

How do rehabilitation programmes help prevent former prisoners from committing more crimes?

Ifrah Karim

Rehabilitation programmes are central to modern approaches in criminal justice, aiming to prepare prisoners for successful reintegration into society and to reduce the likelihood of reoffending. Rather than relying only on punishment, these programmes address the educational, psychological, and social needs of individuals who have been incarcerated. Their effectiveness lies in targeting the root causes of criminal behaviour and equipping people with the tools to build a different future.

A major strand of rehabilitation is education and vocational training. Many prisoners have not completed formal schooling, and this lack of education limits employment opportunities upon release. Programmes offering literacy classes, secondary school qualifications, or vocational training in trades such as carpentry or information technology create opportunities for stable work. The RAND Corporation's large-scale meta-analysis found that prisoners who participated in education programmes were 43% less likely to return to prison (Davis et al., 2013). Similarly, Duwe and Clark (2014) demonstrated that prison-based education significantly improved post-release employment prospects while reducing recidivism. Education, therefore, is not just about skills but about restoring self-confidence and economic independence.

Another crucial dimension is addressing substance misuse and mental health issues. Offending is often connected to addiction or untreated trauma. Programmes offering cognitive behavioural therapy, addiction counselling, and group support address these issues directly. A study published in the *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology* (2020) showed that participants in treatment-based programmes were less likely to reoffend than non-participants, underlining the role of therapy in breaking cycles of dependency and crime.

Rehabilitation also prepares individuals for reintegration into the community. The period after release can be destabilising, with challenges such as housing insecurity, unemployment, and social stigma. Without support, former prisoners may quickly fall back into old habits. Asiedu, Yoon and Suzuki (1999) emphasised the importance of community-based programmes that combine supervision with practical assistance, creating a structured bridge between prison and society. By providing mentoring, housing support, and job placement, these initiatives reduce the risk of social exclusion.

The theoretical framework behind many modern programmes is the Risk-Need-Responsivity (RNR) model, introduced by Andrews and Bonta (2010). This model suggests interventions should match an offender's risk level, address their specific criminogenic needs, and be responsive to personal characteristics such as learning style. Its widespread adoption reflects its strong empirical foundation. However, debates also exist. Ward, Yates and Willis (2012) proposed the "Good Lives Model" as a complement, focusing not only on reducing risk but also on promoting positive life goals. This debate illustrates the evolving understanding of rehabilitation.

Finally, some initiatives use arts and creative expression as rehabilitation tools. Theatre, music, and writing programmes allow individuals to reflect, build self-expression, and develop discipline. Such approaches, while less conventional, have been shown to improve confidence and emotional regulation. The Rehabilitation Through the Arts programme in New York is an example, demonstrating that creativity can play a role in personal growth and reintegration.

In summary, rehabilitation programmes help prevent crime by equipping individuals with education, treating psychological needs, supporting reintegration, and applying evidence-based models. Their effectiveness has been documented in both large-scale

analyses and smaller studies. By focusing on human development as well as public safety, they create pathways for individuals to reenter society as contributing members rather than repeat offenders.

References:

- Andrews, D. A. & Bonta, J. (2010) *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct*. 5th ed. New Providence: LexisNexis/Matthew Bender.
- Asiedu, W. K., Yoon, B. & Suzuki, M. (1999) *Rehabilitation and Correctional Programmes in the Community to Prevent Recidivism by Discharged Prisoners*. UNAFEI Resource Material Series No. 54.
- Davis, L. M., Bozick, R., Steele, J., Saunders, J. & Miles, J. N. V. (2013) *Evaluating the Effectiveness of Correctional Education: A Meta-Analysis of Programs That Provide Education to Incarcerated Adults*. RAND Corporation.
- Duwe, G. & Clark, V. (2014) 'The Effects of Prison-Based Educational Programming on Recidivism and Employment', *The Prison Journal*, 94(4), pp. 454-478.
- *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology* (2020) 'Recidivism After a Prison-Based Treatment Program: A Comparison Between a Treatment and Control Group', 6(1), pp. 95-126.
- Ward, T., Yates, P. & Willis, G. M. (2012) 'The Good Lives Model and the Risk-Need-Responsivity Model: A Critical Response', *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 39(1), pp. 94-110.