

THE INTRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE WITHIN AN ORGANISATION UNDERGOING TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE

*Timothy Hee Sun Leo**



I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The introduction of evidence-based practices and principles into the Singapore Prison Service began about 12 years ago. Since then the Service has developed evidence-based offender assessment systems, methodologies and rehabilitation programmes. Ongoing scientific research and programme evaluation complement the rehabilitation work. Evidence-based thinking and developments are also applied to improve offender management, build resilience in officers and contribute to the knowledge domains and efforts of other departments within the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Prior to 1999, the Prison system engaged in rehabilitative activities for offenders guided in most part by the prevailing practices of the day. Education, prison-based workshops and various social and recreational activities thought to improve human character were provided. The major religious organisations also provided religious services and religious counseling when needed. The evidence-based knowledge and practices that had initially developed in North America reached Singapore.

Though reforming the offenders was one of the intended outcomes of imprisonment, it was nevertheless seen as secondary to the primary goal of ensuring safe custody. There was very little scientific evidence used in rehabilitative activities. Despite the lack of evidence-based knowledge, many prison staff attempted to provide or bring in programmes that were believed to be helpful in reforming offenders.

The period of the 1990s saw a significant increase in inmate population. By 1999, the prison population had reached around 16,000 inmates and peaked around 18,000 in the year 2003, placing great pressure on staff and the prison infrastructure. Singapore had one of the largest inmate-to-staff ratios (7.9:1 in 1983) compared to other prison systems in the world. The prison officers had to direct their energy to make physical space for inmates and manage penal institutions and Drug Rehabilitation Centres. The potential for fights, riots and escapes was ever present. Furthermore many of the prison buildings were not purpose-built facilities to house inmates but were old buildings retrofitted with security doors, grilles and equipment. The infrastructural constraints of such buildings resulted in less than optimal deployment of staff to deal with inherent blind spots and potential vulnerabilities that could be exploited by inmates.

The focus on keeping order and discipline, maintaining a high level of vigilance and the enforcement of strict rules and regulations resulted in the prison officers being able to maintain control of the overcrowded prisons. These officers were commendable for their ability to prevent the occurrence of serious riots or uprisings, despite the constraints and threats. Though prison life was tough for the inmates, they were treated with respect and fairness by the staff. The integrity among the officers also contributed to the safety within the prison. This helped to maintain the confidence of the public and of the inmates in the Prison Service. However, the emphasis on maintaining security also resulted in the staff and inmates keeping distance from each other. Staff were told not to engage in conversations with the inmates beyond what was necessary to deal with their requests or to perform their duties. There was concern that over familiarity with inmates could lead to staff being manipulated by them or being tempted towards corruption.

* Chief Psychologist and Director, Psychological and Correctional Rehabilitation Division, Singapore Prison Service, Singapore.

II. ORGANISATIONAL CHANGES IN MINDSET AND CULTURE

A. Leadership Change

A change in leadership in 1999 saw the beginnings of a massive paradigm shift in the prison system in response to the pressing challenges facing the Prison Service. Under the helm and visionary leadership of Mr. Chua Chin Kiat, the former Director of Prisons, the organisational culture of the Singapore Prison Service was changed, spurred on by a new vision and within that context, evidence-based practice was introduced.

The challenge of an increasing inmate population, resulting in prison overcrowding, threatened the security of the prison. The large number of returning offenders also contributed to the burden on the taxpayer due to incarceration. The inability for incarcerated individuals to contribute to their families, the loss of potential human resource to the country, together with the risks arising from overcrowding made a compelling and urgent case for strategies to reduce recidivism and reduce prison population in the longer term.

Compounding these challenges was the high attrition rate of prison officers, with a significant number of remaining officers with non-tertiary educational qualifications. The high turnover of staff could also result in destabilising the prison system.

The transformational journey of the Singapore Prison System since 1999 has been documented by several parties, including the former Director of Prisons, Mr. Chua Chin Kiat (Chua, 2012, Hellwing, 2009; Leong, 2009; Helliwell, 2011).

This paper draws upon some of the key organisational developments that provided the context for the introduction and initial development of evidence-based rehabilitative practice in Singapore. It is the author's belief that Singapore's success in being able to bring in, develop and use evidence-based practice, is largely due to the change processes in the system that enabled the emergence of a new paradigm in thinking and working.

