

Culture, Change and Community Justice

**Fergus McNeill,
University of Glasgow**

**Ros Burnett,
University of Oxford**

**Trish McCulloch
University of Dundee**

May 2010

COPYRIGHT NOTICE

This publication is copyright SCCJR. Permission is granted to reproduce any part or all of this report for personal and educational use only. Commercial copying, hiring or lending is prohibited. Any material used must be fully acknowledged, and the title of the publication, authors and date of publication specified.

Copyright © SCCJR 2010

ISBN: 978-0-9563526-4-4

FOREWORD

Culture, Change and Community Justice represents a timely research perspective on the management of change within community justice organisations in Scotland. The Scottish Government supports the publication of this review, as part of a range of policy initiatives which are intended to inform the further development and reform of criminal justice social work.

We are, with our stakeholders, currently in the process of developing the Reducing Reoffending Programme. As highlighted in this research, if 'paying back in the community' is to become the default position in sentencing for less serious crimes, as recommended by the Scottish Prisons Commission, then criminal justice social work has a critical part to play – and this will require practitioners to be involved not just in the implementation of reforms, but in the development of them.

The work to produce this paper was undertaken as part of a collaboration agreement between the Scottish Government and the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research. The agreement facilitates an enhanced contribution of social scientific academic knowledge, experience and expertise to policy, research and analysis in the Scottish Government.

Wilma Dickson

**Deputy Director
Community Justice Services Division**

CONTENTS

COPYRIGHT NOTICE	2
CONTENTS	4
1. INTRODUCTION.....	5
2. CULTURE, CHANGE AND ORGANISATIONS.....	8
<i>OVERVIEW</i>	8
<i>UNDERSTANDING ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE.....</i>	9
<i>ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR</i>	11
<i>ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE AND CHANGE</i>	12
<i>RESISTANCE AND CHANGE READINESS.....</i>	13
<i>THE ROLE OF LEADERSHIP</i>	14
<i>BEYOND CULTURAL MODELS OF CHANGE.....</i>	14
<i>THE SUCCESS AND FAILURE OF CHANGE PROCESSES</i>	17
<i>META-GOVERNANCE AND NON-MANAGED CHANGE.....</i>	21
3. CHANGING COMMUNITY JUSTICE	22
<i>INTRODUCTION</i>	22
<i>THE HOME OFFICE EFFECTIVE PRACTICE INITIATIVE</i>	23
<i>THE SCALE OF CHANGE</i>	23
<i>THE PACE OF CHANGE</i>	23
<i>THE LEVEL OF 'CENTRAL DRIVING'</i>	24
<i>THE ROLE OF HMIP AND OTHER PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS</i>	26
<i>THE NATIONAL OFFENDER MANAGEMENT SERVICE</i>	27
<i>'OTHER' COMMUNITY JUSTICE CHANGE INITIATIVES</i>	29
<i>THE CENTRALITY OF PRACTITIONERS.....</i>	29
<i>RECOVERING AN EXPLICIT VALUE BASE.....</i>	31
<i>THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLEAR, COHERENT AND FEASIBLE CHANGE OBJECTIVES.....</i>	31
4. CHANGING CRIMINAL JUSTICE SOCIAL WORK IN SCOTLAND.....	34
<i>THE CHANGING CULTURE(S) OF PROBATION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE SOCIAL WORK.....</i>	34
<i>SCOTTISH PROBATION</i>	34
<i>SOCIAL WORK WITH OFFENDERS.....</i>	35
<i>THE IMPACT OF NATIONAL STANDARDS.....</i>	36
<i>CONTEMPORARY CRIMINAL JUSTICE SOCIAL WORK</i>	36
5. CONCLUSION.....	40
REFERENCES.....	42

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This research project involved a review of the international research on the management of change within community justice organisations. The review of change management is located within a wider analysis of what is known about occupational, professional and organizational cultures within criminal justice and within public sector organizations more generally, and of how practitioners respond to policy changes.
- 1.2 The review was originally undertaken to inform the work of the Scottish Government's Performance Improvement Strategy Group, against the backdrop of the ongoing work of the National Advisory Body. Its origins lie in the group's recognition that both policy implementation and organisational change are complex and difficult to achieve in this area; the prospects for the success of any change initiative are likely to be determined not only by the strength of its own evidence base and theory of change, but also by the cultural and organizational conditions within which its implementation takes place. The review remains equally relevant (if not more so) in the context of the development of the Scottish Government's Reducing Reoffending Programme.
- 1.3 The group agreed that a synthesis of the international research literature on the management of change within community justice organizations, and of the occupational, professional and organizational cultures within them, was required in order to enable the development of strategies for performance improvement that are sufficiently sensitive to the natures and contexts of the organisations and practices whose outcomes they are seeking to enhance. Further, it seemed clear that the establishment of the Community Justice Authorities in Scotland represented a very significant restructuring of strategic and operational accountabilities; one the prospects of which might be enhanced by an evidence-based understanding of change management in community justice. A comparative perspective on these issues seemed likely to enable Scottish developments to draw effectively on international evidence.
- 1.4 Within this context, the aim of the research was to inform the development of appropriate approaches to and strategies for performance improvement in community justice in Scotland by reviewing international evidence about:
 1. The nature and character of occupational, professional and organisational cultures in community justice.
 2. How such cultures respond to, accommodate and resist change processes.
 3. How and why processes of change succeed and fail in criminal justice organisations.
 4. Effective approaches to the management of change in criminal justice.

1.5 To this end, in September 2007, the investigators searched a range of English language databases (Cambridge Scientific Abstracts) using various combinations of the terms 'criminal justice' and 'social work' and contractions of the terms 'organizational change', 'cultural change', 'change management' and 'managing change'. Predictably, this approach produced hundreds of results, most of them not directly relevant to the questions above. So, a narrower search strategy was devised. This strategy invited the databases to identify items which had keywords including:

[Probation OR (Offender Management) OR (Criminal Justice Social Work)]

AND

[(organi*ation* change) OR (cultur* change) OR (change management)) OR (managing change)]

1.6 This more focused approach yielded 56 results. The abstracts of all of these items were reviewed and items were selected for further investigation on grounds of relevance to the four objectives of the study. This narrower focus ensures the relevance of the review but at the same time, the pertinent issues here can best be understood within the broader context of research on organizational change. It makes sense, before presenting their findings, to provide a narrative overview of the wider literatures on culture, change and managing change in organisations and professions, focusing particularly on the literature that deals with the public sector.

1.7 But before delving into this literature, it is necessary to point out that the terms 'culture' and 'cultural' are themselves complex and highly ambiguous. As Garland (2006) has observed, sociologists and criminologists often discuss 'the cultural' as an analytical dimension of social relations – as a level of analysis that exists or is dynamically constructed somehow in the spaces between structural analyses (principally concerned with socio-economic and material conditions) and individualized analyses of human behaviour. At the same time, we also speak of culture as a 'collective entity', as in the culture of a particular group, profession or organization; for example, 'cop culture'. Both usages are problematic. The first is difficult because it is not at all clear whether or to what extent 'the cultural' exists as a level or form of analysis independent of 'the structural' or 'the individual' (but cf. Smith, 2008). The second is difficult because 'cultures' turn out in fact to be heterogeneous. For example, any profession or organization will, on closer analysis, inevitably turn out to have *multiple* cultures and cultural interactions within it.

1.8 These conceptual issues matter in this context precisely because, as will quickly become obvious, many (but by no means all) of the management and organizational studies of culture and cultural change that we review below fail to adequately recognize far less engage with these complexities. Too often, they seem to cast 'culture' as just another variable that managers can manipulate to enhance effectiveness or productivity. This is both analytically flawed and morally problematic. Culture is not just an influence on what we do and a factor in working

out how we can do it better; it is about who we are and how we construct our identities. It follows that the manipulation of culture in pursuit of policy (or business) objectives has an inescapably normative component. Thus in this review of cultural change in community justice we will at least try to show why neglecting questions of the relationships between culture, identity and morality lies at the heart of many failed attempts to change or reform practices.

2. CULTURE, CHANGE AND ORGANISATIONS

Overview

2.1 Most management texts draw attention to the key role of organizational culture in influencing performance. According to some influential writers, a prior understanding of the organisation's culture is imperative to introducing strategic change (Kanter, 1983) and if major improvement or transformation is sought then it will first be necessary to change the organisational culture (Peters and Waterman, 1982). Indeed, Louis Gerstner, the business executive credited with rescuing IBM in the 1990s, came to the conclusion that, when aiming to transform corporate performance,

'culture isn't just one aspect of the game – it is the game. In the end, an organisation is nothing more than the collective capacity of its people to create value' (2002: 182).

2.2 He argued that, for all occupational sectors, vision and principles are irrelevant to an institution's success unless they become 'part of its DNA' (p182) because it is unwritten rules and understandings that influence interaction between employees and how they go about their work. Many writers concur that what happens on a day by day basis within an institution is largely influenced by the imbedded culture; that ignoring it can lead to failure, while conversely an effective culture can be more important than strategy in the development of a 'high performance' organization.

2.3 In order to evaluate such claims, and how they might relate to community justice services, we need to consider both what is meant by 'organisational culture' in general and how the term relates to the public sector in particular. Following this, an exploration of the wider theoretical and empirical literature on the role of organisational culture in improvement and transformation of organisations, as well as other factors implicated in change, will provide a backdrop for examining factors in the development of appropriate approaches to and strategies for performance improvement in community justice in Scotland.

2.4 Should so much emphasis be placed on organisational culture in guiding organisations in new directions; and what else is important? Taking the place of more structural models, cultural approaches (together with studies of leadership and human resource management) became popular following the publication of Peters and Waterman (1982) *In Search of Excellence* and R.M. Kanter's (1983) *The Change Masters*. This 'excellence tradition' held sway during the 1980s and 1990s but has increasingly been criticised for its reliance on slick, managerial recipes which have not been subjected to rigorous testing or longitudinal research, and for its emphasis on human agency ignoring the external, macro-social influences on organisational outcomes (Wilson, 1992).

- 2.5 A broad exploration of the literature reveals that, while cultural factors are relevant to performance improvement, a more comprehensive understanding of factors that may influence success and failure in public service reforms must take account of other theoretical models of change (e.g. see Kezar, 2001) and the wider political and social context, particularly as these relate to the public sector in ways which distinguish it from the private sector. Although the literature on organisational development and change is voluminous, there has been remarkably little empirical research on change in the public sector (Pollitt and Bouckaert 2004; Albury 2005). While much can be culled from the wider field of management research (e.g. see Fernandez. and Rainey 2006), differences between the private and public sector (Paton and Mordaunt, 2004) mean that the wider literature has to be used selectively and leaves some important questions unanswered. Public services have objectives that are more complex than the narrower profit motives of corporate enterprise, and operate in complicated networks of partnerships and inter-dependent agencies, all shaped by a rapidly changing legislative and political context. For these reasons, public management researchers indicate that strategies successfully used to improve performance in private companies have applicability in the public sector but may be more difficult to implement, with no certainty about their impact (e.g. Boyne, 2004).

