Journal of Theoretical & Philosophical Criminology

July, August, 2016, 148-159

Prison-Based Cognitive Behavioral Treatment Programs – A Mechanism of Panoptic Control
Commentary on Jennifer A. Schlosser's (2015) *Narratives and Discursive Discipline in Prison: Rewriting Personal Histories through Cognitive-Behavioral Programs*

Jacqueline B. Helfgott, Seattle University

Introduction

In *Inmate's Narratives and Discursive Discipline in Prison: Rewriting Personal Histories through Cognitive-Behavioral Programs* Schlosser (2015) deconstructs the cognitive behavioral program "Pathway to Change" through analysis of narratives of thirty prisoners in a medium-security prison in the Missouri Department of Corrections. The book is an anecdote to quantitative "jailhouse criminology" (Ferrell & Hamm, 1998) understanding the prisoner experience and contributes to the expanding literature on narrative psychology (Canter et al, 2003, Canter & Youngs, 2011, 2012, 2015; Ward, 2011) and narrative criminology (Gadd & Farrall, 2004; Maruna, 2001, 2004; Presser, 2008, 2009, 2015; Sandberg, 2010; Yates, 2004).

The central thesis of *Inmate's Narratives and Discursive Discipline in Prison* is that cognitive behavioral treatment, the mainstay of current-day correctional rehabilitation, is an identity-stripping "mechanism through which a more pervasive and problematic experiment" is enacted on inmates through a "meta-narrative of carceral control" (p. 3). The book offers insight into the inner workings of one cognitive-behavioral treatment program – the Missouri Department of Corrections' "Pathway to Change" program -- through critical analysis juxtaposing "expert knowledge" that informs the program's curriculum with prisoner narratives. The book draws on Foucauldian thought and the notion of generalized panopticism (Foucault, 1977, Garland, 1990) suggesting that the way in which we "correct" inmates is reflective of the larger cultural value of individual responsibility.

Schlosser suggests that expert knowledge in the form of state sanctioned mandated cognitive-behavioral treatment requires that "whole groups of people learn to abandon their own individual stories in favor of one written by someone else" which she calls *discursive discipline* (p. 4). From the inmates' use of the institution's term "offender" to describe themselves (which Schlosser opts not to use noting that the term presumes all prisoners are guilty which cannot be rightly assumed) to their tendency to a mantra of choice and self-blame that reflects state-induced mind control that renders the inmates agents in their own oppression. Schlosser argues that the Missouri Department of Corrections' "Pathway to Change" program is a "ripe empirical example" of discursive

discipline (p. 75) concluding that the program is inherently flawed and a mechanism of a larger penal metanarrative of self-blame, degradation, disconnection, detachment from reality, and expert knowledge to discursively discipline inmates

Inmate's Narratives and Discursive Discipline in Prison offers a critique of cognitive behavioral correctional treatment programs that have saturated contemporary corrections and are mandatory in many prisons, a required component of federally correctional grant-funded initiatives, and widely considered the most appropriate and evidence-based correctional treatment modality (Petersilia, 2004; Wilson, Bouffard, & Mackenzie, 2005). Schlosser's analysis uncovers shortcomings of the "Pathway to Change" program suggesting that the program is currently operating in such a way that is not evidence-based and completely misses opportunities for prisoner change. Schlosser's analysis raises question regarding how many such programs are currently in operation in prisons in the United States and around the world that are potentially riding a contemporary wave of miscommunication that all cognitive-behavioral correctional treatment programs are evidence-based when the reality is far from the case. Schlosser's work complements recent criticism of evidence-based practice suggesting that it has potential to expand rather than reduce prison populations (Klingele, 2015; Harcourt, 2008) and offers and suggestions for improvements to existing programs, policies, and practices to increase opportunities for crime desistance, recidivism reduction, personal transformation, and successful reentry.
.

