University of Huddersfield Repository

Nikki, Carthy

Deconstructing Offenders' Narratives

Original Citation


This version is available at http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/20354/

The University Repository is a digital collection of the research output of the University, available on Open Access. Copyright and Moral Rights for the items on this site are retained by the individual author and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full items free of charge; copies of full text items generally can be reproduced, displayed or performed and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided:

- The authors, title and full bibliographic details is credited in any copy;
- A hyperlink and/or URL is included for the original metadata page; and
- The content is not changed in any way.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: E.mailbox@hud.ac.uk.

http://eprints.hud.ac.uk/
DECONSTRUCTING OFFENDERS’ NARRATIVES

by

NIKKI L. CARTHY

A thesis submitted to the University of Huddersfield
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

UNIVERSITY OF HUDDERSFIELD

SEPTEMBER 2013
i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns any copyright in it (the “copyright”) and s/he has given The University of Huddersfield the right to use such Copyright for any administrative, promotional, educational and/or teaching purposes.

ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts, may be made only in accordance with the regulations of the University Library. Details of these regulations may be obtained from the Librarian. This page must form part of any such copies.

iii. The ownership of any patents, designs, trademarks and any and all other intellectual property rights except for the Copyright (the “Intellectual Property Rights”) and reproductions of copyright works, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property Rights and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property right and/or Reproductions.
“...[Atticus Finch] you never really understand a person until you consider things from his point of view...until you climb into his skin and walk around in it...”

Harper Lee, To Kill a Mockingbird
Abstract

The view of making sense of a person’s reality through the stories they tell about their lives, developed by Bruner (1991) and McAdams (1993) is the theoretical perspective used to reveal what offenders’ life-stories uncover about their offending action. Interviews with 63 incarcerated offenders and 90 non-incarcerated males’ explored three life-episodes: a Significant Event (SE), crime or deviant act, and life as a film. Narrative Roles Questionnaire (NRQ) and demographic information was also collected. The LAAF framework for eliciting and interpreting life-story narratives was implemented. The LAAF is developed from psychological literature from different aspects of narrative focusing on three primary areas: McAdams (e.g. 1993) life-stories, Bamberg’s (2009) identity in narrative, and Sykes and Matza’s (1957) neutralisation theory.

The first section of analysis focuses on SE and film narratives. Firstly, incarcerated and non-incarcerated descriptions of SE and film, for each of the LAAF content variables, were compared employing Chi Square analysis. Findings show the incarcerated group having more negative items identified in their life-episodes. This difference was consistent in SE and film narratives. Secondly, SSA-I explored the thematic structure of the LAAF variables for the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. A thematic region within the incarcerated SSA-I plot termed ‘contamination script’ was found in all of the incarcerated offenders narratives, for SE and film, but in only a small proportion of the non-incarcerated narratives. Thirdly, archetypal themes were identified in the SSA-I configuration showing distinct regions of themes relating to Youngs and Canter’s (2011; 2012) classifications of hero, victim, revenger and professional for the SE and film narrative. Findings demonstrated psychological consistency with dominant narrative roles across the two life-episodes.

The second section focuses on crime and deviant life-episodes. Youngs and Canter (2012) identified narrative themes in offenders’ NRQ responses. First, SSA-I configuration confirmed narrative themes in the incarcerated and non-incarcerated responses to NRQ items. Principal Component Analysis revealed psychological components of emotion, identity, and cognitive interpretations in NRQ items. Secondly, crimes and deviant acts were differentiated using: property, person, and sensory categories; a psychological classification system, based on Bandura’s (1986, 1999) theory of incentives. Multivariate analyses of the NRQ responses provided loose support for different narrative themes underpinning different crime types. Qualitative thematic analysis revealed a number of psychological themes of emotion, preparedness, and blame present in both incarcerated and non-incarcerated narratives; differences were exhibited by Feshbach’s (1964) instrumental and expressive dichotomy.