Understanding organisational culture

- 2.6 It is generally agreed that organisational culture is complex and hard to penetrate. Indeed, some scholars suggest that defining organisational culture is the hardest part of studying it (Keup et al, in Astin, 2001: 18) while other investigators opt out of offering a definition altogether 'since culture appears to include virtually everything in an organization [and therefore] any definition must do the same' (Wilson 1992: 69). In sociological discussion, the concept is presented as multi-layered and multi-dimensional, with Edgar Schein's (1990) formulation being favoured, albeit usually only partially applied. As part of a much more elaborate analysis, Schein (1990) identified three main dimensions of organisational culture: assumptions, values, and artefacts. 'Assumptions' are implicit but largely unspoken beliefs about human nature and the organisational environment – they 'go without saying'; 'values' underpin preferences for alternative outcomes and the means of achieving those outcomes; and 'artefacts' are the tangible or visible representations of culture including language, rituals, slogans, traditions and myths. Researchers have typically focused on 'values' as indicators of organisational culture because they are more accessible than assumptions and more reliable than artefacts.
- 2.7 Expressed simply, the concept of organizational culture refers to 'shared ways of seeing, thinking and doing' within an organisation (Thompson et al, 1996: 647): these reflect deeply entrenched traditions, habits, values, beliefs and norms. Some accounts distinguish historical and developmental dimensions, though what each amounts to are repeated experiences and messages that become translated into

shared assumptions and practices, each contributing to unwritten notions of 'what we stand for' and 'how we do things here'. A somewhat loaded, but perhaps useful distinction is made between 'positive cultures' and 'negative cultures', these adjectives reflecting the extent to which employees typically experience job security, pride in their work, opportunities and empowerment, and the degree of alignment between cultural values and the values and objectives of the agency. While some of the literature refers to culture as if singular within an organisation, it is generally acknowledged that several cultures or sub-cultures may simultaneously exist within an organisation – and it may be the tensions between them rather than any single culture that could be counter-productive. Theorists agree that such cultures evolve rather than stand, though some accounts emphasise the difficulty of shifting initial culture of an organization associated with founding members, especially if it has been rewarded (Gerstner, 2002).

- 2.8 One of the best known typologies of organizational cultures, much applied in the broader management literature, is Quinn and Rohrbaugh's (1983) classic distinction between 'group', 'developmental', 'rational', and 'hierarchical' cultures, as operationalised by Zammuto and Krakower (1991). *Group cultures* are associated with a focus on people much more than on the organization, and they value human resources, interpersonal relations, employee participation, and positive morale. These cultures place a high value on equity, loyalty, tradition, and putting people first. *Developmental cultures* are associated with a focus on the organization, flexibility, adaptability and readiness, growth, and resource acquisition. Dynamic and entrepreneurial, they are open to risk and innovation, and they reward individual initiative while seeking growth and resource acquisition. *Rational cultures* are production oriented. They are therefore focused on tasks, plans and goal setting that will enable them to realise their objectives. They apply competitive strategies and reward achievement. *Hierarchical cultures* revolve around procedures, control mechanisms, enforcement of rules, managing information and attention to technical matters. They emphasise stability, conformity, formality and rewards based on rank. This bureaucratic form of administration is stereotypically associated with traditional models of work in the public sector.
- 2.9 Viewing these organizational cultures from the perspective of a competing values framework reveals that each of these cultures, in their pure form, seem to steer an organization's preoccupations in differing directions along two value dimensions: internal versus external focus, and control versus flexibility (Zammuto and Krakower 1991; Parker and Bradley 2000). Thus, group cultures (otherwise referred to as the human relations model) are flexible but tend to be inward-looking; developmental cultures (or the open systems model) are flexible and outward-looking; hierarchical cultures (or the internal process model) are controlled and inward in orientation; while rational cultures (or the rational goal model) are controlled but outward in orientation.
- 2.10 In an application of this model in a study of the public sector, Moynihan and Pandey (2004) found that developmental cultures are perceived by employees to

be the most likely type of culture to result in organizational effectiveness. According to Zammuto and Krakower's (1991: 87), in a developmental culture 'individuals are motivated by the ideological appeal of the task being undertaken' though not by rules and the formalities associated with hierarchical culture. With this in mind as well as their own and other research indicating the positive impact of a clearly articulated mission, Moynihan and Pandey (2004: 433) argue that 'the success of organizations in communicating the goal of the agency and the employee's role in fulfilling this goal has a significant effect on performance'. In addition to a developmental organizational culture with a focus on goal clarity, employees in this study associated decentralized decision-making and the support of elected officials with organizational effectiveness.

- 2.11 Each of these models represent 'ideal types'; in other words they are unlikely to exist in reality in such stark and exclusive form within any one organization. Rather, as Zammuto and Krakower (1991) note, all organisations are likely to exhibit these types to varying degrees, rather than simply fall into one type or another. More detailed accounts of organisational culture distinguish between integrated and differentiated conceptualisations of culture:

'The integration perspective views cultural change as process by which a set of unifying and homogeneous values replace a different set of previously held organisation-wide values. This approach suggests that culture can be 'managed' to achieve organisation-wide consensus and shared values... Culture became a fad in management and organisational research and was seen as providing a quick fix for managers seeking to improve productivity or organisational performance more generally. In contrast, the differentiation perspective rejects the concept of an organisation-wide consensus or value framework, emphasising the importance of subcultures linked to demographics or professional occupational categories' (Parker & Bradley 2000: 127).

Organisational culture in the public sector

- 2.12 During the last few decades the imperative for change within the public sector, for most countries in the developed world, has come from a number of sources. Predominant among these has been the introduction of 'new public management'; that is, managerial approaches intended to increase cost-efficiency, accountability and measurable improvements to services. Associated changes include much greater emphasis on performance management and decentralisation of operations. According to some scholars, these transformations have taken place without sufficient sensitivity to the cultural characteristic of public sector organisations (Sinclair, 1991, cited in Parker and Bradley, 2000).
- 2.13 Although, as we have noted above, empirical evidence on organisational culture in the public sector remains limited, it has been suggested that public sector employees may have different values than their private sector counterparts:

‘The small body of research on the values of public sector employees suggests that public sector employees are more altruistic than private sector employees and that they have a commitment to social development and the pursuit of the public interest (Sinclair, 1991)’ (Parker and Bradley, 2000: 138).

- 2.14 A more recent study by Norris (2003) sought to identify whether government workers have distinctive work orientations, motivational values and employment experiences in comparison with private sector workers. It drew on the International Social Survey Program examining work orientations in over 24 nations. The analysis found that overall there was more concordance than difference between the work-related perspectives of public and private sector employees. For instance, there was no difference in the degree of job satisfaction experienced by public and private sector employees. Significantly, however, there were some differences reflecting alternative occupational values. The public sector respondents conveyed a stronger sense of having a mission and performing a contributory role in society. More specifically, they perceived themselves as serving the public, reflecting what may be described as a ‘public service ethos’.
- 2.15 Two key questions arise. If there is a distinctive culture in the public sector, is it a ‘positive’ one, in harmony with policy and service goals? And, if it is in some way negative or counter-productive, how readily can it be changed?

Organisational culture and change

- 2.16 Can organisational culture be changed? Thompson et al (1996: 647) distinguish between representations of culture as a characteristic of the organisation which can be changed by management edict and representations of it as intrinsic to an organisation’s essential make-up. In the latter case, the task of culture change is a much greater challenge, requiring moulding through skilled strategy and negotiation.
- 2.17 An Australian study (Parker and Bradley, 2000) which looked at organisational culture in six public sector organisations found that, despite being encouraged to adopt alternative values of change, flexibility, entrepreneurialism, outcomes, efficiency and productivity, these public sector organisations continued to emphasize the values of a bureaucratic or hierarchical organisational culture. According to the authors of this study,

‘The literature on public organisations... suggests that they have traditionally under-emphasised developmental and rational aspects of organisational culture because they have lacked an orientation towards adaptability, change and risk-taking (developmental culture) and they have lacked an orientation towards outcomes such as productivity and efficiency (rational culture). Instead these organisations have been oriented towards

a hierarchical culture because of their emphasis on rules, procedures and stability.’ (Parker and Bradley, 2000:130-131)

- 2.18 These investigators note the persistence of a focus on internal processes, rules and regulations even though respondents expressed a preference for alternative organizational models with greater flexibility, and more focus on productivity, outcomes and human relations.

Resistance and change readiness

- 2.19 Human resistance has been identified by some as the main obstacle to successful organisational change (Szabla, 2007). A soft version of this argument is that the occupational culture defines what the work force does to the extent that change cannot be simply imposed from above, while a hard version represents employees as more actively resistant to change. In other analyses, resistance is represented as a potentially constructive factor in the process of change because it can be a source of information and can stimulate communication. Szabla (2007) argues that a multi-dimensional understanding of the phenomenon of organisational resistance, taking account of cognitive, emotional and intentional aspects, is needed in order to understand and manage its effect on planned change. Towards this, formulations which incorporate both ‘resistance’ and ‘change readiness’ in staged models of change (e.g. Reynolds, 1994, cited in Keup, et al 2001) appear helpful.

‘The notion of readiness for change can be defined as the extent to which employees hold positive views about the need for organizational change (i.e. change acceptance), as well as the extent to which employees believe that such changes are likely to have positive implications for themselves and the wider organization’ (Jones et al 2005: 362)

- 2.20 Keup et al (2001:27) suggest that institutional readiness for change is inversely related to the resistance experienced during the transformation effort. Similarly, Jones et al (2005: 362) argue:

‘the reason so many change efforts run into resistance or outright failure is traceable to the organization’s inability to effectively unfreeze and create readiness for change before attempting a change induction. In this respect, organizations often move directly into change implementation before the individual or the group to be changed is psychologically ready.’ (Jones et al. 2005: 362).

- 2.21 Accordingly, researchers of organizational change have sought to identify factors that might promote more positive attitudes to intended change. Variables identified as influencing change readiness include: employees’ perceptions of their organization’s structural and operational flexibility and their beliefs about its ‘reshaping capabilities’ (its preparedness to take on large-scale change); and

supportive and participative working cultures that are strong in human relations values (Jones, et al, 2005). Unsurprisingly therefore, studies on how to achieve change readiness lead back to organisational culture. Keup, et al (2001: 25) propose that institutional readiness for transformation efforts should be preceded by the nurturing of a culture of trust, and the introduction of open, participative planning strategies.

The role of leadership

2.22 There is extensive debate in the literature about the relative importance of leadership in bringing about improvement and change in organisations; however, the bulk of the evidence is supportive of claims that leadership matters (Fernandez and Rainey, 2006). This is no less true of change management in the public sector. Investigation by Borins (1998; 2002) into the role of leadership in successful 'turnarounds' of public departments that had failed to meet expectations found that their in-depth knowledge of the operations, good relations with key stakeholders and their professional knowledge were more critical than their possession of those characteristics which are the hallmarks of transformational leaders such as charisma and vision. Moreover, they were able to regain the confidence of politicians in their organization, and to convince dispirited staff that change is possible.

2.23 A case study by Joyce (2004) investigated the nature of leadership which accompanied the successful turnaround of the London borough of Newham County Council during the 1990s; according to performance indicators applied by the Audit Commission, Newham was 31st out of 33 London boroughs in 1996 when Wendy Thomson became its chief executive. It was third when she left in 1999. The main message drawn from this case study is that successful leadership seems to blur the usual distinction between managers and leaders. As well as communicating a vision of change, effective leader-managers involve themselves in the operational detail and community context of the organization. This involves not only knowledge but being visibly in touch with operational people and issues. Furthermore they need energy and resilience to cope with resistance and to get people to own the numbers in performance measurements and see what aspects need improving. They also articulate a strategy that gains the support of higher authorities such as council leaders and politicians.