Synopsis

Schlosser opens the book with the stories and quotes of prisoners on what led them to crime and prison, their prior attempts to desist from criminal behavior, and what they thought would happen upon release – Reggie, a 24-year old prisoner with a history of robbery, assault, and burglary since age 13 who saw his eventual release and return to prison as "inevitable" and George, a 29-year old prisoner whose uncles had also gone to prison with a history of drug use and dealing who when asked whether he would continue to sell drugs upon release said, "the poor have no choice but to do this" (p. 2). Schlosser goes on to explain how the research unfolded after conducting interviews for the original purpose of studying inmate identity morphing into a very different study -- "I saw grounded theory actually start to work the way everyone said it should," leading to a quest to understand a theme that rose to the forefront in her interviews reflecting her subjects' unresolved tension around accepting responsibility for their crimes and situations while narrating lived realities filled with trauma, tragedy, disadvantage, and situational-contextual factors that did not reconcile neatly with their acknowledgment that their own "bad choices" had landed them in prison. Schlosser discovered early in her data collection process while talking to prison staff that the prisoners she interviewed had completed a mandatory program called "Pathway to Change," a program based on cognitive-behavioral psychology and performance theatre. Schlosser's observation of a consistent theme running through her interviewee's narratives -- of perpetual individualism promoting singular responsibility over unique experience that appeared to be part of a larger meta-narrative of carceral control redirected her study from her original interest in inmate identity to focus on the examination of the "Pathway to Change program" to better understand themes she was noticing in the inmates' stories reflecting tension and struggle between the inmates and the institution.

In the first half of the book, Schlosser introduces and explains cognitive behavioral treatment programs discussing the quantitative research that has shown that their recidivism reduction effects and qualitative and mixed method findings have uncovered problems for individual inmates participating in these programs. Schlosser highlights key literature on post-modern perspectives, Foucauldian theory, constitutive criminology, narrative methods in studying prisoners, the notion of cultural meta-narratives expanding and explaining the concept of discursive discipline and the nature and role of "expert knowledge" reflecting the views of the state, taxpayers, and the prison administration imparted through the cognitive-behavioral program "Pathway to Change." She presents her theoretical orientation and methodological framework citing influential works that have

shaped her work including Foucault (1977), Goffman (1965), Becker (1963), Matza (1969), Henry & Milanovic (1996), Maruna (2008), Presser (2008). She explains her method and procedure including the types of data used (publicly accessible institutional documents, co-constructed narratives gathered during interviews, and the instructor's manual for the "Pathway to Change" program). In the second half of the book, Schlosser presents findings from inmate interviews comparing "Pathway to Change" curricular content with interview data to discuss what she identifies as the "three premises central to the development of discursive discipline" (p. 7) – self-blame, degradation, and disconnection. She concludes by dismantling discursive discipline examining what the program might look like if it were to center around the notion that the inmates themselves are the experts suggesting the program be radically changed with the aim to reduce recidivism with changes to policy and shifts in the model that consider issues of practicality, relevancy, functionality, personal investment, and agency.

The essence of Schlosser's analysis is the juxtaposition of the "Pathway to Change" curricular content with her interview data. Her analysis reveals critical disconnects between the program and the goal of recidivism reduction showing missed opportunities for change. The "Pathway to Change" curriculum consists of 20 lessons included in a 47-page instructor's manual. Schlosser offers examples of the different lessons interweaving them through her presentation of interview data. Pathway to Change lessons include topics such as recognizing mistakes and excuses used in the past and preparing for the future, becoming more responsible, identifying personal values and how their own personality style affects people with other personality styles, identifying things that others do that press their buttons, understanding the difference between sex, love, and intimacy, positive self-image and success and activities such as role playing in front of other inmates using props, blindfolding, whispering, playing songs, and gender-switching. Schlosser provides examples of how self-blame and degradation are imposed on inmates throughout the curriculum suggesting that the program operates in a coercive context in which inmates have no choice to opt out of participating in humiliating activities without failing the program which ultimately culminates a disconnect between program goals and realities of the inmates' lives. The program offers no guidance to inmates to help them understand how what they have learned can be used to change their behavior, desist from crime, and succeed in reentering society upon release. The primary takeaways from Schlosser's analysis are that the Missouri State Department of Corrections "Pathway to Change" program is an ambiguously implemented, internally inconsistent, poorly implemented cognitive behavioral treatment program that humiliates, degrades, and disrespects inmates through curricular components that ignore the realities of inmates' past and present situations, engages them in unexplained exercises that put them in precarious situations in a hypermasculine prison environment, fail to link inmates' thinking patterns to their behaviors, and leave them on their own to determine what it all means and how it is supposed to help them change their lives.