B. Strategic and Organisational Planning Capabilities

The development of a staff unit to undertake strategic planning for the Prison Service and to provide the necessary administrative support gave the necessary bandwidth to begin the organisational change process. The Research and Planning Branch was the newly formed unit that undertook the task of supporting strategic planning and analysing organisational and offender trends and patterns. In addition the Branch suggested adjustments and refinements to organisational processes and became the resource unit to the leaders in the organisation. The branch also took on the initial task of exploring rehabilitation technologies and reviewed the then extant literature of "what works" in offender rehabilitation.

C. Shared Vision

This was a process that took over a year, beginning in 1999, and involved staff at different levels of the organisation. Guided by concepts used in organisational learning, the Vision and Mission Statements for the Singapore Prison Service were eventually crafted. The process of engaging prison staff increased the ownership of the Vision:

We aspire to be Captains in the lives of offenders committed to our custody. We will be instrumental in steering them towards being responsible citizens, with the help of their families and the community. We will thus build a secure and exemplary prison system.

Allied to the new Vision was a new Mission Statement:

As a key partner in Criminal Justice, we protect society through the safe custody and rehabilitation of offenders, co-operating in prevention and aftercare.

The idea of staff being "Captains of Lives" (COL) is a noble one that lifts the prison officer's job beyond one of custodian to include the possibility of becoming a positive change agent in the offender's life. Implicit in this is a recognition of a potential for offenders to change, and is in contrast with a deterministic view

that rehabilitation does not work in reducing reoffending (e.g. Martinson, 1974). The effect of the Vision statement gave the current staff a renewed sense of their mission and also attracted like-minded people to join the Prison Service. The result of which was an increase in the quality of staff with better educational qualifications and the passion to make a difference in the lives of offenders.

Allied to this notion is the view that all staff, whether they are working in administration or directly with offenders can still share the “Captain of Lives” Vision. The work of the frontline staff being involved in rehabilitation is equally important. However, there was an unintended dichotomy between rehabilitation and operations staff when professionally trained programme deliverers (e.g. psychologists and rehabilitation specialists) were introduced. While each have their primary roles, the “Captain of Lives” notion invites and expects all to play a role in steering an offender away from crime to living a prosocial life. The Vision serves to provide the focal point for all to converge towards a shared journey.

1. The Ripple Effect

These changes did not remain within the prison. The Captains of Lives motto was advertised in the local media, giving the Prison Service a positive public profile. The media tagline, “Captains of Lives – Rehab – Renew – Restart” prepared the public for a greater role in giving offenders a “second chance.” It also reinforced the growing sense of mission among prison staff.

The concept of a “Ripple Effect,” visually illustrated by the effect of throwing a stone into a still pond and setting into motion from the centre a series of concentric waves diverging outwards, was used to inspire staff to be agents of change. All staff, as “Captains of Lives,” can cause ripple effects to society. When an officer touches the life of an inmate, he also transforms a family, and impacts the criminal justice system and the community as a whole. Eventually, the efforts of staff lead to a ripple effect that reaches out to the entire nation and beyond. The metaphor was powerful in garnering the imagination and the passion of staff to go beyond themselves towards a more noble cause.

2. Awards

The cumulative changes in the Prison System resulted in winning several prestigious awards, including the highest national award for organisational excellence, the Singapore Quality Award and the Top Public Service Award in 2006. The Singapore Prison won the Aon Hewitt Top 10 Best Employers Award in 2007, 2009 and 2011. It also won the Aon Hewitt Best Employers in Asia Pacific in 2011.

D. Organisational Learning

One of the most powerful and useful concepts that gave the Prison Service both a paradigm and a language to create short- and long-term changes in the organisation was drawn from the work of Peter Senge and his colleagues. The concepts and principles of the “Learning Organisation,” described in the books, “The Fifth Discipline” (Senge, 1990) and “The Dance of Change,” (Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Roth, Ross & Smith, 1999) were introduced to staff through training and providing opportunities to practice in team meetings. The “Learning Organisation” concept also gained some popularity in the Civil Service during that period. Furthermore, concepts relating to leading organisational change were also adopted (e.g. Kotter, 1996). Conceptual methodologies such as “mindmapping” became widely used to give visual representations to conceptual and organisational relationships. The Prison Service adopted a pragmatic approach to most of these organisational learning models and concepts, without exclusively prescribing a particular doctrine or school of thought.