Beyond cultural models of change

2.24 The previous discussion indicates that in order to change an organisation or to gain significant improvement it is necessary to change the culture and put people first. A broader exploration of the literature, particularly the academic literature, makes clear that this is widely disputed. Key criticisms of change models which give a critical role to culture include the following (adapted from Wilson, 1992: 73-75):

- There is a lack of sustained empirical support.
- Supportive studies have not employed rigorous methodologies, such as strategic sampling.
- There are alternative explanations for the success, such as monopoly position in the market.
- This model of change assumes a simple, causal relationship between culture and performance.
- The literature lacks intellectual justification and a convincing theoretical basis.

2.25 Wilson (1992: 91) concludes that:

‘to effect change in an organization simply by attempting to change its culture assumes an unwarranted linear connection between something called organizational culture and performance. Not only is this concept of organizational culture multi-faceted, it is also not always clear precisely how culture and change are related, if at all, and, if so, in which directions.’

2.26 Beyond the cultural theories, there is a vast literature on organisational change. In a comprehensive review of the literature, Kezar (2001) building on the work of Van de Ven and Poole (1995) developed a typology of change theories, including six theoretical models: evolutionary; lifecycle; teleological; political; social-cognitive; as well as cultural. Each of these reflects different ideologies and assumptions, but each is of distinctive value in illuminating why and how change occurs in organizations.

2.27 **Evolutionary models**, sometimes referred to as environmental theories, assume that change is shaped by circumstances and the environment. The organisation adapts in order to survive when situational variables demand it. These models are deterministic in that managers and workers are seen as having little or no impact on the change process. Rather, change is mostly unplanned and the role of human agency and strategic choices are understated. Metaphors used in this literature include homeostasis (to model self-regulation and maintenance of a steady state of equilibrium between the system and environment) and the constant nest building of termites in unplanned reaction to external erosion. These models have been criticised for over-emphasising environmental constraints and neglecting the role of social phenomena and human agency and creativity. They are valuable, however, in conceptualising organizations as systems upon which unplanned, external influences act as forces of change.

2.28 **Teleological models** include models of planned change, scientific management, organisational development and adaptive learning approaches. The unifying assumption is that organizations are purposeful and that change occurs because leaders, change agents, and others make it happen. Change is represented as a process that may be controlled via assessment and planning, goal-setting and strategy, and incentives and rewards. A suitable ‘change-master’ and clear organising principles are central to this process, and, dating from the 1950s, the

teleological tradition is replete with studies of effective leadership and strategies for organizational development, as well as investigations of total quality management (TQM) and reengineering. While leaders are attributed with the main role in creating change, the teleological model is credited with recognising the importance of workers as active participants in the organisation and stimulating research on resistance to change and on cultural values and norms. However, teleological models have been criticised for crediting managers with unrealistic levels of power to influence change, and for representing organisations as static until reformed by managers. Change is portrayed as a rational, linear process while chaotic and extrinsic influences, as portrayed in evolutionary models, are understated.

- 2.29 **Life cycle models** are similar to evolutionary models but focus on the importance of people in the change process. Change is seen as a natural progression within a pre-determined cycle of progressive stages of maturity. Employees in the organization adjust to these changes, under the guidance of managers and with appropriate training and communication structures. All people in the organization are necessarily involved in this change process, and the outcome is a new organizational identity. The life-cycle paradigm is helpful in drawing attention to the occurrence of progressive phases through which organisations pass, and in shifting the focus from leaders to other participants. However, the model so far lacks empirical support and, like the evolutionary model, has been criticised for its deterministic slant.
- 2.30 **Dialectical models** characterise change as the result of an eventual clash between polar opposite belief systems. It is assumed that conflict within organizations is inevitable because norms, values and beliefs always coexist with their polar opposite. (Interestingly, Czarniawska and Sevon (1996) identified the literature on change itself as being dialectically patterned, with evolutionary and planned change models representing opposites). A modified ideology or identity emerges from the dialectical conflict, though without necessarily improving the organization. The concept of 'social movement' is primary in this model. Many of the employees may remain inactive during the process, but the momentum for change comes from collective action, for example bargaining by workers' unions.
- 2.31 **Social-cognitive models** of change have flourished during the last two decades. Drawing mainly from phenomenological or social-constructivist views of organizations, they build on social-psychological studies of knowledge structures (schema) and thinking processes (such as cognitive dissonance). According to this model, change in organizations occurs as a reaction to tensions and strains between activities and what is valued. Change is not the product of a leader's vision or management strategies, although leaders may influence the process by reframing operations in ways which help individuals to reinterpret aspects of the organization and its environment and to make sense of things differently. The outcome of change is a new frame of mind or world view. The main contribution of the social-cognitive model is its focus on the interpersonal and human aspects of change, providing a more nuanced account of *how* change occurs. It illustrates,

for example, that planned change may fail because germane aspects have not been understood by individuals or because the relevant learning has not taken place.

- 2.32 **Cultural approaches** emphasise the role of symbolism, core beliefs, rituals, myths and deeper realities that are embedded in an organization's history and traditions. Like social-cognitive approaches, cultural models allow that change can be either planned or unplanned and involves modification of beliefs. Employees' sense of the legitimacy or otherwise of developments is more critical to change than productivity and outputs, Theorists adopting cultural approaches argue that change management needs to be sympathetic to underlying cultural perspectives, and may necessitate modification of employees' shared meanings and understandings. Many studies in the cultural vein focus on how leaders might reshape organizational culture, for example by 'interpretative strategy' using orienting metaphors and other techniques to guide reconstruction of shared understandings. A strength of cultural models is their focus on values and beliefs, but assumptions that cultures can be managed or changed are seen by critics as simplistic and impracticable.
- 2.33 Amongst the above models, the teleological model and evolutionary model are more developed and more often applied, emphasising, respectively, planned change and adaptive change. These two models have contrasting assumptions, reflected in dichotomies such as deterministic versus intentional accounts of change and emphasis on its social versus technical aspects. The other models have been developed partly to reconcile some of the conflicting assumptions of planned change and adaptive change models. There are also several 'combined models' that bring together elements from several in the present typology (Kezar, 2001).
- 2.34 Paton and Mordaunt's (2004) comparative study of the experiences of turnaround or attempted turnaround in both non-profit and for-profit organizations highlights various contextual complicating factors for public bodies that do not feature in the accounts of corporate recovery. They underscore in particular 'the continuing, pervasive and extended nature of the "politics" involved' (2004: 215); in other words, networks of stakeholders and professional services, and the necessity of negotiation with external lines of authority for the freedom to act on decisions.

The success and failure of change processes

- 2.35 The statistics commonly cited for the extent to which attempted turnarounds fail are hardly inspirational for any aspiring change leader/manager. One standard text estimated that between 40% and 70% of change initiatives fail (Burns, 2000). Three factors that are consistently identified as pivotal in the outcomes of planned change take us back to cultural models of change: these are 'resistance to change', 'change readiness' and 'leadership'. Though 'resistance' and 'readiness' have generated separate streams of investigation, analysis on one almost invariably heralds discussion of the other. Likewise, the extensive body of work on leadership in management overlaps with the literature on employee attitudes to change.

2.36 One recent study of innovation in the public sector (Albury, 2005) notes that '[i]t is important also to recognize the barriers to innovation. Barriers have to be lowered or removed if high rates of successful and systemic innovation are to be achieved. Although there are different perspectives on these barriers or inhibitors, they include:

- Short-term budgets and planning horizons: hence one of the reasons for the current UK Government introducing three-year Spending Reviews and three-year, rather than annual, budgets in major parts of the public sector.
- Poor skills in active risk or change management; HM Treasury and other UK government departments are taking forward many of the recommendations in the Strategy Unit's November 2002 report, *Risk: Improving Government's Capability in Handling Risk and Uncertainty*.
- Few rewards or incentives to innovate or adopt innovations.
- Technologies available but constraining cultural or organizational arrangements.
- Over-reliance on current high performers as sources of innovation.
- Reluctance to close down failing programmes or organizations: various forms of intervention regimes are tackling this (but see also the discussion below on contestability).
- Culture of risk aversion.
- Delivery pressures and administrative burdens: devolution and flexibility to the 'front-line'—two of this Government's principles of public service reform—are now a major part of departmental plans and strategies.

[extract from Albury, 2005: 55]

2.37 Studies have also identified common change-facilitating factors:

- The most important critical success factor is an effective set of linkages and relations between the innovators and the end-users, and between elements of the 'supply chain' (Clayton, 2003).
- A senior-level champion for each innovation is vital, especially for support and determination through the hard times which nearly all innovations encounter during their development.
- The first innovator is not necessarily the most successful innovator (CAT scanners are a classic case study), the first version of an innovation is rarely the form in which it finally 'stabilizes', and applications of innovations are not always those expected.
- Innovations are generally not singletons; there are often parallel developments in the same or proximate areas.
- Across sectors there is a complex relationship between the degree of competition, 'market' concentration and rates of innovation.

[extract from Albury, 2005: 51-52]

2.38 Although we can learn from the general literature on managing change, most of it applies to the business sector. In a climate of frequent political and legislative

changes and insufficient resources, it is arguably more challenging to bring about change in public sector bodies than in private sector companies (Robertson et al 1995; Rusaw, 2007). As is noted by the authors of the standard UK text on public management reform, there is a paucity of rigorous, empirical research on the outcome of the extensive reforms in recent years to improve public services (Pollitt and Bouckaert, 2004). They argue however that there is little doubt that the new public management reforms which have taken place in many public sector agencies in many countries have resulted in greater productivity and measurable outputs, and that it would ‘take a giant dose of cynicism to arrive at the conclusions that nothing had changed and that the productivity of specific organizations had remained static’ (p139). Nevertheless they conclude that the dearth in empirical research leaves us without ‘a science of improvement’ to be applied in public sector reform.

2.39 This is not to claim there are no empirical studies that cover aspects of how public managers have achieved change. But what little there is about how to pursue successful reforms in the public sector typically takes us back, once more, to the issues of organisational culture and employee resistance to or readiness for change, and leadership skills (see preceding section).

2.40 A broader review of research on the implementation of large-scale, planned change was recently undertaken by Fernandez and Rainey (2006) in order to learn about its relevance for further research and application in public sector reforms. Their coverage and selective focus, as they acknowledge, emphasizes the role of human agency in initiating and taking responsibility for organizational change. Despite differences in the theoretical underpinnings of empirical studies reviewed, they observed considerable consensus in the factors identified as contributing to success. They converted these common themes into the following testable propositions, offering them for further research and for consideration by those leading the implementation of change:

Determinants of Successful Implementation of Organizational Change in the Public Sector (Source: Table 1 in Fernandez and Rainey, 2006: 7)

Ensure the need: Managerial leaders must verify and persuasively communicate the need for change.

- Convince organizational members of the need and desirability for change.
- Craft a compelling vision of change.
- Employ written and oral communication and forms of active participation to communicate and disseminate the need for change.

Provide a plan: Managerial leaders must develop a course of action or strategy for implementing change.

- Devise a strategy for reaching the desired end state, with milestones and a plan for achieving each one of them.
- The strategy should be clear and specific; avoid ambiguity and inconsistencies in the plan.

- The strategy should rest on sound causal theory for achieving the desired end state.

Build internal support and overcome resistance: Managerial leaders must build internal support and reduce resistance to change through widespread participation in the change process and other means.