Schlosser concludes by identifying five patterns that emerged from her data –Choice, responsibility, goals, context, and future that operate as invisible forces of discursive discipline and disciplinary panoptic control perpetuated through a meta-narrative that regulates inmate thinking patterns and behavior in and out of the prison. Schlosser notes that in the coerced adoption of the institutional meta-narrative the inmates' history, experience, real struggles, and truths are "devalued, deleted, and replaced with the same stories and truths that every other law-abiding citizen is expected to proclaim...one single narrative they are expected to embrace" (p. 99) -- adherence to this singular meta-narrative a requirement with the cost of defiance reentry failure and continued imprisonment. The most critical flaw of the Missouri State Department of Corrections "Pathway to Change" program ultimately revealed through the inmates' narratives is the program's lack of internal curricular integrity, disconnectedness of the programs goals and methods, and the unfulfilled promise of cognitive-behavioral change in the failure to show inmates through concrete and realistic means how to change their behaviors by changing their thinking --"The truth is the inmates don't know how to help themselves; if they did it is unlikely they would have ended up in prison to begin with....they seek guidance and concrete solutions to some of the bitter realities facing

them on the outside.... the program simply teases the inmates into believing that they are actually learning something." (p. 74). Schlosser invites consideration of the consequences of discursive discipline suggesting that the disrespect inmates experience as a result of participation in the "Pathway to Change" program drives a potentially permanent wedge between the "us" (experts, governmental agents, correctional staff, "good" non-criminal tax payers) and the "them" ("bad" prison inmates) reinforces the meta-narrative of control and creates a barrier to reentry success presented publicly under a guise of processes that look like unification–-"The state uses humiliation and degradation to put inmates 'in their place.' In doing so it draws a heavy line between *them* (men who made bad choices) and everyone else. The use of degradation and lack of respect for human dignity is used as a tactic to drive them further away from the general population... Degradation is a method by which punitive discipline is delivered and there is nothing inmates can do but go along with the show, even at the risk of losing who they are entirely (p. 67-68).

Despite Schlosser's relentless critique of the Missouri State Department of Corrections' "Pathway to Change," she does not directly suggest that the program be completely pulled from the prison. Rather she offers constructive suggestions for program improvement including more effective implementation and training, redefining what is considered expert knowledge to include perspectives of inmates and former inmates, allowing for the possibility of shared responsibility, focus on process of decision-making rather than on making "good" and "bad" choices, redesigning format to replace "instructors" with "facilitators" who guide through collaboration, construction of collaborative recidivism reduction involving current and former prisoners, program revision that shows inmates how to change their thinking and behavior.

Commentary

The use of the program "Pathway to Change" and the points Schlosser raises about the program's missed opportunities to aid prisoners in making direct connections between thoughts and behaviors through the different curricular components illustrates an issue that is touched on (in the discussion of cognitive-behavioral programs on p. 13) but not explicitly discussed in the book. Prison-based cognitive behavioral treatment programs have early roots in the work of Albert Ellis's *Rational Emotive Behavior Therapy* in the 1950s and 1960s (Ellis, 1957, 1962; Ellis & Harper, 1975) which was most popularly applied in the forensic and correctional context in Yochelson & Samenow's (1977) *Criminal Personality*. Through the years elements of these works have morphed into a dizzying array of cognitive-behavioral-based correctional treatment programs many of which are very loosely based offshoots of the original Criminal Personality model. In the late 1970s and 1980s one would be likely to find a copy of *The Criminal Personality* on every probation and parole officer's shelf. Yochelson & Samenow's (1977) model for offender change that was one of the first to abandon traditional psychotherapy in favor of a rational choice free-will cognitive behavioral model that focused on responsibility by addressing criminal thinking patterns and behavior. The Criminal Personality model was based on a treatment program conducted in the 1970s in Saint Elizabeth's hospital for offenders who had been deemed criminally insane. Through analysis of the narratives contained in the phenomenological reporting of the inmates under their care, Yochelson & Samenow developed a treatment program that specifically targeted the thinking patterns and errors of this special group of offenders who Yochelson & Samenow called "Criminal Personalities" (which they indicated was a term they considered synonymous with psychopaths. Later research found that Yochelson & Samenow's "criminal personalities" meet the classification criteria for all four cluster B personality disorders --Histrionic, Antisocial, Narcissistic, and Borderline (Wulach, 1988). *The Criminal Personality* became wildly popular and few who read it understood that Yochelson & Samenow's model was specifically developed for a small subset of offenders who would today likely

score above 30 on the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised (Hare, 1990, 2003) (which was not available at that time).