The main concepts in the “Learning Organisation” can be summarised into five disciplines:

- Personal Mastery
- Mental Models
- Building a Shared Vision
- Team Learning
- Systems Thinking

The Prison Service comprises mainly of uniformed personnel who are accustomed to “rank and file” and “command and control” concepts. The introduction of organisational learning concepts through trainings and facilitated staff retreats allowed a legitimate framework and language for officers of various ranks to share

their views in an intellectually permissive forum. This helped to reduce the reticence of junior officers in putting forth ideas and suggestions and allowed the organisation to become more comfortable with divergent thinking. The change in intellectual climate allowed the staff to proffer new and innovative ideas, and the organisation began to reap these ideas for implementation and to build up momentum for further changes.

The concept of “Systems Thinking” broadened the staff’s capacity to think beyond their areas of work. The natural tendency in most large organisations is for staff to work within the “silos” of their job areas. The ability to think systemically allowed for officers to see the inter-connectedness within different parts of the system. An increased understanding of system dynamics also allowed officers from different parts of the system to cooperate better, understand each other’s perspectives in relation to the organisation, and work towards constructive “win-win” outcomes (Covey, 1990).

At the leadership level, the “Learning Organisation” and various organisational change concepts and principles provided a guide and heuristic to a disciplined way of making sense of the change process and to influence change. Thinking, learning and innovating became common-place words. Leadership meetings became frequent and were designed to deal with operational and urgent issues and also to discuss new ideas to further the development of the prison system. This allowed for the Director of Prisons to personally lead by example the commitment towards organisational development and innovation in pursuit of the shared Vision and Mission of the Service.

To further emphasize the organisation’s direction in raising the intellectual capital of staff, the Prison Headquarters was redesigned and renovated to encourage group learning. Previously, staff were reluctant to be seen talking together in groups outside of formal meetings as this may be perceived as a form of loafing. However, the formation of a Learning Centre specially designed for staff to meet in small groups to discuss issues changed the paradigm. This new concept also set the precedence for the formation of similar centres in other prison facilities.

Understanding an organisation at its various levels become crucial when changes are desired and new ideas are put into place. The understanding of organisational change process allowed for evidence-based practices to be brought into the system, not just at the ground level of implementation but also at middle management and at the leadership levels. The “Vision Deployment Matrix” (authored by Daniel Kim in “Levels of Thinking” in the Systems Thinker, June/July 1993) became one of well-used tools for planning.

E. Innovation

One significant outcome of a developing innovative culture was the development of a Prison School in 2000. Male offenders who were receiving formal education classes in various prison institutions were centralized in one location. The Prison School was run like an educational institution, with a full academic curriculum and character building activities, staffed by teachers. The economy of scale from centralisation enabled the Prison School to create a learning culture that was not possible when education was offered within a general penal institution. Good perimeter security and inmate management allowed the inmates to feel safe and to remain undistracted in their studies. Officers who displayed willingness and an aptitude to integrate rehabilitative thinking with prison operations were given the opportunity to work in the school. The first leaders in the school, a young Superintendent and a committed Principal, paved the way for a new working model. The joint leadership between a Senior Prison Officer and a School Principal was unprecedented in prison history and has continued since its inception. To date, the Prison School has produced inmate students with good academic results. The Prison School has received positive accolades from visitors, including former President of Singapore, Mr. S.R. Nathan, several government Ministers and public figures. It remains an icon of innovation for the Prison Service.

Another innovative development was the implementation of a new Housing Unit Management system in 1999. The system introduced the concept of a centralised management of inmates within a prison housing unit allowing for better teamwork among officers and enabling them to take on case-management roles for the inmates. Prison officers working in the Units are called “Personal Supervisors” to instill in officers the idea of taking a personal, though professional, interest in the rehabilitation of inmates under their care. This required a mindset shift in which officers had to engage inmates in “purposeful” conversations to understand the inmates’ issues. This placed the officers in a better position to help the inmates in their

rehabilitative journey. This was a massive change for staff who were used to keeping a safe distance from inmates. The reception to this change was mixed, with some officers concerned that security would be compromised. Other staff, especially those who had joined the Prison Service to make a real difference to offenders welcomed this and pushed forward for change. Inmates' feedback with regards to this change was sought through the "Inmates Feedback Working Group" discussions and surveys. Inmates response to the question, "Inmates can approach the officers anytime," saw an increase in the percentage agreement of the inmates from 62.9% to 75% from 2002 to 2004 (Singapore Prison Service, 2006a).