- Encourage participation and open discussion to reduce resistance to change.
- Avoid criticism, threats, and coercion aimed at reducing resistance to change.
- Commit sufficient time, effort, and resources to manage participation effectively.

Ensure top management support and commitment. An individual or group within the organization should champion the cause for change.

- An "idea champion" or guiding coalition should advocate for and lead the transformation process.
- Individuals championing the change should have the skill and acumen to marshal resources and support for change, to maintain momentum, and to overcome obstacles to change.
- Political appointees and top-level civil servants should support the change.

Build external support. Managerial leaders must develop and ensure support from political overseers and key external stakeholders.

- Build support for and commitment to change among political overseers.
- Build support for and commitment to change among interest groups with a stake in the organization.

Provide resources. Successful change usually requires adequate resources to support the change process.

- Provide adequate amounts of financial, human, and technological resources to implement change.
- Avoid overtaxing organizational members.
- Capitalize on synergies in resources when implementing multiple changes simultaneously.

Institutionalize change. Managers and employees must effectively institutionalize changes.

- Employ a variety of measures to displace old patterns of behaviour and institutionalize new ones.
- Monitor the implementation of change.
- Institutionalize change before shifts in political leadership cause commitment to and support for change to diminish.

Pursue comprehensive change. Managerial leaders must develop an integrative, comprehensive approach to change that achieves subsystem congruence.

- Adopt and implement a comprehensive, consistent set of changes to the various subsystems of the organization.
- Analyze and understand the interconnections between organizational subsystems before pursuing subsystem congruence.

(Fernandez and Rainey, 2006: 7)

- 2.41 Although these factors and propositions are set out in way that might suggest a linear sequence of steps to be taken, Fernandez and Rainey point out that, though additive in value, each of these factors need to be present and each might be contributory at different points in time.

Meta-governance and non-managed change

- 2.42 Beyond proactive theories of organizational improvement and change which focus on strategic approaches, there lie wider influences that are beyond the control of managers. Institutional theorists have proposed that organizations in the same domain tend to become similar over time because of wider forces, or may be affected by a wave of change impacting on all occupational sectors and larger systems. Some contributions to discussions about change in public service organisations have focused on these wider influences and what they mean for change management strategies. Joldersma and Winter (2002: 88) for example argue that the managerial focus should now be on ‘meta-governance’, defined as ‘creating the conditions for strategic change’, two forms of which are: self-governance and external governance. Based on case-studies, they propose that public services can apply a form of analytical meta-governance whereby, as hybrid organisations, they can modify their organizational context, shift the balance between the extent to which they are constrained by government and without control by holding on to what is valued but also being innovative and prospecting for new opportunities.
- 2.43 While the preceding study takes an optimistic view of the control that might be regained through self meta-governance, this stance also highlights the extent to which the organisational context is shaped by both ‘exogenous and endogenous developments [and notes that] environmental forces ... determine the organization’s strategic space and internal cultural attitudes and structures regarding strategic decision-making’ (Joldersma and Winter 2002: 90). The unpredictability of events results in a level of uncertainty. This is compounded by the need to manage stakeholders and the politics of this becomes more complicated as the numbers of stakeholders increase.
- 2.44 Better recognition by managers of what they cannot influence, and acceptance of randomness in the unfolding of events, may help reduce the psychological strain of organizational reform (Bordia, et al, 2004) and give a more realistic edge to change plans. This may mean abandoning detailed strategies for the next twenty years in favour of shorter timeframes (Tschirhart, 2006).

3. CHANGING COMMUNITY JUSTICE

Introduction

- 3.1 The preceding section has demonstrated the difficulties of managing change in public sector organisations characterised by complex and contested purposes, partnership arrangements and political contexts. Given these characteristics, the prevalence of hierarchical cultures with an internal and control-based focus makes some sense, but such cultures may also underlie both a lack of readiness for change and the sometimes slow pace of cultural change on the public sector. Equally, problems with securing change in public sector cultures and practices may reflect the mismanagement and/or poor leadership of such change efforts. With this in mind, in this section we turn our attention towards attempts to reform probation, offender management or community corrections. It is now almost impossible to discuss such services without attending to the concept of change as a defining feature of them - be that cultural, structural, professional, or procedural. Indeed, for those engaged in the policy and practice of community justice over the last decade, change would appear to be one of the few observed constants. The drivers for change in this area are multiple and diverse, ranging from changes in policy trends and legislative developments, to shifting modes of governance and professional leadership, to the relentless modernisation of public services with the associated rise of consumer culture.
- 3.2 Despite change - and the process of change - being a key feature of community justice, critical research attention to this phenomena and to the effective management of change within the field is notably scarce. Most of the literature that does attend to this issue is focussed on recent implementation efforts in respect of the Home Office's 'Effective Practice Initiative'. More recently, some research attention has been paid to the change processes associated with the development of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) in England and Wales (Robinson and Rex, 2007) and a small number of studies can be found which attend to 'other', and often smaller scale, change initiatives and developments within the field. Examples of the latter include: the development of evidence based practice in particular regions (Raynor & Miles, 2007; McIvor, 2004); the development of anti-racist practice in the prison and probation services (Bhui, 2006); the progressive reduction (until recently at least) of the prison population in the Netherlands (Downes, 1998); the implementation of structured assessment tools in probation (Robinson, 2003) and the reorganization of probation officer training in England and Wales (Aldridge, 1999). This section will review this diverse, albeit limited, collection of 'change' literature, with a view to (i) identifying the key features of recent change processes within the field of criminal and community justice and (ii) establishing what can be learnt from these processes regarding the effective management of change in community justice.

The Home Office Effective Practice Initiative

3.3 One of the striking features of discussion and analysis of the Effective Practice Initiative (EPI) implementation process is the notable commonalities between accounts. While there exists considerable debate as to the merits or otherwise of the 'effective practice' or 'what works?' literature itself, discussion of the *implementation* of the EPI is predominantly critical (see for example: Kemshall et al, 2004; Raynor, 2002; Nellis, 2002; Mclvor, 2004). There is a general acknowledgement within the literature that the EPI has not achieved what it set out to achieve. For many, this relates to a perception that the crucial organisational and professional prerequisites of effective change - which were set out in some detail by Underdown in 1998 (Home Office, 1998) - have been overlooked in the rush to roll out the 'product'. Typically, discussion of this process highlights four key features of implementation, giving particular attention to: the scale of change; the pace of change; the level of 'central driving', and the considerable role of the Probation Inspectorate (and other performance and monitoring systems) in 'taking forward' the EPI.

The scale of change

3.4 The scale of change - or at least change expectation - imposed on the probation service via the EPI has been variously described as 'vast', 'unprecedented', 'transformative' and 'deep-rooted'. Indeed, whilst there exists considerable debate as to what has been achieved by the implementation process, there is little debate as to the scale of what was envisaged. Further, as Nellis (2002) observes, the predominant emphasis in this change initiative has been firmly upon what Giddens (1991) terms 'detraditionalisation' - that is, a process of 'deep rooted cultural change ... leading the service against the grain of its past history and traditions', as set out by the National Probation Service director, Eithne Wallis, in her outline of the service's 'new' project and mission (Wallis, 2000: 5). Comment on the legitimacy of this change initiative - and its associated objectives - is beyond the scope of this discussion. However, the scale and nature of change imposed is significant both in itself, and in considering the accompanying features of the process through which change has been 'achieved'.

The pace of change

3.5 The scale of change is frequently noted alongside observation regarding the 'pace' of change accompanying EPI implementation activity - considered by most observers to have been 'swift' to say the least. While some acknowledge the considerable achievement of this feat on the part of the Home Office and the probation service (see for example, Raynor, 2002), much of the analysis in this area is more critical. Kemshall et al (2004) draw attention to the perception that implementation has been 'forced' and rushed through in the absence of sufficient evidence of effectiveness and/or resourcing. Others highlight the erosive nature

of the 'top down' drive towards 'higher speed change', impacting variously on: staff ownership of 'what works' (Kemshall et al, 2004; Mclvor, 2004), the marginalisation of other, more time-intensive, forms of practice (Bhui, 2006) and staff morale and motivation for change (Lynch, 2004). The most detailed analysis of the impact of the 'pace' of recent change initiatives is provided by Nellis (2002). In this important paper, Nellis (2002) not only calls into question the time given for change implementation but suggests that the failure of recent effective practice change initiatives needs to be understood within the context of the irrational, managerial and linear conceptions of time dominating such initiatives. For Nellis (2002) such conceptions are grossly at odds with the feasible timescales required to effectively implement and achieve change in the individualised and complex context of offenders' lives and communities. By contrast, and drawing on strategic change models developed by Das (1993) and Whipp (1994), Nellis advocates an approach to change which, from the outset, is conceived more as 'a negotiation of a process' than 'the imposition of a blueprint'. In such an approach, change outcomes are not something that can be 'ordered into existence by what are largely electorally-driven deadlines set by government' (Nellis, 2002: 63). Rather:

'Strategic change is regarded as a continuous process, which occurs in given contexts – including the historical, organisational and economic circumstances which condition its form. The keynote of the processual approach is that strategy does not move forward inevitably in sequential phases. On the contrary, the pattern is more commonly iterative and highly uncertain.' (Whipp, 1994: 107).

- 3.6 In a service delivery context where outcomes are complex, environments are diverse and change partnerships are, ultimately, voluntary, the approach advocated by Nellis (2002) makes considerable sense. However, in a political climate where these daily realities are routinely eclipsed by a change narrative predicated on urgency, inevitability and a sense of time running out (not least for governments, between elections), our ability to receive and implement such messages remains questionable.

The level of 'central driving'

- 3.7 Perhaps the most significant feature of the EPI implementation is what Kemshall et al (2004) refer to as 'the level of central driving'. Though some accounts acknowledge the contribution of localised practitioner or 'grass root' initiatives in the initial rise of effective practice (Raynor, 2002), in its 'official' form the EPI is generally recognised as being a carefully crafted and meticulously managed product of central Home Office control. Launched and, as Underdown (2001) notes, massively resourced by the Home Office in 1998, the EPI set out a national implementation plan for the effective supervision of offenders in England and Wales (Home Office, 1998). The plan was both explicit and extensive in its detail and direction, placing 'unprecedented demand upon probation areas to implement a detailed curriculum of What Works programme for offenders'

(Kemshall, et al 2004: 170). More specifically, the plan stipulated that probation services across the country should 'ensure that every offender is supervised in accordance with those principles which have been shown to reduce expected rates of re-offending' (Home Office, 1998). In addition to prescribing the 'what' of probation practice, accompanying changes in the structure and professional direction of the service saw increasing levels of centralised control being brought to bear on 'how' that was to be achieved. In essence, a series of Home Office driven professional, organisational and structural reforms were brought to bear on the service as part of a broader project to create an organisation which could be more effectively managed and directed from the centre (Raynor, 2002). The objective was very clearly to ensure that central policy initiatives could be more smoothly implemented without local or professional priorities dominating or distracting.