The influence of the Criminal Personality model on current-day cognitive-behavioral treatment programs cannot be ignored and is clear in Schlosser's account of the "Pathway to Change" program with the program's reliance on choice and responsibility. The thinking error "victim stance" is one of the primary thinking errors noted by Yochelson & Samenow that obstructs the change process and the notion that criminals freely choose their behaviors and that this is identified in their thinking patterns and errors is a salient theme in the Criminal Personality model. However what has occurred in this and other cognitive-behavioral treatment programs is what Schlosser aptly notes in her critique of cognitive-behavioral treatment programs –that "using a blanket general cognitive therapy class in prison to treat a diverse cohort of inmates assumes that therapeutic results apply universally across all class, racial, and ethnic age lines to treat inmates problems effectively (p. 13). Other researchers have found that the roles offenders see themselves playing in their crimes differ by crime type (Ioannou et al, 2015), personality style (Canter & Youngs, 2012), criminal experience (Gregorio, 2009), and whether or not they are criminally active or have desisted from crime (Maruna, 2004). Thus, what is illustrated through Schlosser's findings is that the "Pathway to Change" program attempts to apply a one-size-fits all model to a heterogeneous group of inmates using program components that have historically been developed for use with a homogeneous subset of prisoners who in the terminology of Yochelson & Samenow would fall on the extreme end of what they called a "responsibility continuum," would likely fit the modern-day construct of psychopathy, and would make up approximately 15-20% of the general prison population (Hare, 1993).

The discussion in chapter eight about the importance of considering inmates' histories, situations, and shared responsibility and acknowledging confounds the goals of criminological understanding with correctional treatment. What is necessary for the purpose of criminological understanding (i.e., recognizing the deterministic factors and forces that shape criminal and all human behavior) has been found to be a hindrance in correctional treatment especially with inmates who have antisocial personality disorder and most certainly with the small subset of inmates who would score high on measures of psychopathy (Black, 1999; Cleckley, 1941; Hare, 1996; Meloy, 1988; Thortnon, & Blud, 2007; Yochelson & Samenow, 1977; Wong & Hare, 2004). Prior research suggests that when inmates are invited to recount their histories, a view of themselves as victims has the potential to interfere with change process goals (Yochelson & Samenow, 1977). Schlosser's presentation of the inmates as victims in places in the book (e.g.,"the effects are like sending these inmates out into a war zone without proper armor training or even the permission to change their minds when it might be most beneficial for them to do so (p. 104)) coupled with the absence of sufficient background data on the subjects of her study make it difficult to ascertain whether or not the issue if the victim stance (which is a specific thinking error identified in the Criminal Personality model) contributing to deflection of responsibility would or would not be a hindrance to change and reentry success. Furthermore, while there is an underlying restorative spirit to Schlosser's work, there is no mention of the victims of the inmates she interviewed or the importance of accepting responsibility for the harms caused to others as part of a cognitive behavioral treatment program.

The many years of research on "what works" in correctional treatment (Petersilia, 2004) and the rise of the Risk Need Responsivity Model (RNR) (Andrews & Bonta, 2010; Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 2011) utilized on a widespread scale in corrections in North America has resulted in a move to evidence-based practice in corrections that includes the use of cognitive-behavioral treatment programs with attention to the RNR. We know today after over 50 years of research in forensic psychology and criminology that all offenders are not alike, psychopathy (like the concept of criminal personality) is a distinct construct that represents a small high risk subset of prisoners, and

that any given prison population consists of a heterogeneous group of individuals with different levels of risk, need, and learning styles that make them respond in different ways to different types of programs. Furthermore, there are many different types of people in a prison setting just as there are in any setting who are situated along a broad continuum of personality, thinking, and learning styles that must be attended to in line with the RNR model. Along these lines, Schlosser notes that the use of rational choice theory that underlies "Pathway to Change" makes the assumption that all people have the same type of rationality ignoring that there are different types of rational actors– those who are forward looking and those who are resolute. However, the current metanarrative holds up resolute rationality is the standard universally applicable method for personal decision making identifying anyone who doesn't think that way as having flawed thinking patterns. "In telling the inmates that the reason they are in prison is because of their bad choices and the way to stay out of prison is to stop making bad choices, the subjective individual reasons for those original choices become swallowed up by the new idea they're told to adopt: that good citizens always make the good decision to follow the law" (p. 103-104).

Schlosser's critique of the "Pathway to Change" suggests that the program is a loosely based cognitive behavioral treatment program that is a relic of the past that is far from the "evidence-based" programs touted but the RNR movement in correctional rehabilitation. Given that Schlosser's study was conducted in 2009-10 and involved a prison program established as part of the "Missouri Reentry Process" in a Transitional Housing Unit (TRU) and the "Pathway to Change" program was included as the cognitive restructuring program in the Missouri Department of Corrections in a Second Chance Act Adult Offender Demonstration Project evaluability assessment (Willison et al, 2013) s part of a dizzying number of programs proclaiming to be evidence-based cognitive behavioral treatment programs. That this program is currently in use raises question as to how many such programs are currently in operation under that guise of evidence-based practice.