Though staff were generally in support of rehabilitation, many were uncertain as to how they could balance both the rehabilitation efforts and their security and operational roles. This challenge became increasingly stark when a corresponding need for significant increases in manpower was not in sight. These were real concerns as to how staff could do more with the same level of manpower resourcing. Such discussions occurred at all levels of the organisations. The need for staff to have the space to discuss their issues and to be able to raise it to their leaders was an important part of the change process. The call to innovation was also a means to deal differently with existing problems. Phrases such as "thinking out of the box" were useful in helping to generate new solutions to existing problems. Having the conceptual tools to facilitate discussions also allowed for discussions to be carried out in a generative manner.

The Prison Service adopted an annual "Organisational Climate Survey" to tap the entire staff views of various aspects of the organisation. As the organisation developed and the change processes started to take root, there was also a corresponding increase in the staff's satisfaction with the leadership and management of the Prisons, with the percentage of favourable responses rising from 70.5% to 83.9% in the period 2001 to 2005. Staff satisfaction in working for the Department also rose from 82.4% to 92.9% in the same period (Singapore Prison Service, 2006).

The support from frontline and institutional staff was critical for successful implementation of evidence-based interventions and programmes. Without their active cooperation, many rehabilitative processes would not have been able to run smoothly.

F. Partnerships

The Singapore Corporation of Offender Rehabilitative Enterprises (SCORE) is a statutory board set up by the Government to provide vocational training and skills to offenders and to increase their employability after they are released from prison. Historically SCORE has been running the prison bakery and laundry services for prisons and external industries. The hospitals form an important customer group for the laundry services. SCORE revamped their organisational vision to help offenders re-integrate into post-release society using inspirational words such as "*building bridges of hope*" along with the Prison Service's organisational change efforts. The Prison Service and SCORE function like twin organisations, both working towards a similar end state for inmates. The two organisations are co-located for better synergy, share a common yearly workplan seminar for staff and integrate their plans to complement and support each other.

An outcome of the close partnership between the Prison Service and SCORE is the formation of the CARE (Community Action for the Rehabilitation of Ex-offenders) Network in year 2000. The CARE Network was set up to serve as a platform for a network of partnership involving the Singapore Prison Service, SCORE, Ministry of Home Affairs and several social agencies to explore possible collaboration and enhance community services for rehabilitating ex-offenders. The CARE Network subsequently also inspired the launch of the Yellow Ribbon Project (YRP) in 2004. The main message of the YRP is to appeal to the community and employers to give ex-offenders a second chance. The YRP has experienced great success as the number of employers who were willing to hire ex-offenders grew significantly from 1,473 in 2005 to 2,118 in 2008. In addition, the pool of volunteers who assist in delivery of programmes have grown from 124 to 1,420 volunteers over the last 10 years. In addition, more than 90% of the public in Singapore are aware and supportive of this project. These figures are the hallmark of the success that the CARE Network and the YRP have enjoyed.

The "ripple effect" of the YRP has since gained regional and international recognition, with the nation of Fiji starting a similar project for their ex-offenders.

The objectives of the Yellow Ribbon Project are to:

- Raise Awareness of the need to give second chances to ex-offenders and their families.
- Generate acceptance of ex-offenders and their families in the community.
- Inspire community action to support the rehabilitation and reintegration of ex-offenders back into society.

III. THE SCIENCE OF REHABILITATION

A. The Introduction of Evidence-Based Practice

The introduction of evidence-based practice occurred at the beginning of the change process. As staff mindsets towards rehabilitation changed and organisational systems structures were developed in tandem with these changes, the introduction of scientific approaches to rehabilitation found growing acceptance among staff.

