 34th Annual Research and Treatment Conference, Montreal, QC, Canada.
- McCulloch, T. (2005). Probation, social context and desistance: Retracing the relationship. *Probation Journal*, 52(1), 8–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550505050623>
- McNeill, F. (2009). What works and what's just? *European Journal of Probation*, 1(1), 21–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/206622030900100103>
- McNeill, F., & Weaver, E. (2010). *Changing lives? Desistance research and offender management*. Report No. 03/2010. Scotland: The Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research.
- Mingus, W., & Burchfield, K. B. (2012). From prison to integration: Applying modified labelling theory to sex offenders. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 25(1), 97–109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2012.657906>

- 1001 MnCoSA. (2017). MnCoSA Circle Member. *Idealist*. Retrieved from [https://](https://www.idealist.org/en/volunter-opportunity/f0e705fe443b45d9a8411460d65e4107-mncosa-circle-member-mncosa-saint-paul)
1002 [www.idealist.org/en/volunter-opportunity/f0e705fe443b45d9a8411460d65e4107-](https://www.idealist.org/en/volunter-opportunity/f0e705fe443b45d9a8411460d65e4107-mncosa-circle-member-mncosa-saint-paul)
1003 [mncosa-circle-member-mncosa-saint-paul](https://www.idealist.org/en/volunter-opportunity/f0e705fe443b45d9a8411460d65e4107-mncosa-circle-member-mncosa-saint-paul)
- 1004 Nellis, M. (2009). Circles of support and accountability for sex offenders in
1005 England and Wales: Their origins and implementation between 1999–2005.
1006 *British Journal of Community Justice*, 7(1), 22–44. [https://doi.org/10.1080/](https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580701372046)
1007 [10282580701372046](https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580701372046)
- 1008 Northcutt Bohmert, M. N., Duwe, G., & Hipple, N. K. (2016). Evaluating
1009 restorative justice circles of support and accountability can social support
1010 overcome structural barriers? *International Journal of Offender Therapy*
1011 *and Comparative Criminology*, 1–20. [https://doi.org/10.1177/03066](https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X16652627)
1012 [24X16652627](https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X16652627)
- 1013 Pratt, D., Piper, M., Appleby, L., Webb, R., & Shaw, J. (2006). Suicide in
1014 recently released offenders: A population-based cohort study. *The Lancet*,
1015 368(9530), 119–123. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(06\)69002-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(06)69002-8)
- 1016 Rocque, M., Bierie, D. M., & MacKenzie, D. L. (2011). Social bonds and
1017 change during incarceration: Testing a missing link in the re-entry research.
1018 *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 55(5),
1019 816–838. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x10370457>
- 1020 Schwaebe, C. (2005). Learning to pass: Sex offenders' strategies for establishing
1021 a viable identity in the prison general population. *International Journal of*
1022 *Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 49(6), 614–625. [https://doi.](https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x05275829)
1023 [org/10.1177/0306624x05275829](https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624x05275829)
- 1024 Serin, R. C., & Lloyd, C. D. (2009). Examining the process of offender change:
1025 The transition to crime desistance. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15(4), 347–364.
1026 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10683160802261078>
- 1027 Shaw, J. A., & Budd, E. C. (1982). Determinants of acquiescence and naysaying
1028 of mentally retarded persons. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*, 87,
1029 108–110.
- 1030 Smith, J. A., & Osborn, M. (2003). Interpretative phenomenological analysis.
1031 In J. A. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research meth-*
1032 *ods* (pp. 51–80). London: Sage.
- 1033 Swedish Research Council. (2015). Preventing sexual abuse of children: Risk
1034 assessment and interventions for adults at risk of offending. *Fortæ: Swedish*
1035 *Research Council for Health, Working Life and Welfare*, 51, 1–53.
- 1036 Tewksbury, R. (2012). Stigmatization of sex offenders. *Deviant Behavior*, 33(8),
1037 606–623. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2011.636690>

- Tewksbury, R., & Connor, D. P. (2012). Incarcerated sex offenders' perceptions of family relationships: Previous experiences and future expectations. *Western Criminology Review*, 13(2), 25–35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885512467318>
- Tewksbury, R., & Copes, H. (2013). Incarcerated sex offenders' expectations for re-entry. *The Prison Journal*, 93(1), 102–122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885512467318>
- Tewksbury, R., & Lees, M. (2006). Perceptions of sex offender registration: Collateral consequences and community experiences. *Sociological Spectrum*, 26(3), 309–334. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02732170500524246>
- Tewksbury, R., & Mustaine, E. E. (2009). Stress and collateral consequences for registered sex offenders. *Journal of Public Management & Social Policy*, 15(2), 215–239.
- Thomas, T., Thompson, D., & Karstedt. (2014). *Assessing the impact of Circles of Support and Accountability on the reintegration of adults convicted of sexual offences in the community*. Leeds: Centre for Criminal Justice Studies, University of Leeds.
- Thornton, D., Mann, R., Webster, S., Blud, L., Travers, R., Friendship, C., et al. (2003). Distinguishing and combining risks for sexual and violent recidivism. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 989(1), 225–235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2003.tb07308.x>
- Van den Berg, C., Beijersbergen, K., Nieuwbeerta, P., & Dirkzwager, A. (2017). Sex offenders in prison: Are they socially isolated? *Sexual Abuse*, 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063217700884>
- Weaver, B., & McNeill, F. (2015). Lifelines desistance, social relations, and reciprocity. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42(1), 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854814550031>
- Willis, G. M., & Grace, R. C. (2008). The quality of community reintegration planning for child molesters: Effects on sexual recidivism. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 20(2), 218–240. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063208318005>
- Willis, G. M., Levenson, J. S., & Ward, T. (2010). Desistance and attitudes towards sex offenders: Facilitation or hindrance? *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(6), 545–556. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-010-9314-8>
- Wilson, C., Bates, A., & Völlm, B. (2010). Circles of support and accountability: An innovative approach to manage high-risk sex offenders in the community. *Open Criminology Journal*, 3, 48–57. <https://doi.org/10.2174/1874917801003010048>
- Wilson, R. J., Picheca, J. E., & Prinzo, M. (2005). *Circles of support and accountability: An evaluation of the pilot project in South-Central Ontario*. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Author Queries

Chapter No.: 4 0003412424

Queries	Details Required	Author's Response
AU1	Refs. "Elliott and Zajac (2015), Crawley and Sparks (2005), Levenson, Brannon, Fortney, and Baker (2007), Hanvey, Philpot and Wilson (2011), Armstrong, Chistyakova, Mackenzie, and Malloch (2008), McCartan, Kemshall, Westwood, MacKenzie and Pollard (2014), Ward and Langlands (2009) and Thomas, Thompson, and Karstedt (2013)" are cited in text but not provided in the reference list. Please provide details in the list or delete the citation from the text.	
AU2	Refs. "Brown et al. (2007), Hannem (2011), Levenson et al. (2007), Marshall and Marshall (2007), Swedish Research Council (2015), and Willis et al. (2010)" were not cited anywhere in the text. Please provide in text citation or delete the reference from the reference list.	
AU3	Please update the ref. if published.	