Perhaps one of the most salient findings of this work, though not specifically labeled as such by Schlosser, is the role that social distance between incarcerated individuals and correctional professionals play in the many missed opportunities for change in prison-based programs that have a potential backfire effect setting inmates who are unequipped up for unrealistic expectations. Schlosser articulates the ways in which expert knowledge in the form of institutionally mandated programs impart a cultural vocabulary of personal responsibility, hard work, and independence that pits experts with knowledge against inmates who are lacking. Schlosser's interview data offers examples of inmates expressing the need to be listened to and not judged… and inmates' suggesting that opportunities to have former prisoners helping them as "experts" would go a long way to assist them with the tools they need to live productive crime-free lives. Throughout the book, Schlosser notes the disconnect between the "Pathway to Change" curriculum and the reality of the inmates lives emphasizing how the lessons appear to have not been written for prison inmates with no relationship to anything the inmates say they have experienced -- "It is as if the manual's author has no experience with the realities of crime and addiction or poverty and desperation, yet fancies himself as expert on the lives of prison inmates"(p. 72), Schlosser highlights the ways in which this disconnect can exacerbate the process of change and reentry success for inmates:

> *The authors of these programs, as well as administrators of prisons, are far enough removed from the inmates' realities that it is unlikely they could fabricate teaching moments even closely related to life on the streets. The result is an insulting, unrealistic representation of make-believe reality that could potentially have the effect of causing more harm than good. If inmates in prison cannot relate to the examples provided in quasi-therapeutic programs like this, they are at risk of*

> *shutting down entirely and losing anything of value they might have taken from the*
> *class* (p. 80).
>
>   *...the expert knowledge of professors, politicians, and justice administrators*
> *is pitted against the lived realities of incarcerated inmates. The two sides are locked*
> *in a battle where the struggle to stay on top is reiterated in a multitude of ways; each*
> *side fighting for its own voice to be heard; but the fight isn't fair. The institution gets*
> *to decide, by virtue of having a list of "experts" to consult, how the inmates should*
> *think of themselves and their pasts, how they are allowed to speak of their lives and*
> *what they must repeat in order to earn their freedom.* (p. 129).

This perception among prisoners and former prisoners that the correctional staff charged with supervising and "correcting" them may not have any similar experience to be able to understand their unique positions and the realities of their lives in prison and upon release has been noted elsewhere as a potential hindrance to successful reentry (Helfgott, 1997, Helfgott & Gunnison, 2008, Gunnison & Helfgott, 2013). However, research on the views of correctional officers suggest that correctional personnel believe that offenders often use the notion of social distance as an excuse not to take responsibility to change (Gunnison & Helfgott, 2011; Helfgott & Gunnison , 2013). Schlosser's work offers additional insight into the role that social distance plays in the offender change process and highlights the importance of understanding the enormous potential disparities that exist between the lived experience of people who are incarcerated and the knowledge of experts charged with the ultimate official correctional goal of recidivism reduction. The assumption of prisoners (and Schlosser) that most or all correctional staff and prison program facilitators have histories that are dissimilar to the histories of inmates may be less true than perceptions suggest. In fact research has found that correctional staff often do not share their backgrounds to maintain necessary professional boundaries but that they in fact do share similar histories with prisoners and former prisoners under their supervision (Gunnison & Helfgott, 2007, 2011, 2013; Helfgott & Gunnison, 2008). Schlosser's findings that inmates in her study perceive this disconnect combined with previous research revealing differences in how inmates and correctional staff perceive each other and the ways in which this hinders reentry success calls for further investigation into this understudied area to better understand the role social distance (or the perception of social distance among inmates) plays as a hindrance to the reentry process.

One cannot help to wonder in reading Schlosser's account of the use of the Pathway to Change program how the program was selected as the mandatory cognitive-behavioral treatment program used by the Missouri Department of Corrections. Schlosser notes, "It is unclear how the Missouri Department of Corrections identified and decided upon the 'Pathway to Change' as the program to use... the documentation regarding why the DOC chose this particular program is murky" (p. 37). She indicates that the program was a recently required addition to the prison curriculum as a result of the Missouri Reentry Process developed by George Nelson a theatre and film professor from Brigham Young University and former bishop of the Mormon Church. Upon reading the cryptic information Schlosser had to rely on to learn about "Pathway for Change," it is difficult to resist conducting a quick independent search for information on the program. Consistent with Schlosser's mention of the missing links with respect to the history of "Pathway to Change" as well as the way in which it was selected as a mandatory program for the Missouri Department of Corrections, there is little to no published descriptive information or empirical data to be found on the "Pathway to Change" program short of Professor Nelson's bio on the Insight Learning Systems website and CV available on the Brigham Young University website indicating that he received a BA in Theatre Arts from Brigham Young University in 1977 and an MFA from the University of Washington in 1979, is a Trainer with Insight Learning Systems, and has been an Associate Professor of Theatre and Media Arts at Brigham Young since 1990. Professor Nelson's bio says that he has for 20 years "shown