- 3.8 Arguably, the level of central direction, prescription and control emanating from the Home Office in this area merely reflects the urgency, nature and scale of change required. Indeed, an Audit Commission (2001) paper on organisational change suggests that centrally driven approaches – coined by the authors as 'step-directive' or 'strategic surgery' - can be successful where 'a radical shift is needed'. The existence of such knowledge, set amidst the rising tide of political dissatisfaction and distrust of the probation service, the increasing politicisation of penalty and the 'poor outcomes' associated with the content and quality of probation practice across England and Wales (see for example, Home Office, 1998), perhaps go some way towards explaining why such an approach was seen as necessary. However, concern regarding the level of central direction accompanying the EPI rests less with the approach *per se* and more with the means by which that was enacted. For example, many observers have made reference to the 'remorseless managerialism' accompanying the EPI implementation, a process which has arguably seen the ideal of strong central guidance transposed into the imposition of a narrowly conceived, highly standardised model of effective practice (Nellis, 2002) - a process which Nellis goes on to observe was 'less about requiring that staff implement a vision' and more about 'foisting on them a concrete set of preordained actions' (Nellis, 2002: 63).
- 3.9 Various commentators further suggest that such an approach (i.e. highly centralised, standardised and prescriptive) is potentially at odds with the form, culture and function of the organisation. Burnett (1996), for example, draws attention to the traditional individualism of probation service delivery, while Robinson (2003, 2005) acknowledges the centrality of professional discretion and 'indeterminacy' in effective assessment and intervention. Similarly, Bhui (2006) highlights the service's distinct humanitarian ethos and person-centred value base, which he argues have long underpinned both the 'what' and the 'how' of effective probation practice. For all of these authors the professional discretion, autonomy and context specific knowledge deemed intrinsic to the achievement of effective probation practice would seem to be entirely at odds with the technical rationality, knowledge and expertise increasingly prioritised by recent centrally-

driven initiatives. More generally, Duffee (1984) and Nellis (2002) - writing at different times and from different contexts - call into question the feasibility of a standardised national approach to change, arguing that successful policy implementation also requires attention to the spatial, environmental and community dimensions of change. As Nellis (2002) observes:

‘Although lip service is paid to the idea of respecting the local pace of change, the idea that any locality, of any size, might legitimately want or need to develop its responses to offenders and victims differently from the national model – concentrating more on restorative justice, for example – does not come in to play.’ (Nellis, 2002: 69)

- 3.10 While then the level and form of ‘central driving’ is, without question, seen as integral to the perceived ‘impact’ of the Effective Practice Initiative, it is also considered by many to have been critical to the service’s failure to achieve the outcomes envisaged. Looking on, what emerges is a picture of a change initiative which is keenly felt but not owned by many within the service; which has seen the compartmentalisation and erosion of complex practice rather than its integration and cohesion; and which has resulted in an approach to practice which, rather than contributing to a more meaningful engagement with the problem in its varied and complex manifestations, is considered by many to have become detached, simplistic and self-serving (Robinson, 2003; Kemshall et al, 2004).

The role of HMIP and other performance management systems

- 3.11 The final feature of the EPI worthy of note here is the role of Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP) in taking the EPI forward. Closely associated with centralisation, the level and nature of performance inspection and monitoring accompanying the EPI implementation process is considered by many observers to have been critical to the impact of the EPI and, to a lesser extent, the outcomes achieved. Certainly, there exists something of a consensus within the literature regarding the usefulness of accountability and performance management systems in supporting the process of effective change. However, both theory and practice in this area highlight that the validity and usefulness of such systems are largely dependent on (i) mechanisms being in place which have the potential to achieve the desired change (i.e. responsive management systems, adequate resourcing, reasonable timescales etc), and (ii) the development of intelligent and meaningful performance and progress indicators (Nellis 2002, Robinson, 2003). With regard to the implementation of the EPI, again, there exists some speculation regarding the extent to which these conditions have been and are being met. Drawing on the same limited body of literature, at best the picture emerging is of an organisation desperately seeking to progress the array of demands placed upon it whilst being directed through that process by a series of centrally defined targets and performance indicators. At worst, one observes an organisation grappling with an ever expanding array of change directives in a practice context of pressure, inadequate resourcing, insufficient time and, arguably, inappropriate expectation.

From this position it finds itself subject to an 'unprecedented level of accountability and scrutiny' (Kemshall, et al, 2004, p.181) in the form of inspection and monitoring systems which, though well intentioned, deny the embryonic and uncertain nature of the knowledge upon which they rely while actively marginalising 'other' forms of professional knowledge (i.e. experiential and contextual) once considered critical. Whatever one's perspective, the *potential* of performance management systems in supporting the management of change does not appear to be in debate. The *actual* ability of such systems to meaningfully support, engage and empower practitioners through the process of change would appear to be dependent on a range of other variables, many of which, at least in this initiative, appear to have been overlooked.

The National Offender Management Service

- 3.12 The National Offender Management Service was instituted in England and Wales in June 2004, following the *Correctional Services Review* (the Carter Report) calling for an integration of probation and prison services in the provision of 'end-to-end' management of offenders throughout custodial and community elements of their sentences. Over a year after this major development, two studies were carried out to investigate the perspectives of frontline staff on its impact and implications for their organizations, for service users and for their professional roles. Interviews were held with 41 probation practitioners from four Probation Service Areas (Robinson and Burnett 2007) and with 87 prison staff across seven Prison Service Areas (Burnett and Stevens, 2007).
- 3.13 In both services, there was extensive lack of knowledge about the precise nature and purposes of developments taking place, about what had occurred already and what was yet to occur, and about the distinctions between NOMS-related changes and other initiatives. While senior staff and managers tended to be more au fait with the documented objectives and implementation plans for NOMS, staff at all levels revealed doubts and ambivalence about the possible implications of these organizational changes.
- 3.14 They did not attribute these gaps in their knowledge and understanding to an absence of information about NOMS. Indeed, many of them suggested that there was information overload, especially via the intranet, if they found time or managed to access it. Rather than quantity it was the quality of information that was perceived to be insufficient. Uncertainty and confusion about NOMS was also the cumulative effect of having experienced so many reforms and new initiatives during recent years. For many of the prison staff, NOMS seemed 'nothing new' because sentence planning and some privatisation had been ushered in some time ago. And many of the probation staff, having already participated in the major reforms to the service in and since 2001, conveyed a sense of service goals having become a moving target, as a result of which they were experiencing 'initiative confusion' and 'change fatigue' (Robinson and Burnett, 2007).

- 3.15 Although these practitioners were open to NOMS resulting in positive outcomes, especially in providing resettlement services that would benefit prisoners, they expressed much doubt and ambivalence about the implications for the future of their service and their own professional roles. Given the threat of contestability and loss of work to the private sector, for the probation service this was combined with job insecurity, and the reframing of their practice into the model of offender management gave a sense of being alienated from the values and practices that had attracted them into the service. In general, morale was low among the probation sample (see also Farrow, 2006). Among the prison interviewees, the perceived impact on their own role was somewhat reversed. They had already survived, and if anything gained strength from, the encroachment of privatisation, and they envisaged a more varied and professionally satisfying role oriented towards the resettlement needs of prisoners. The majority of prison staff anticipated job stability and promotion, and their self-ratings of morale were accordingly much higher than those of probation staff.
- 3.16 Both studies revealed variability in how practitioners cope with protracted and impending organizational change. Some manage to remain positive and optimistic by narrowing their focus onto their immediate tasks and shutting out concerns about the future. Others become stressed and depressed, with the consequence that their commitment and ability to perform are compromised. Others become cynical and passively angry, and seek escape through sickness absence or resignation. Given gaps in understanding and the remote quality of the changes occurring, many referred to a sense of unreality or characterised NOMS as a 'dark shadow', a 'brewing thunderstorm' or the 'elephant in the room'. Such strategies of minimization or denial are understandable reactions to events over which they have neither control nor ownership.
- 3.17 It is clear from these two studies of practitioners' experiences of the transition to NOMS that there is a need for effective communication policies that will enable all staff to gain a clear understanding of the goals of change, the steps involved and how they will be affected. Interviewees expressed a preference for more personalised communications, such as meetings with their line managers, and more opportunities for dialogue. Succinct printed information and less reliance on the intranet would also be helpful in disseminating salient information. Clarity of purpose and up to date information on progress needs to be made available not only to frontline staff but especially to local managers so that they can convey a clear and positive message to staff. When changes are introduced that threaten the fundamental nature and continuation of people's jobs, there should be a more ethical, sensitive and proactive way of responding to the resulting job insecurity. The comparison between the levels of morale found in each of these professions, when faced with corresponding modifications to their work and services, is noteworthy. Though the prison staff were at least as unclear as probation staff about what NOMS would mean to them and their service, most of them were more upbeat about it and ready to take it on. Although the pre-change professional baseline positions for each of these services were not the same, presumably this difference in morale must partly be attributed to the respective

levels of job security and job satisfaction enjoyed. An obvious lesson for any 'change-master' is that when employees are faced with continuous and radical change they also need to be offered incentives and rewards.

'Other' community justice change initiatives

3.18 The findings emerging from the above analysis of the implementation of the EPI in England and Wales and the implementation of NOMS underscore that the achievement of meaningful change in community justice is a complex, multi-faceted and time-consuming process. Thus far, the discussion has focussed predominantly on features of change management to be avoided, or at least more critically and contextually considered. Indeed, any identification and analysis of key features of successful change has arisen more from a critique of what was not done in the implementation of these change processes than from what was. Turning our attention now to the literature reviewing 'other' change initiatives within the field of corrections, again, attention is given to the key features of these change processes and to what can be learnt from these more diverse examples.

3.19 The available literature in this area is naturally more diverse in its focus, tracing the implementation of change initiatives and processes as varied as the reorganisation of probation officer training in England and Wales (Aldridge, 1999) and the Netherlands' progressive programme of decarceration (Downes, 1988). Further, the studies examined present a more varied picture of the change process, including examples of both successful and less successful change initiatives. Amidst this diversity, each of the studies is united by an explicit forward-looking focus, in so far as selected examples of change are explored with a view to identifying what can be learnt in respect of future change processes in the field of corrections, both general and specific. For example, Bhui (2006) charts the development of anti-racist practice in the probation and prison services, with a view to highlighting the implications for the effective development of an anti-racist identify for NOMS. Similarly, Robinson (2003) considers the lessons to be learnt from the recent implementation of LSI-R and ACE, with a view to developing knowledge applicable to the implementation of OASys. Collectively, a number of lessons can be learnt from these studies in respect of effective change management, some of which resonate with the messages already highlighted, some of which take us into new territory.

The centrality of practitioners

3.20 Perhaps the most recurring finding to emerge from this collection of studies is the centrality of practitioners, and of forming constructive alliances with practitioners, in effective change management. Frequently constructed as obstacles to change or as sites of resistance (Colombo & Neary, 1998), many of the studies here attest to the need to understand the process of change from the perspective of practitioners, and to develop strategies of change management which recognise

and respond to practitioners' priorities and concerns (see for example: Lynch, 2004; McIvor, 2004; Robinson, 2003; Lewis, 1994; Dymond-Whyte, 1994).