To support the move towards a system-wide application of rehabilitation practices, the Service formed a “Programme Branch” to oversee and develop rehabilitation policies and implement rehabilitation processes. The branch also recruited prison counsellors, trained in counselling, psychology or social sciences, to develop and provide criminogenic rehabilitation programmes to offenders. The Prison Service also invested in developing a psychology branch to bring in psychological expertise in research, psychometric scale development, assessment and psychological-based interventions for special populations (e.g. violent and sex offenders).

Evidence-based practice began with the introduction of an empirically validated assessment instrument – the Level of Service Inventory – Revised (Andrews & Bonta, 1990). The 54-item instrument is conceptually underpinned by the Psychology of Criminal Conduct (Andrews & Bonta, 2006) and was then one of the most advanced third generation actuarial Risk/Need assessment tools that was supported by evidence.

To ensure that the use of the instrument was defensible, the psychologists recommended that it should be empirically validated. Their proposal to conduct a validation study was approved with the broad intent of engendering confidence in the use of the instrument on local offenders. The aims of the validation study were:

- To determine the reliability (internal consistency) and validity (predictive) of the instrument in a Singaporean offender population.
- To determine the level of inter-rater agreement amongst trained raters.
- To obtain local norms for male and female offenders.
- To determine the need to improve the instrument to meet local needs.

A total of 1,300 inmates released from Singapore Prison in 2002, who were administered the LSI-R, were tracked for recidivism data within a 2-year period post release. Recidivism was defined by re-incarceration. The study found the instrument to have satisfactory psychometric properties. It has good inter-rater reliability measured by the Pearson coefficient from two sets of ratings of the LSI-R total score ($r=0.93$; $p<0.001$). Inter-rater consistency for individual items was satisfactory. The items in the scale were found to be generally measuring the same concept (Internal Consistency) as indexed by the full scale Cronbach’s alpha of 0.66. It also achieved a predictive validity of 0.69, as measured by the Area under the Curve, with a sensitivity of 0.64 and specificity of 0.65 (Neo, 2003).

The study provided the basis for establishing local norms for the LSI-R. The results provided confidence in the use of the instrument for predicting recidivism for the local offending population.

The study also highlighted differences in the range of scores obtained from the local population compared to those the Canadian norms. The highest predictive validities for the individual domains were found for Criminal History, Education/Family Domain and Alcohol/Drug domain. The study found lesser agreement for the other seven domains. The data from the study pointed to the need of redefining the operational definitions of the domain items. This was important to increase inter-rater reliability for these items.

The Validation Study also enabled the development of two new scales based on the scores of the LSI-R items. A 9-item actuarial risk assessment scale was derived from the study data and was later named the "Singapore Prison Short Risk Scale." Similarly, several items from the LSI-R norming study were able to satisfactorily predict institutional violence committed by inmates. This was later called the "Institutional Violence Risk Scale."

Both scales were subjected to validation studies and demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties and predictive validity. The "Singapore Prison Short Risk Scale" provided for a quicker means of assessing the risk of an offender without the need of completing the 54-item LSI-R. The "Institutional Violence Risk Scale" provided an additional means for early identification of offenders with a higher probability of committing institutional violence. This added to the accuracy of the security classification of inmates and contributed to prison security.

The span of research work for these instruments took place between 2002 and 2006. The empirical validation of instruments and their application to both rehabilitation and inmate management, gave scientific credibility to rehabilitation efforts. The role of scientific research became an increasing and indispensable part of the Prison Service. By 2006, the Singapore Prison Service published a Research Compendium documenting a total of 45 research studies, of which 28 were conducted by Prison Staff and remaining studies by external academics and students from the local universities (Singapore Prison Service, 2006b).

B. The Importance of Evidence-Based Risk Assessments

Actuarial risk assessments then formed the basis for the development of a Classification System for offenders entering the prison system. The LSI-R became the basic instrument to identify the risk level and type of criminogenic needs of offenders. This enabled the channelling of rehabilitation resources using the Risk, Need and Responsivity principles established in the literature (Andrews & Bonta, 2006; Bonta & Andrew, 2007). To ensure a high standard in the classification process, the Prison Service obtained ISO 9001:2000 certification for the classification system and processes in 2003. The Service has continued to maintain the certification to date.