thousands of educators how to successfully teach criminal offenders — some of the most difficult learners in society" and that he has "developed dozens of innovative behavior-change and skill-building programs that have been used to teach offenders in prisons, jails, brigs, probation and parole departments throughout the United States, Canada and Australia" (George D. Nelson, n.d.). Professor Nelson's CV lists plays and publications in theatre and three publications in corrections journals in the mid-1990s including two articles --"A program by any other name would still be a life skills program" and Harnessing the learning preference of criminal offenders" in the *Texas Corrections Journal* and an article titled "Understanding how they learn" in *Community Corrections Journal.* However, these titles and journals could not be located through EBSCOhost search. The Missouri Department of Corrections Supervision Strategies and Treatment Alternatives (2015) suggests that Pathway to Change is currently in use:

> *Pathway to Change is an essential element of the offender management approach utilized by the Missouri Department of Corrections. Research shows that building cognitive skills has been the single most effective intervention technique that can be employed by corrections. The curriculum adopted by the Department will address issues related to criminal behavior and recidivism such as: factors that lead to criminal behavior, responsible decision making, examination of values and attitudes, successful relationships, identifying and correcting thinking errors. This is a twelve week program. The first 6 sessions must be completed in chronological order and the last 6 may be completed as chosen by the officer/offender (p. 22).*

In addition, the Urban Institute Justice Policy Center conducted an evaluability assessment of the Missouri Department of Corrections Second Chance in Action Program as part of a National Institute of Justice Office of Justice Programs 2001 Second Chance Act Adult Offender Reentry Demonstration Project which lists Pathway to Change as "the DOC's core cognitive restructuring program" offered both in prison and the community for women transitioning from prison to community (Willison et al, 2013). This clearly suggests that the program is currently being used and raises question about how many such programs are in operation in prisons across the United States and around the world. Schlosser's work is compelling in this regard in terms of lighting the fire to further investigate the extent to which similar programs are in operation.

While Schlosser's work is an important and timely contribution to the literature, there are a number of questions that arise with respect to the research design and methodology. It is unclear why Schlosser chose not to make an attempt to observe a "Pathways to Change" session to rely solely on secondary data and inmates' interviews to learn about program, in particular given her emphasis on uncovering the inner workings of cognitive behavioral treatment programs. While she notes that her use of secondary data allowed her to "stay more closely tied to the intended focus of the class" making it less likely that her critique was tied to staff members' conception of the class which allowed her analyses to be 'strongly grounded in the empirical data" available in the prison field setting (p. 45) this complete disconnect between the actual class environment and complete reliance on official institutional program documents (which are more often than not far-removed from the actual manner in which prison programs are implemented) and inmates' ad hoc and perceptions and perspectives on the experience in the class (given they were not asked directly about their experience in the class) may be more of a weakness than a strength. It is also unclear as to why or if official criminal history data was not collected and the absence of more details on the subjects leaves question regarding their risk and need levels and the nature of their criminal histories beyond only brief mention in the presentation of their narrative comments of their race and age and self-reported crimes. Given the importance of making sense of correctional treatment

curricula with attention to inmate differences, this information seems particularly important and saliently absent. In addition, some of the methods uncovered such as the gender switching exercises seem particularly odd and inappropriate which leaves at least this reader wondering why no further investigation into the origin of some of the lessons was conducted.

Schlosser's *Narratives and Discursive Discipline in Prison: Rewriting Personal Histories through Cognitive-Behavioral Programs* is a key contribution to the correctional literature. The findings expose nuanced inside details of a cognitive behavioral treatment program currently in use in a large state department of corrections and raise awareness of what is likely a widespread issue with potential to severely hinder reentry success for inmates in prisons across the United States and around the world. Schlosser's findings suggest the "Pathway to Change" is not as effective as presented, does not adhere to evidence-based practice, and raises the issue of transparency in terms of how such programs are selected. Her work contributes to previous research that has highlighted the need for humanistic elements in traditional cognitive behavioral treatment programs that violate respect for individuality central to humanistic psychology and are unresponsive to individual differences of offenders (e.g., Dahlen & Johnson, 2010). The book provides concrete suggestions for improving existing programs, inspires methodological creativity to further examine through mixed method research the effectiveness of cognitive behavioral prison programs and offers a methodological framework for qualitative analysis of prison programs, and Illuminates the issue of disconnection and social distance that could potentially hinder inmate change and reentry success and encourages future research to empirically examine this with potential to create change in correctional programs, policies, and training .