- 3.21 Robinson's (2003) study in particular considers the implementation of change (in the area of structured assessment) from the perspective of practitioners, attending to the impact of change on practitioner perceptions of professionalism (a change 'issue' emerging from almost all of the studies reviewed). To summarise, her findings suggest that the introduction of structured assessment tools was associated by practitioners both with a potential for increased credibility and a heightened sense of professionalism, *and* with the erosion of professional discretion, the de-skilling of practice and a process of de-professionalization. Described by Robinson (2003) as the 'professional paradox' associated with the profession's collective ambivalence around the move towards structured approaches to assessment and intervention, Robinson's attention to this issue usefully underlines both the complexity of practitioner experiences of change, and the potential to more effectively support practitioners through change. Further, Robinson's findings contradict the notion of professional insecurity and ambivalence in this area as the preserve of a small minority of 'old guard' officers (a finding supported by the wider change literature reviewed above and by the most recent study of criminal justice social work in Scotland reviewed below). Rather, in Robinson's (2003) study, ambivalence and concern was voiced by 'a number of officers with varying degrees of experience and commitment to the instrument' (p.34).
- 3.22 For Robinson, this professional paradox – which, in the increasingly 'technical enterprise' of probation, clearly extends beyond the implementation of structured assessment tools -- needs to be recognised, legitimised and sensitively managed. Amongst other things, Robinson argues that this will involve assuring practitioners that change is in the interests of offenders, users and the probation service generally – a process which will require attention to the development of positive reinforcements for change, whether in the form of timely and relevant feedback or the development of meaningful research and information systems. Secondly, it is argued that practitioners need to be persuaded that the benefits of change outweigh the costs. This seems to be critical, and for Robinson (2003) extends beyond issues of time and resourcing to also entail critical discussion and debate regarding the perceived erosion of professional judgement increasingly associated with centrally driven change and reform. Evidently the change 'approach' advocated here extends beyond top down communication or information sharing. Rather, we see an approach to change in which practitioners are conceived of as active partners in the change process, integral not only to the effective implementation of change, but to the construction and achievement of outcomes which are in the interest of a much broader group of stakeholders.

Recovering an explicit value base

- 3.23 A further message to emerge from the studies reviewed is the significance of an organisation's value base and cultural identity in achieving positive change. In light of observations that the humanitarian ethos and value base of the probation service is being eroded – generally attributed to recent, centrally driven, programmes of change and reform (Nellis, 2002; Bhui, 2006) -- the fact that this issue emerges as a feature of successful change is significant. Charting the probation service's 'problematic but ultimately upwards journey' (p171) towards the outcome of anti-racist practice, Bhui (2006) argues that success in this area has been fuelled by effective strategic management coupled with the strong humanitarian ethos, value base and culture underpinning probation practice. By way of contrast, Bhui traces similar change efforts within the prison service, highlighting that, despite the development of effective management systems, successful and sustained change has been hampered by the overarching and 'hard to change' values and culture of the organisation – predicated, ultimately, on the enforcement, control and otherness of the offender. Bhui argues that the humanitarian, holistic and person-centred values held by staff within the probation service have been, and will continue to be, integral to the achievement of anti-racist outcomes within the service. Moreover, the existence and nurturing of such values are seen to be equally critical to the achievement of 'other' forms of practice routinely associated with ethical and effective practice (i.e. relational, responsive, individualised and contextualised practice).
- 3.24 In this respect, the comparative analysis presented by Bhui (2006) is both timely and cautionary. As probation, and criminal justice social work in Scotland, find themselves working through yet another cycle of organisational, structural and cultural change, in a climate where the explicit discussion and articulation of professional values appears to have become an unfashionable activity (Nellis, 2002; Bhui, 2006), there is arguably an urgent need for the recovery of debate in this area. Further, there exists a growing rationale within the research literature for the repositioning of professional and organisational values as a critical, or at the very least considered, feature of successful change and reform.

The development of clear, coherent and feasible change objectives

- 3.25 Finally, and closely associated with the above discussion, a few of the studies reviewed suggest that the nature and form of prescribed change objectives, and the dominant ideologies and beliefs underpinning them, would appear to be critical to the success or otherwise of the change process. This is particularly evident in the work of Carlen (2002) and Downes (1988) who, drawing on diverse examples of change efforts -- largely unsuccessful reform efforts in women's imprisonment and the progressive reduction of the prison population in The Netherlands respectively -- conclude that successful change requires the construction of, and sustained commitment to, a clear, coherent and feasible change objective. In tracing the Dutch experience, and contrasting that with less

successful change efforts in England and Wales, Downes (1998) suggests that the progressive reduction of the prison population in the Netherlands was associated with the construction of a coherent change objective, coupled with a sustained commitment to the values and ideologies underpinning that objective. For example, drawing on Rutherford's (1984) outline of the three main policy options available to penal institutions – expansionist, standstill and reductionist -- Downes posits that successful change in the Netherlands reflected the expressly reductionist nature of its change objective, and its associated belief in the limited capacity of penal establishments to combat and control crime. As Downes observes:

'The roots of reductionism seem to derive not so much from a free floating tolerance on the part of people in general but from the conviction of the most influential elites that crime is to be best combated by social and institutional, rather than specifically penal, means.' (Downes, 1988: 191).

3.26 Further, Downes suggests that sustained progress in the Netherlands (until more recently) was the product of a clearly focussed, carefully maintained, and effectively co-ordinated approach to policy development and change. By contrast, he argues that reform efforts in England and Wales have been characterised by ideological ambivalence, shifting trends and contradiction – all too often propped up by an impressive though at times distracting array of organisational objectives, themes and preoccupations. As Downes notes, decision makers and practitioners operating in this context, lacking an integrated sense of direction, often find themselves concentrating on the component parts of a given strategy rather than the whole. The fact that this observation is so salient to recent experiences of change and reform within NOMS (see for example, Robinson and Burnett, 2007) would suggest that, two decades on, we still have much to learn from such observations.

3.27 Though taking a different pathway, Carlen's (2002) study reaches similar conclusions. In tracing what she considers the failure of various reform efforts in the area of women's imprisonment, Carlen locates this failure with the absence of a coherent and common purpose:

'Reforms have repeatedly faltered because of a lack of holistic purpose within and between sectors and related agencies and, more importantly, between governments competing for populist electoral approval of their law and order policies' (Carlen, 2002: 76).

3.28 Further, and again in common with Downes (1988), Carlen (2002) argues that the nature, feasibility and ideological coherence of an organisation's change objectives are critical to the success or otherwise of such efforts. For example, for Carlen, within-prison reform is doomed from the start, in so far as 'the nature of imprisonment places severe limitations upon the potential scope of both prison reform and the capacity of in-prison programmes to reduce recidivism' (p86) – a conclusion also reached by Hannah Moffat (2001) in an earlier study.

3.29 As change initiatives in the area of offender management and community justice continue to be disseminated with what some observers have described as 'evangelical' fervour (Mair, 1997), these findings are significant and suggest the need for more critical attention to the nature and ideological coherence of change being sought, to the values and ideologies underpinning change, and to the ultimate feasibility of such objectives and their associated change strategies. To date, existing studies suggest that this form of normative thinking about change has not been a key feature of change and/or implementation efforts. Rather, recent change initiatives appear to have been characterised by what Nellis (2002) terms 'managerial utopianism' or, as Carlen (2002) puts it, histories of 'wishful thinking'.

4. CHANGING CRIMINAL JUSTICE SOCIAL WORK IN SCOTLAND

The Changing Culture(s) of Probation and Criminal Justice Social Work

4.1 The preceding section has highlighted a range of issues and problems linked to the pace, scale and management of change, as well as the extent to which it is centrally driven and/or practitioner owned. Our review has pointed to the importance of practitioners and their values in change processes, as well as to the degree of clarity of, coherence within and feasibility of change objectives. With these lessons in mind, in this last section, we turn directly to what is known from research about the development to date of criminal justice social work(s) cultures in Scotland.

Scottish probation

4.2 Though probation and criminal justice social work *practices* have been studied a number of times in Scotland in recent years, there has been very little work directly focused on understanding the *cultures* of criminal justice social work. A recent (and not yet published) oral history of Scottish probation in the 1960s (conducted by one of the authors – McNeill – and involving interviews both with ex-probation officers and with ex-probationers) suggests that the probation services from which criminal justice social work emerged were themselves complex and contested organisations. Probation officers' accounts of their pathways into probation work reveal a little about the ideologies and values that shaped these services. Their accounts stress not only the significance of the types of religious and political values that one might expect to find associated with humanitarian endeavour, but also of more mundane needs in the post-war years to find meaningful work that carried a degree of social status. Their accounts of their selection and recruitment suggest a preoccupation (amongst the selectors) with the creation of a workforce capable of engaging with people in adversity but unlikely to disrupt established hierarchies within the criminal justice system. Probation officers were often ambivalent about the power and status of courts and judges; though they sometimes experienced this as marginalising and even oppressive, they were also attracted to the associated status lent them as officers of the court.

4.3 Although they recollected their formal training to varying degrees, probation officers learned the job principally from their peers – a recurring finding in probation research. Such processes of professional socialisation may have had a conservative effect on Scottish probation's cultures, ensuring continuities with earlier eras and diminishing the practical impact of new strategies and techniques. Perhaps partly for this reason, the approaches to practice that they described were much less imbued with theories of 'social casework' than might be expected

from a reading of official and academic sources of the time (see McNeill 2005, McNeill and Whyte, 2007). Routine practice, most of it with young people, was focused principally on diversion and containment, with casework or ‘treatment’ approaches reserved for the small number of adults on probation, particularly those with mental health problems. In the course of their work, Scottish probation officers were also highly conscious of their engagements with local communities, working in a patch-based system to build ties to informal sources of social control and support (families, churches, employers, youth organisations, former probationers). They actively used such ties to try to bind probationers; ‘binding’ them sometimes in the sense of healing but also often in the sense of restraining. This engagement with and utilisation of community resources perhaps reflected Scottish probation’s distinctively local character; Scottish services were always aligned to local council areas rather than to courts, despite occasional criticisms of this model (see Morison, 1962).

- 4.4 Unfortunately, there has been no study to date of how the cultures and practices of the various social work agencies and workers came together in the forging of the generic social work departments. What does seem clear is that probation work somehow moved from being a higher-status form of social work to being a lower profile and lower status activity within those departments, perhaps largely because of the gendering of and gender dynamics within these new organisations. Many men probation officers quickly became managers of the generic social work teams, and their interests in probation may have been diminished by their recognition of the need to develop other services.

Social work with offenders

- 4.5 Just as the 1970s and 1980s were a fallow period for probation development in Scotland, they were a fallow period for probation research. The next significant Scottish study of probation – Ford and Ditton’s ‘Probation in Scotland’ was not published until 1992 (see also Ditton and Ford, 1994), although the fieldwork was conducted between 1985 and 1989, before the introduction of the National Objectives and Standards (SWSG, 1991). This study was described as a ‘formal ethnography’ but it was based mainly on interviews with social workers, judges and probationers and on case records, rather than on observational methods. Ford and Ditton discerned differences in general approaches amongst the social workers – describing some as ‘befrienders’, some as ‘rehabilitators’ and some as ‘supervisors’ – but also noted that social workers varied their approaches to suit the nature of the case in question. They identified some variations between generalist and specialist workers and found an association between ‘court agent based approaches’ and better levels of service. For persistent offenders at least, the most positive outcomes seemed to be achieved by workers who combined a court-agent approach with a rehabilitative focus, especially where such workers were more experienced, more specialised and better supervised. Interestingly, and much in line with the oral history study referred to above, Ditton and Ford found that:

'the ability to carry authority easily, showing firmness and control in a relaxed way... is important, as is the ability to confront the probationer in a straightforward way. 'Pushy' social workers, who consistently demand real effort and change, are seen as showing genuine interest and concern, helping to create and maintain the motivation of the probationer... in general, persistent offenders need persistent social workers' (Ditton and Ford, 1994: 189).