Similar dominant narrative roles were exhibited by the incarcerated and non-incarcerated crime and deviant episodes; differences resided in the contamination script and level of instrumentality. Psychological consistency, in different life-episodes, demonstrates theoretical contributions. Methodological contributions are recognised by the success of the LAAF framework for exploring criminals’ narratives. The application of a narrative perspective provides a tool for researching criminal action in a way that makes sense to those closest to the action – the criminal.
Dedication

I dedicate this thesis to my late father, Nicholas Carthy. Dad, if you had not taken the time from work to take me to the PhD interview and prepare me for what was ahead; the journey may have never begun! You have been an inspiration in my life in many ways – thanks Dad!
Acknowledgements

First of all, I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to all of the narrators that took the time to take part in the research; without such detailed and interesting life-stories the study would not be possible. Thank you to the research team for collecting the data and HMP Liverpool for providing the means to do so.

I would like to thank my supervisors Professor David Canter and Dr Donna Youngs for giving me the opportunity to work with such an exciting and intriguing dataset. I would also like to thank them for all of their support, mentorship and continued guidance. David, I am eternally grateful for your thorough and constructive feedback on my writing; it has certainly helped me improve and provided me with a strong foundation for continued development. Donna, I would like to thank you for your patience and helping me to develop both academically and professionally. It has been a pleasure to work with you both and I look forward to many future collaborations.

Thank you to the University of Huddersfield for funding my studies and for the technical and administrative support.

A big thank you Sophia Tkazky, Valerie Savoie, Kathy Hughes, Olivia Simpson, Emek Yuce Zeyrek and Agnes Wozna for all the great work and help with inter-rating – I know it was not easy but I am eternally grateful. It has been a pleasure to work with the team at IRCIP; the peer support has provided an enjoyable experience even during difficult times. I have made some life-long colleagues and some life-long friends. In particular, I would like to thank (in no particular order) Dr Maria Ioannou, Dr Laura Hammond, John Synnott, Jemma Hollinshead, Val Savoie and Kathy Hughes for all the proof reading and comments you have provided over the years, which has helped develop the thesis into what it is today.

Thank you to my colleagues at Teesside University for all of their success (and horror) stories which helped me prepare for the PhD rollercoaster ride. To, Natalie Wilson, a colleague and dear friend, for the time she spent reading drafts and the many weekly stats debates we had.
I would like to extend a personal thanks to my family, especially my mother, Beverly Carthy, for supporting me through the years emotionally (and financially!) to reach my goals and teaching me to never give up; and to my brothers Brogan, Tysen and Kalem and to Karen for your love and support. To my friends who have barely seen me. My oldest and dearest friend Natalie Crow for supplying plenty of coffee breaks and conversations about the life that exists beyond being a PhD student; to my treasured friend, Stacey Tonkin, for all the friendship and kindness she has given over the years; to my dear friend Dr Matthew Haigh for the guidance he has provided; and to my old and dear friend Phil Wood for always reminding me: “the force is with you”.

Finally, I would like to give a special thanks to my partner, Michael Sreenan, whose support, patience, compassion and friendship (and culinary skills!) was the backbone of the journey. Thank you!
Contents

Abstract....................................................................................................................................i

Acknowledgments....................................................................................................................ii

Table of Contents.....................................................................................................................v

List of Tables............................................................................................................................xi

List of Figures..........................................................................................................................xii

List of abbreviations................................................................................................................xiii

Chapter 1. A Crime, A Criminal, A Narrative, Does this Exhibit An Agenda.........................1
  1.1. Using Criminals As A First-hand Data Source...............................................................2
  1.2. Storylines of Criminal Action......................................................................................4
  1.3. Researching the Offenders’ Perspective......................................................................7
  1.4. Linguistic Examination of Crime Narratives...............................................................8
  1.5. Limitations in the research.........................................................................................9

Chapter 2. A Psychological Framework for Criminal Narrative Deconstruction.....................11
  2.1. Defining Narratives.......................................................................................................11
  2.2. Autobiographical Narratives .......................................................................................12
  2.3. Agentic Benefits of Narrative ....................................................................................15
  2.4. The Role of Narrative in Understanding Criminality: A summary of ideas............17
    2.4.1. Exploring deviancy.................................................................................................18
      2.4.1.1. Definitional issues and limitations for offender – non-offender comparisons.19
    2.4.2. The role of time and place accounting for change in narrative.......................21
    2.4.3. Narrative identity.................................................................................................22
      2.4.3.1. Dominant narratives .....................................................................................24
      2.4.3.2. Portrayal of a character role .........................................................................25
      2.4.3.3. Creating meaning.........................................................................................27
      2.4.3.4. Idealised persons: Imagoes of the self and others .......................................29
    2.4.4. Behaviours and incentives.....................................................................................30
2.4.5. Polarising aspects of interpersonal behaviour ...........................................31