Conclusion

Inmate's Narratives and Discursive Discipline in Prison offers an extraordinary critique of a cognitive behavioral correctional treatment programs that raises questions about the many programs operating behind prison walls under the veil of evidence-based practice. Schlosser's analysis of the "Pathway to Change" program reveals a relic program loosely based on early cognitive-behavioral correctional psychology fraught with internal inconsistencies and missed opportunities for prisoner change. Schlosser's analysis raises question regarding how many such programs are currently in operation in prisons in the United States and around the world riding the contemporary wave of miscommunication that all cognitive-behavioral correctional treatment programs are evidence-based when the reality is far from the case. Schlosser's analysis inspires methodological creativity to dig deeper into the inner-workings of cognitive-behavioral treatment programs in correctional contexts. Schlosser asks, "...It's time to ask not "what works "but "at what the cost?" (p. 124). It is also time to ask what would happen if her concluding suggestions were to take hold. What would it look like if cognitive-behavioral treatment programs presented a different meta-narrative of subjective rationality, shared responsibility, acknowledgement of context, concrete connection between state goals and inmate goals? What would happen if inmates were assisted in preparing for their future while acknowledging their past? What if prisoners and former prisoners joined with correctional administrators and staff, community members, mental health providers, and even victims in the collaborative recidivism reduction process? The many questions raised by this work offers hope for a new era of correctional and reentry research that is theoretically and methodologically equipped to more fully and meaningfully examine the mechanisms by which human change occurs in correctional environments.

References

Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Wormith, S.J. (2011). The Risk-Need-Responsivity Model. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 38* (7), 735-755.

Andrews, D.A. & Bonta, J. (2010). The psychology of criminal conduct. New York: Routledge.

Black, D.W. (1999). Bad boys, bad men: Confronting Antisocial Personality Disorder. New York: Oxford University Press.

Becker, H.S. (1963). The outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance. New York: The Free Press.

Canter, D., Kaouri, C., & Ioannou, M. (2003). The facet structure of criminal narratives. In Levy,S., and Elizur,D. *Facet Theory: Towards a Cumulative Social Science,* Ljubljana: Faculty of Arts, Center for Educational Development, 27-38.

Canter, D. & Youngs, D. (2011), Narrative roles in criminal action: An integrative framework for differentiating offenders. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 17*, 262-275.

Canter, D. & Youngs, D. (2012), Narratives of criminal action and forensic psychology*. Legal and Criminological Psychology, 17*, 262-275.

Canter, D. & Youngs, D. (2015). The LLAF Procedure for exploring offenders' narratives. The Howard Journal, 54(3), 1-18.

Cleckley, H. (1941, 1988). *The mask of sanity.* Augusta, GA: Emily S. Cleckley.

Dahlen, K. & Johnson, R. (2010). The humanism is in the details: An insider's account of humanistic modifications to a cognitive-behavioral treatment program in a maximum-security prison. The Prison Journal, 1, 115-135.

De Gregorio, E. The role of offender experience and crimes in shaping accounts. *Journal of Investigative Psychology and Offender Profiling, 6*, 101-116.

Ellis, A. (1957). Rational Psychotherapy and Individual Psychology. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 13: 38-44.

Ellis, A. (1962). *Reason and Emotion in Psychotherapy*. New York: Stuart.

Ellis, A. & Harper, R.A. (1975). A new guide to rational living. Chatsworth, CA: Wilshire Book Co.

Ferrell, J. and Hamm, M. S. (Eds) (1998). *Ethnography at the Edge: Crime, Deviance and Field Research.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison.* New York: Vintage.

Gadd, D. & Farrall, S. (2004). Criminal careers, desistance, and subjectivity: Interpreting men's narratives of change. *Theoretical Criminology, 8*(2), 123-156.

Garland, D. (1990). Punishment and modern society: A study in social theory. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity.* New York: Simon and
        Schuster.

Gunnison, E. & Helfgott, J.B. (2007). Community corrections officer perceptions of ex-offender
        reentry needs and challenges. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology, 22*(1).