- 4.6 Leaving aside the question of the effectiveness of social work with offenders in the 1980s, what these findings perhaps reveal is some heterogeneity within criminal justice social work's evolving occupational or professional cultures. It appears that the variations in role construction may have reflected a range of professional ideologies and values. Certainly it seems that the practical and ideological embedding of probation work within the emergent cultures of the generic social work departments was far from straightforward and far from uniform.

The impact of national standards

- 4.7 The extensive research programme which evaluated the impact of the introduction in 1991 of the National Objectives and Standards (SWSG, 1991) found evidence that these ambiguities survived the creation of criminal justice social work as a separately funded specialism. Paterson and Tombs (1998) reported that while the reforms had ensured that the necessary organisational and managerial changes were effectively put in place, the success of the reforms also required a major shift in the professional culture, evidence of which was much more qualified. Essentially, they suggested that it would take time for social workers committed to a welfare model of practice (if indeed that is what they were) to adapt to the 'responsibility model' implicit in the national standards. In their view, the success of criminal justice social work in reducing the risk of custody and reducing the risk of reoffending – the 'new' policy objectives – depended precisely on this kind of longer-term cultural change 'from social workers as experts in welfare to the production of a new kind of social work expertise – an expertise in risk assessment to assist with the targeting of organisational resources and to indicate their potential to impact on criminal behaviour' (Paterson and Tombs, 1998: 61).

Contemporary criminal justice social work

- 4.8 By the early 2000s, some research evidence was emerging that this longer term cultural shift was indeed becoming evident. Robinson and McNeill (2004), for example, report the findings from a qualitative study conducted (by McNeill) in 2001-2002 which involved in-depth interviews and focus groups involving about 20 social workers. They found that the social workers tended to accept public protection as an overarching aim, but that they typically insisted that protecting

communities *required* helping offenders; that the social work relationship was their primary vehicle for change, and that both offending behaviour and their efforts to bring about change had to be located in their wider social contexts. These ways of linking public protection and social welfare concerns perhaps reflect the Scottish policy context in suggesting a broader concept of rehabilitation connected with social inclusion agendas. However, they also illustrate how, at the front line, ideological change can be negotiated, mediated and managed in practice by individual penal professionals finding differing ways to re-inscribe existing purposes and practices with evolving ideologies. Perhaps unsurprisingly in this regard, it was apparent in Robinson and McNeil's (2004) study that the ways in which public protection came to be interpreted and operationalised in practice was primarily governing by risk, and in particular, risk of harm. Workers and others moved more clearly towards public protection as a super-ordinate or governing purpose and, correspondingly, towards assisting individuals *primarily* as an instrumental rather than an intrinsic good, in cases where the risk of serious harm to the public was seen as significant.

- 4.9 The final, and most fully developed, ethnographic study of criminal justice social work was conducted by a team based at the Universities of Strathclyde and Glasgow between 2003 and 2005 (Tata et al, 2009; Halliday et al, 2008, 2009; McNeill et al, 2009). Rather than relying on interviews, and thus on *accounts* of practices, this study included two lengthy periods of participant observation, in two different CJSW teams, focused on the routine production of social enquiry reports (SERs). Leaving aside the specific findings about SER practice, this study paints a detailed picture of the impact on CJSW of the wider social changes affecting the field of penalty so well articulated by Garland (2001) in his account of the emergence of the 'culture of control'. The criminal justice social workers evidenced an enduring role tension between their responsibilities as justice professionals towards the courts, and their responsibilities as social work professionals towards their clients or service users. In their discourses and practices, they also revealed a sense of 'double-marginalisation'; both from generic social work (or more specifically generic social managers) and from the law-profession dominated world of the courts.
- 4.10 The insecurities of this double-marginalisation, underpinned by their awareness of the changing social and political climate, meant that, on some level, they recognised that those welfare discourses and techniques that previously provided the capital in and through which they had historically traded had lost their political and cultural purchase (see also McCulloch and McNeill, 2007). Policy discourses and public debates have led social workers to believe that their welfare affiliations are a liability that must be offset by adapting to a risk management and protection ethos. Thus, criminal justice social workers have come gradually to invest, some more reluctantly than others, in new discourses and techniques of risk assessment, management and reduction; discourses and techniques that represent new forms of capital through which some of them perhaps sense that they might maintain or acquire influence from their marginal position within criminal justice. Nonetheless, this strategy sits uneasily with their existing

habitus (meaning 'durable dispositions'), in many cases framed in earlier eras. Their individual and shared histories at the intersections between the fields of justice and welfare seem to produce habitus that predictably retain much more than a residualised commitment to penal welfarism; thus, even where the need to trade or invest discursively in risk and protection is recognised, the meanings of risk and protection are themselves reframed; existing practices are re-legitimated in new ways. In this, there may be, a significant degree of 'resignation' about and 'adaptation' to the risk agenda in relation to purposes and objectives, but there is also 'misadaptation' and 'revolt' in relation to techniques and practices. That this finding was evidenced not only amongst experienced social workers but also amongst relatively recently qualified staff members (who had been educated both about the emergence of risk and its associated technologies *and* about criminal justice social work's welfare traditions) underlines the durability of the latter influence on the profession and its practices – or at least it suggests that the eclipse of welfarism might require the passage of considerable time, or some more violent rupture in the development of the profession¹.

- 4.11 Despite its rapid advances therefore in terms of scale, specialism and resourcing, criminal justice social work continues to struggle with fundamental issues of identity and purpose; the increasingly febrile nature of Scottish penal politics creates a difficult climate within which to address these uncertainties but, at the same time, renders their resolution all the more important. If the success of the Reducing Reoffending Programme depends on the further development and reform of criminal justice social work, then it seems that a comprehensive engagement with and development of its cultures (that is, its assumptions, values and environment) is urgently required. Indeed, it seems that the Scottish Prisons Commission recognised this in its proposal to establish a National Community Justice Council:

'...we have identified a need for renewed vision, visibility and leadership of these services. Community justice and criminal justice social work services are pivotal to making the reforms proposed above work; these services need to be credible and to enjoy the confidence and support of Scottish judges and Scottish communities. This requires the proper resourcing of community justice and criminal justice social work – not just in financial terms, but in terms of boosting the specialist knowledge and skills of the workforce, their integration and standing within the criminal justice system, and their standing and status *within* local authorities and local communities too... [W]e need to find ways to release their key professional skills in helping troubled and troubling people comply with supervision and helping them tackle their underlying problems. That way, social workers can play their vital part *centre-stage* in a joined-up justice system that is more immediate, more efficient and more effective. **The Commission**

¹ There are, of course, jurisdictions where such 'violent ruptures' have been manufactured precisely to shift professional cultures that were seen to be too wedded to welfarist ideals. The abandonment of social work training and qualifications for probation officers in England and Wales in the mid-1990s is one such example.

recommends that the National Community Justice Council (NCJC) should be charged with and resourced to provide dynamic leadership in developing the status, visibility, quality, consistency and credibility of criminal justice social work nationwide’.

(Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008: paragraph 3.50, **emphasis in original**).

5. CONCLUSION

- 5.1 The first part of this review perhaps served principally to confirm the complexities of organisational culture, of organisational change and of the management of change, especially in the public sector. But if it is the case that change is rendered more complex where purposes are contested, where partnerships are complex and where politics is highly animated, then criminal justice in Scotland must represent an exceptionally difficult setting for such efforts. Whilst it could be argued that clarifying the underlying purposes and forging the requisite partnerships have always been difficult, the rapid politicisation of criminal (and youth) justice in Scotland post-devolution (see McAra, 2008) has added a further confounding factor. It is no exaggeration to suggest that criminal justice social work in recent years has laboured under the volume and weight of policy developments, institutional reforms, increased workloads, and unprecedented media and political scrutiny. In some respects, as we noted in the first section, these sorts of conditions are highly likely to lead public sector managers and organisations towards an inward-looking and control-oriented focus. Both features are likely to stifle rather than foster innovation and development.
- 5.2 Moreover, if this is the broader context for contemporary criminal justice social work managers and organisations, then at the level of practice cultures there are other forces that might tend to produce conservatism. The professional insecurity and double-marginalisation revealed in the most recent Scottish research suggests that, under the kinds of social and political pressures alluded to above, criminal justice social workers may themselves tend to look inwards, to identify with their traditions, their teams and their peers, and to hold fast to established routines and practices. To borrow from the literature on organisational change, the *readiness for change* of criminal justice social work is open to question.
- 5.3 And yet the *need for change* seems to be beyond question – not because there is compelling evidence that criminal justice social work itself is failing but because, despite CJSW's successes the Scottish prison population continues to grow. Behind recent policy developments lies not a principal concern with criminal justice social work itself but rather recognition of the key role it must play in the broader transformation of how Scotland approaches punishment. If 'paying back in the community' is to become the default position in sentencing for less serious offenders (Scottish Prisons Commission, 2008: paragraph 3.5), then criminal justice social work has a critical part to play – and criminal justice social work needs to change. This is now recognised in the Scottish Government's Reducing Reoffending Programme.
- 5.4 But given the question of change readiness, to the extent that this review can reach clear conclusions and recommendations, and looking particularly to recent developments in England and Wales, we suggest that in the implementation of the programme we must pay very careful attention to the three key factors identified

in the second section of our report. Firstly, the Scottish reform efforts need to involve a much clearer recognition of the centrality of practitioners in the process of change. We need to develop creative mechanisms for the fullest possible engagement with and participation of practitioners in the process; ideally, they need to be involved not just in the implementation of reforms but in the development of them. Secondly, we need to make open dialogue about our penal and social work values a part of this process. The ideological shift from an essentially rehabilitative to a principally reparative focus (albeit retaining rehabilitative elements) poses major challenges for criminal justice social work – but there is some good reason to believe that these challenges can be addressed in ways that preserve the best of criminal justice social work’s traditions (McNeill, 2009). Finally, the change process needs to be characterised by clear, coherent and feasible objectives; these objectives need to be consistently communicated and maintained, even within the febrile political context described above.