Risk assessments using validated instruments are used in pre-release decision making. The ability to assess offender recidivism risk provided added confidence for the Prison Service to implement the Home Detention Scheme and the Work Release Scheme as a form of early release for offenders who displayed good behaviour and who do not pose a significant risk to the public.

The validation and development of new assessment instruments allowed Singapore Prison to share with the Courts the potential contribution of empirically validated risk assessment instruments to sentencing processes. At the working level, Singapore Prison shared risk assessment findings with the Courts and allowed the trial judges to have additional information before sentencing certain categories of offenders. The use of such instruments has gained acceptance by the Courts (Kow, 2009).

Risk assessments by psychologists provide important information relevant to the consideration for special cases, such as the remission of an offender's sentence in very serious medical cases. The approval of special remission of a sentence rests with the Minister of Home Affairs. Such cases, though rare, require a proper balancing of risk and humanitarian considerations. The use of validated instruments by a professional psychologist add to the rigour of decision making and allow for greater confidence in recommending or withholding the remission of a sentence.

C. Development of Criminogenic Programmes

The first programmes that were developed in the 2001 covered the following areas:

- Substance Abuse
- Time Management
- Anger Management
- Parenting skills
- Prosocial thinking
- Violence (MOVE)
- Sex offending (3R)

- Synthetic Drug Abuse

These programmes were based on cognitive-behavioral principles. Much of the earlier programmes were rudimentary in the application of cognitive-behavioural methods with scant attention paid to the motivational aspects of offenders. With training in the Trans-Theoretical Model (Prochaska, DiClemente, Norcross, 1992), Motivational Interviewing (Miller & Rollnick, 2002, Crime & Justice Institute, 2004, McMurrin, 2009) and incorporating the newer findings in reviews of criminogenic programmes (Landenberger & Lipsey, 2005), refinements were made to the earlier criminogenic programmes. Examples include incorporating a “Commitment to Change” phase to some of the programmes to enhance motivation for change. More skills-based modelling and practice were included to the cognitive-change component of programmes.

The need to set up a dedicated Programme Evaluation unit and develop a system for evaluation was mooted by the professional staff to the prison administration. By 2006 a team of four professional staff were assigned to develop programme-evaluation principles, protocols and methods for systematic evaluation. To quicken the process, overseas expertise with research and evaluation experience in Correctional Rehabilitation and Forensic Mental Health Rehabilitation were sought for consultation and training of staff for quick knowledge transfer. Several criminogenic programmes were formally evaluated by the external consultants and were found to be consistent with evidence-based principles. Recommendations for refining the programmes, as well as developing a system for evaluation, were also made and followed through on.

D. Recruiting and Developing Professional Staff

Having staff with the relevant evidence-based knowledge and skills to develop and deliver criminogenic programmes were essential to kick-start a sound Rehabilitation system. In 1999 there was only one psychologist and a handful of counsellors. An active strategy was used to recruit and develop a body of professional staff. By June this year the Prison Service will have around 150 professional staff comprising psychologists, rehabilitation specialists and offender caseworkers, with the potential for further increase. The role of the professional staff is to provide scientific and practice expertise in the following areas:

- Assessment of inmates for rehabilitation, specialised management (suicide), behavioural adjustment problems, pre-sentencing and pre-release decisions
- Developing criminogenic interventions (e.g. Cognitive-Behavioural Prog.)
- Delivering criminogenic interventions
- Provide evidence-based case work in Aftercare
- Programme evaluation
- Correctional research and development of assessment and profiling tools
- Training officers in behavioural and rehabilitation related skills
- Provision of critical incident stress support for staff and inmates
- Developing mental resilience in our staff

Professional staff form the bulk of knowledge workers in the Prison Service. Davenport (2005) describes:

“Knowledge workers have high degrees of expertise, education or experience. The primary purpose of their jobs involves the creation, distribution and application of knowledge.”

Managing knowledge workers can be a significant challenge to organisations when such workers are a minority. In the Singapore Prison Service, professionals form less than 4% of total staff strength. In many large organisations, the working culture and style are influenced by the majority. The challenge faced by psychologists and counsellors is having their contribution and style of working understood and accepted by both management and ground staff. Their work differs significantly from administrative and staff functions, operational line duties and routine transactional work. Knowledge workers need specific avenues and “space” for formal learning, discussion and applying knowledge in dynamic situations.