Gunnison, E. & Helfgott, J.B. (2011). Factors that hinder reentry success: A view from community
        corrections officers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology,
        55(2),* 1-18.

Gunnison, E. & Helfgott, J.B. (2013) *Offender Reentry: Beyond Crime and Punishment.* Boulder, C:
        Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Harcourt, B. E. (2007). *Against prediction: Profiling, policing, and punishing in an actuarial age.*
        Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Hare R. D. (1991, 2003). *Manual for the Psychopathy Checklist-Revised*. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-
        Health Systems.

Hare R. D. (1993). *Without conscience: The disturbing world of psychopaths among us.* New York:
        Pocket Books.

Hare, R.D. (1996). Psychopathy and Antisocial Personality Disorder: A case of diagnostic confusion.
        Psychiatric Times, 13, 39-40.

Helfgott, J.B. (1997). Exoffender needs versus community opportunity in Seattle, Washington.
        Federal Probation, *61*, 12-24.

Helfgott, J.B. & Gunnison, E. (2008). The influence of social distance on community corrections
        officer perceptions of offender reentry needs. *Federal Probation, 72* (1), 2-12.

Henry, S. & Milovanovic, D. (1996). *Constitutive criminology: Beyond postmodernism.* Thousand
        Oaks, CA: Sage.

Klingele, C. (2015). The promises and perils of evidence-based corrections. *The Notre Dame Law
        Review, 91*(2), 537-584.

Maruna S (2001) *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives.* Washington, DC:
        American Psychological Association.

Meloy, J.R. (1988). *The psychopathic mind: Origins, dynamics, and treatment.* New Jersey/London:
        Jason Aronson, Inc.

Missouri Department of Corrections (November 19, 2015). Strategies and treatment alternatives.
        Jefferson County, MI: Missouri Department of Corrections Board of Probation and Parole.
        Retrieved from http://doc.mo.gov/Documents/prob/SupervisionStrategies.pdf.

Nelson, G.D. (n.d.) Insight Learning bio of George D. Nelson. Retrieved from
        http://www.insightlearning.com/personnel/employees/BioGDN.htm.

Nelson, G.D. (2012). Curriculum Vita of George D. Nelson. Retrieved from
        https://cfac.byu.edu/tma/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/George-Nelson-CV.pdf.

Petersilia, J. (2004). What works in prisoner reentry? Reviewing and questioning the evidence.
        Federal Probation, 68(2), 4-8.

Presser, L. (2008). *Been a heavy life: Stories of violent men.* Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Presser, L. (2009). The narratives of offenders. *Theoretical Criminology 13,* 177–200

Presser, L. (2015). *Narrative criminology: Understanding the stories of crime.* New York: New York University Press.

Stevens, A. (2012). 'I am the person now I was always meant to be': Identity reconstruction and narrative reframing in therapeutic community prisons. *Criminology & Criminal Justice, 12*(5), 527-547.

Thortnon, D. & Blud, L. (2007). The influence of psychopathic traits on response to treatment, In Herve, H. & Yuille, J.C. (Eds.) *The psychopath: Theory, research, and practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 505-539.

Ward, T. (2011). Narrative identity and forensic psychology: A commentary on Youngs and Canter. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 17,* 250-261.

Willison, J.B., Owens, C., Barrick, K., & Walsh, K. (2013). FY 2011 Second Chance Act Adult Offender Reentry Demonstration Projects: Evaluability assessment of the Missouri Department of Corrections Second Chance in Action (SCIA) Program. WA D.C.: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/243985.pdf.

Wilson, D.B., Bouffard, L.A., & Mackenzie, D.L. (2005). A quantitative review of structured, group-oriented cognitive-behavioral programs for offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 32*(2), 172-204.

Wong, S. & Hare, R.D. (2004). *Guidelines for a psychopathy treatment program.* Multi-Health Systems.

Wulach, J.S. (1988). The criminal personality as a DSMIII-R antisocial, narcissistic, borderline, and histrionic personality disorder. *International Journal of Offender Counseling and Comparative Criminology, 33*, 185-199.

Yates, J. (2004). Criminological ethnography: Risks, dilemmas, and their negotiation. In Mesko, G., Pagon, M., & Dobovsek, B. (Eds). *Policing in Central and Eastern Europe: Dilemmas of Contemporary Criminal Justice.* Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/Mesko/208043.pdf.

Yochelson, S., & Samenow, S.E. (1977). *The criminal personality. Volumes 1-3.* New York: Jason Aronson, Inc.