REFERENCES

- Albury, D. (2005) 'Fostering innovation in public services', *Public Money and Management* 25(1): 51-56.
- Aldridge, M. (1999) 'Probation Officer Training, Promotional Culture and the Public Sphere', *Public Administration* 77(1): 73-90
- Armenakis, A.A., Harris, S.G. and Mossholder, K.W. (1993) 'Creating readiness for change', *Human Relations* 46: 681-703.
- Audit Commission (2001) *Change Here! Managing Change to Improve Local Services*, London: Audit Commission.
- Bordia, P., Hunt, E., Paulsen, N., Tourish, D. and DiFonzo, N. (2004) 'Uncertainty during organizational change: is it all about control?', *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology* 13(3): 345-65.
- Borins, S. (1998) *Innovating with Integrity: How Local Heroes are Transforming American Government*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Borins, S. (2002) 'Leadership and innovation in the public sector', *Leadership & Organization Development Journal* 23(8): 467-476.
- Boyne, G. (2003a), 'What is public service improvement?', *Public Administration*, 81(2), 211-227.
- Boyne, G. (2004) 'A "3Rs" strategy for public service turnaround: retrenchment, repositioning and reorganization', *Public Money and Management*, 24(2), 97-103.
- Burnett, R. (1996) *Fitting Supervision to Offenders: Assessment and Allocation Decisions in the Probation Service*. Home Office Research Study 169. London: Home Office.
- Burnett, R. and Stevens, A. (2007) 'Not of Much Significance (yet): NOMS from the perspective of prison staff' *Prison Service Journal* 172: 3-11.
- Burns, B. (2000) *Managing Change: A Strategic Approach to Organizational Dynamics, 3rd edition*. Harlow: FT/Prentice-Hall.
- Carlen, P. (2002) 'Women's imprisonment: models of reform and change', *Probation Journal*, 49, 2, 76-87.
- Clayton, T. (2003) 'Service innovation—Aiming to win' in Tidd, J. (ed.), *Service Innovation, Organizational Responses to Technological Opportunities*. London: Imperial College Press.
- Columbo, A. and Neary, M. (1998) "' Square Roots and Algebra": Understanding Perceptions of Combined Risk/ Needs Assessment Measures' *Probation Journal* 45(4): 213-219.
- Czarniawska, B., and Sevón, G. (1996) *Translating Organizational Change*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Das, T. K. (1993) 'Time in Management and Organisation Studies', *Time and Society*, 2(2) 267-74.
- Ditton, J. And Ford, R. (1994) *The Reality of Probation: A formal ethnography of process and practice*. Aldershot: Avebury.
- Downes, D. (1988) *Contrasts in Tolerance: Post-war Penal Policy in the Netherlands and England and Wales*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Duffee, D. E. (1984) 'The community context of probation' in McAnany, P., Thomson, D. & Fogel, D. (eds.) *Probation and Justice: Reconsideration of Mission*, Cambridge: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain Publishers.
- Dymond-White, S. (1994) 'Managing change – the 'diagonal slice' approach at Dartmoor', *Prison Service Journal* 92: 13-14.
- Farrow, K. (2004) 'Still committed after all these years? Morale in the modern-day probation service' *Probation Journal* 51(3): 2006-220.
- Fernandez, S. and Rainey, H.G. (2006) 'Managing successful organizational change in the public sector: an agenda for research and practice', *Public Administration Review* 66(2): 1-25.
- Ford, R. and Ditton, J. (1992) *Probation in Scotland: Process and Practice*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office Central Research Unit.
- Garland, D. (2001) *The Culture of Control*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garland, D. (2006) 'Concepts of culture in the sociology of punishment' *Theoretical Criminology* 10(4): 419-447.
- Gerstner, L.V. (2002) *Who Says Elephants Can't Dance? Inside IBM's Historic Turnaround*. London: Harper Collins.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Halliday, S., Burns, N., Hutton, N., McNeill, F., and Tata, C. (2008) 'Shadow writing and participant observation: A study of criminal justice social work around sentencing' *Journal of Law and Society* 35(2): 189-213.
- Halliday, S., Burns, N., Hutton, N., McNeill, F., and Tata, C. (2009) 'Street-level Bureaucracy, Interprofessional Relations and Coping Mechanisms: A Study of Criminal Justice Social Workers in the Sentencing Process' *Law and Policy* 31(4) 405-428.
- Hannah-Moffat, K. (2001) *Punishment in Disguise: Penal Governance and Federal Imprisonment of Women in Canada*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Hodgson, L., Farrell, C.M. and Connolly, M. (2007) 'Improving UK public services: a review of the evidence', *Public Administration* 85(2): 355-382.
- Home Office (1998) *Effective Practice Initiative: A National Implementation Plan for the Effective Supervision of Offenders*. Probation Circular 35/98. London: Home Office.
- Joldersma, C. and Winter, V. (2002), 'Strategic management in hybrid organizations' *Public Management Review* 4(1): 83-99.
- Jones, R.A., Jimmieson, N.L. and Griffiths, A. (2005) 'The impact of organizational culture and reshaping capabilities on change implementation success: the mediating role of readiness for change' *Journal of Management Studies* 42 (2): 361-386.
- Joyce, P. (2004) 'The Role of Leadership in the Turnaround of a Local Authority', *Public Money and Management*, August, 235-42.
- Kanter, R.M. (1983), *The Change Masters: Corporate Entrepreneurs at Work*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Kemshall, H., Holt, P., Bailey, R. & Boswell, G. (2004) 'Beyond programmes: organisational and cultural issues in the implementation of What Works', in Mair, G. (ed.) *What Matters in Probation*, Cullompton: Willan
- Keup, J.R., Astin, H.S., Lindholm, J.A. and Walker, A.A. (2001) Organizational culture and institutional transformation' in Astin, A.W. and Astin, H.S. (eds.) *Transforming*

- Institutions: Context and Process*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- Kezar, A.J. (2001) *Understanding and Facilitating Organizational Change in the 21st Century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 28(4). San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Kotter, J.P. (1995). 'Leading change: why transformation efforts fail' *Harvard Business Review*, March/April, 59-67.
- Lewis, B. (1994) 'Cultural Change and the Prison Service' *Prison Service Journal* 92: 6-9.
- Lynch, R. (2004) 'How healthy is your 'community of practice'?' *Probation Journal* 51(1): 59-66
- McAra, L. (2008) 'Crime, Criminology and Criminal Justice in Scotland' *European Journal of Criminology* 5(4) 481-504.
- McCulloch, P. and McNeill, F. (2007) 'Consumer Society, Commodification and Offender Management' *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 7(3): 223-242
- McIvor, G. (2004) 'Getting Personal: developments in policy and practice in Scotland', in Mair, G. (ed.) *What Matters in Probation?* Cullompton: Willan.
- McNeill, F. (2005) 'Remembering probation in Scotland' *Probation Journal* 52(1): 25-40
- McNeill, F. (2009) 'Probation, Rehabilitation and Reparation' *Irish Probation Journal* 6: 5-22.
- McNeill, F. and Whyte, B. (2007) *Reducing Reoffending: Social Work and Community Justice in Scotland*. Cullompton: Willan.
- McNeill, F., Burns, N., Halliday, S., Hutton, N. And Tata, C. (2009) 'Risk, responsibility and reconfiguration: Penal adaptation and misadaptation' *Punishment and Society* 11(4): 419-442.
- Mair, G. (1997) 'Community Penalties and the Probation Service', in Maguire, M., Morgan, R. & Reiner, R. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morison Report 1962) *Report of the Departmental Committee on the Probation Service*. Cmnd 1650, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Moynihan D.P. and Pandey, S.K. (2004) 'Testing how management matters in an era of government by performance management' *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 15(3), 421-439.
- Nellis, M. (2002) 'Community Justice, Time and the New National Probation Service' *The Howard Journal* 41(1): 59-86
- Norris, P. (2003) 'Is there still a public service ethos? Work values, experience and job satisfaction among government workers' in J.D. Donahue and J. S. Nye, Jr. (eds.) *For the People: Public Service in the 21st Century*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Parker, R. and Bradley, L. (2000) 'Organisational culture in the public sector: evidence from six organisations', *The International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 13 (2/3): 125-141.
- Paterson, F. and Tombs, J. (1998) *Social Work and Criminal Justice: Volume 1 - The Impact of Policy*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office Central Research Unit.
- Paton, R. and Mordaunt, J. (2004) 'What's different about public and non-profit "turnaround"?' *Public Money & Management* 24(4): 209-216.
- Peters, T. and Waterman, R. (1982) *In Search of Excellence: Lessons from America's Best-run Companies*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Pollitt, C. and Bouckaert, G. (2004) *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Quinn, R.E. and Rohrbaugh, J. (1981) 'A competing values approach to organizational effectiveness', *Public Productivity Review* 5(2):122-40.
- Robertson, P.J. and Sneviratne, S.J. (1995) 'Outcomes of planned organizational change in the public sector: a meta-analytic comparison to the private sector' *Public Administration Review*, 55(6): 547-558.
- Raynor, P. (2002) 'Implementing 'what works': achievement and problems so far', in Maguire, M., Morgan, R. and Reiner, R., (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*, 3rd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Raynor, P. and Miles, H. (2007) 'Evidence-based Probation in a Microstate: The British Channel Island of Jersey', *European Journal of Criminology* 4: 299-313.
- Robinson, G. (2003) 'Implementing OASys: Lessons from research into LSI-R and ACE' *Probation Journal* 50(1): 30-40
- Robinson, G. (2005) 'What works in offender management?' *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 44(3): 307-318.
- Robinson, G. and McNeill, F. (2004) 'Purposes Matters: The Ends of Probation', in G. Mair (ed.) *What Matters in Probation*. Cullompton: Willan
- Rusaw, A.C. (2007) 'Changing public organizations: four approaches' *International Journal of Public Administration* 30(3): 347-361.
- Rutherford, A. (1984) *Prisons and the Process of Justice*, London: Heinemann and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Szabla, D.B. (2007) 'A multidimensional view of resistance to organizational change: exploring cognitive, emotional, and intentional responses to planned change across perceived change leadership strategies' *Human Resource Development Quarterly* 18(4): 525-558.
- Schein, E.H. (2004). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. Third edition. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Scottish Prisons Commission (2008) *Scotland's Choice*. Edinburgh: Scottish Prisons Commission.
- Singh Bhui, H. (2006) 'Anti-Racist Practice in NOMS: Reconciling Managerialist and Professional Realities' *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 45(2): 171-190.
- Smith, P. (2008) *Punishment and culture*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Social Work Services Group (1991) *National Objectives and Standards for Social Work Services in the Criminal Justice System*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office.
- Tata, C., Burns, N., Halliday, S., Hutton, N and McNeill, F. (2008) 'Assisting and Advising the Sentencing Decision Process: the Pursuit of 'Quality' in Pre-Sentence Reports' *British Journal of Criminology* 48(6): 835-855.
- Taylor, C. (2005) *Walking the Talk: Building a Culture for Success*. London: Random House.
- Thompson, N., Stradling, S., Murphy, M and O'Neill, P. (1996) 'Stress and organizational culture' *British Journal of Social Work* 26: 647-665
- Tschirhart, M. (2006) 'Fernandez and Rainey: Managing successful organizational change in the public sector: an agenda for research and practice', *Public Administration Review* 66(2): 38-42.

- Underdown, A. (2001) 'Making 'What Works' work: challenges in the delivery of community penalties', in Bottoms, A., Gelsthorpe, L. & Rex, S. (eds.) *Community Penalties: Change and Challenges*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Van de Ven, A. H., and Poole, M. S. (1995) 'Explaining development and change in organizations', *Academy of Management Review* 20(3): 510–540.
- Walker and Boyne (2006) 'Public management reform and organizational performance: an empirical assessment of the U.K. Labour Government's public service improvement strategy' *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 25(2): 371–393.
- Wallis, E. (2001) *A New Choreography: Integrated Strategy for the National Probation Service for England and Wales. Strategic Framework 2001-2004*, London: Home Office.
- Whipp, R. (1994) 'A time to be concerned: a position paper on time and management', *Time and Society*, 3(1): 99-116.
- Wilson, D.C. (1992) *A Strategy of Change: Concepts and Controversies in the Management of Change*. London: Routledge,
- Zammuto, R.F., Gifford, G. and Goodman, E.A. (1999), 'Managerial ideologies, organisation culture and the outcomes of innovation: a competing values perspective' in N. Ashkanasy, C. Wilderom, and M. Peterson (eds.), *The Handbook of Organisational Culture and Climate*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zammuto, R.F. and Krakower, J.Y. (1991). 'Quantitative and qualitative studies of organizational culture' *Research in Organizational Change and Development* 5: 83–114.