As Davenport (2005) puts it, knowledge workers spend a significant amount of their work time “thinking for a living,” i.e. applying specialised knowledge at work and using such knowledge to deal with changing and oftentimes complex situations. This type of work contrasts with a standard application of set procedures to a work situation. The imposition of tight and rigid controls over the work of knowledge workers is likely

to lead to under performance over time and the loss of staff to other competing organisations that better support knowledge work.

Professional development opportunities are highly valued by this group. Hence the provision of organisational arrangements to cater to their needs and development are important. This includes a healthy professional training budget, opportunities for attendance at local and overseas conferences, study leave and sponsorships for professional upgrading, and lecturing at internal and external institutes of learning. Internally, systems of professional supervision have to be created to ensure sound and ethical professional practices.

IV. CONCLUSION

The introduction of evidence-based practices into a Correctional System requires not just an executive decision from management, but should also involve a systematic and planned process to assist correctional staff to accept and understand the nature of rehabilitation, its relevance to the organisation and the wider society and the evidential basis for achieving good results. Organisational learning and change methods, in the hands of visionary leaders, can stir up passion and commitment in correctional staff, even when resources do not commensurate with an ambitious shared vision of the future. The combination of good organisational change through team learning and the use of evidence-based knowledge are likely to create a strong momentum in rehabilitation efforts. In such a system, the staff is the key to success, and the evidence-based knowledge and practices, the means to reduce reoffending.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, D., & Bonta, J. (1995). *LSI-R: The level of service inventory-revised, user's manual*. North Tonawanda, NY: MultiHealth Systems, Inc.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (2006). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (4th ed.). Newark, NJ: LexisNexis
- Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2007). *Risk-Need-Responsivity Model for Offender Assessment and Rehabilitation*. Ottawa: Public Safety Canada
- Chua, C.K. (2012). *The making of captains of lives – Prison reform in Singapore 1999 to 2007*. Singapore: World Scientific.
- Covey, S. (1990). *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People*. Tampa: Free Press.
- Crime and Justice Institute, (2004). *Implementing evidence-based principles in community corrections: The principles of effective intervention*. Washington: National Institute of Corrections.
- Davenport, T. H. (2005). *Thinking for a living*. Boston: Harvard Business Press.
- Helliwell, J. F. (2011). "Institutions as enablers of wellbeing: The Singapore Prison case study." *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 1 (2), 255-265.
- Kim, D. (1999). *Introduction to systems thinking*. Pennsylvania: Pegasus Communications.
- Kotter, J. (1996). *Leading Change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Kow, K. S. (2009). *Sentencing principles in Singapore*. Singapore: Academy Publishing.
- Landenberger, N. A., & Lipsey, M. W. (2005). "The positive effects of cognitive-behavioral programs for offenders: A meta-analysis of factors associated with effective treatment." *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 451-476.
- Leong, L. (2010). *The story of the Singapore Prison Service: From custodians of prisoners to captains of lives*. Singapore: Civil Service College.

- Manfred, K. V., & Hellwig, T. (2011). *The captains of lives: Transformation journey of the Singapore Prison Service*. INSEAD.
- Martinson, R. (1974). "What works? Questions and answers about prison reform." *Public Interest*, 35, 22-54.
- McMurran, M. (2009). "Motivational interviewing with offenders: A systematic review." *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 14, 83-100.
- Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational Interviewing: Preparing People to Change* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Press.
- Neo, L. H. (2003). *The LSI-R: An appropriate risk/needs assessment tool for the Singapore correctional population?* Internal research report. Singapore: Singapore Prison Service.
- Prochaska, J. O., DiClemente, C. C., & Norcross, J. C. (1992). "In search of how people change: Applications to addictive behaviors." *American Psychologist*, 47 (9), 1102-1114.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline – The art and practice of the learning organisation*. New York: Doubleday.
- Senge, P. M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Roth, G., Ross, R., & Smith, B., (1999). *The dance of change: The challenges to sustaining momentum in learning organizations*. New York: Doubleday.
- Singapore Prison Service, (2006a). *Application Report for the Singapore Quality Award*. Singapore: Singapore Prison Service.
- Singapore Prison Service, (2006b). *Correctional Research Compendium*. Singapore: Singapore Prison Service.