2.4.6. Life-story themes: a redemption script and a contamination script
..................................................................................................................................33

2.4.6.1. A move towards the light: the redemption script ..........................33

2.4.6.2. Descending from the light: A contamination script .....................35

2.4.7. Justifying behaviour: Cognitive interpretations expressed in
narrative .........................................................................................................................36

2.4.8. Emotions ........................................................................................................38

2.5. A Psychological Framework for Narrative .........................................................39

2.5.1. Development of a Narrative Action System (NAS) .............. 40

Chapter 3. Rationale for Research ...........................................................................42

3.1. Themes of the Analysis ..................................................................................44

3.2. Research Aims and Questions ....................................................................44

Chapter 4. Thesis methodology ............................................................................47

4.1. Thesis statement .............................................................................................47

4.1.1. Epistemological and theoretical position ...........................................47

4.2. Data .................................................................................................................49

4.2.1. CY-NEOv1 narrative protocol ..................................................................49

4.2.1.1. Life-episodes .........................................................................................51

4.2.1.2. NRQ .......................................................................................................51

4.2.1.3. Demographic questions ........................................................................52

4.2.1.4. LTQ, Emotions and D45 ....................................................................53

4.2.1.5. CY-NEOv1 in action ..............................................................................53

4.1.2. LAAF framework ..................................................................................54

4.3. Sample ...........................................................................................................55

4.3.1. Incarcerated offenders’ ...........................................................................55

4.2.2. Non-incarcerated respondents ............................................................57

4.4. Data collection process .................................................................................58
4.4.1. Ethics ...................................................................................................60

Section introduction (1): Life outside of crime ........................................62

Chapter 5. Life narrative comparisons of incarcerated and non-incarcerated males ..........63

  5.1. Introduction ...........................................................................................63

  5.2. Method ..................................................................................................64

    5.2.1. Data analysis strategy .....................................................................65

  5.3. Results ..................................................................................................66

    5.3.1. Film narrative .............................................................................75

        5.3.1.1. Story content .....................................................................75

        5.3.1.2. Psychological content .......................................................80

        5.3.1.3. Psychological complexity ...............................................83

        5.3.1.4. Psychological components ..............................................84

    5.3.2. Significant event ........................................................................89

        5.3.2.1. Story genre .........................................................................97

        5.3.2.2. Psychological content .......................................................99

        5.3.2.3. Psychological complexity .................................................104

        5.3.2.4. Psychological components ..............................................104

  5.4. Chapter summary and conclusion: uncovering the criminal narrative ............110

Chapter 6. Offenders’ contaminated script .......................................................114

  6.1. Introduction ........................................................................................114

  6.2. Method ................................................................................................115

    6.2.1. Data analysis strategy ...............................................................117

  6.3. Results ................................................................................................117

    6.3.1. Thematic structure and frequency analysis of LAAF variables ..........118

        6.3.1.1. Frequency analysis ..........................................................118

        6.3.1.2. Thematic structure ..........................................................129

        6.3.1.3. The contaminated script ................................................134
6.3.2. Case studies: level of contamination within the life narratives
..................................................................................................................................138

6.3.3. Background characteristics and level of contamination .................141

6.4. Chapter summary and conclusion: the contaminated script .................142

Chapter 7. Archetypal themes in life-episodes .........................................................145

7.1. Introduction ...........................................................................................................145

7.2. Method ....................................................................................................................147
  7.2.1. Data analysis strategy .....................................................................................147

7.3. Results ....................................................................................................................147
  7.3.1. Archetypal structure of LAAF items .................................................................147
  7.3.2. Archetypal themes and dominant narrative roles in the LAAF items
  .......................................................................................................................................152
  7.3.3. Correlating dominant narrative roles with narrative contexts ......................163

7.4. Chapter summary and conclusion: Archetypal themes and life trajectories
........................................................................................................................................163

Section introduction: Life inside of crime .................................................................166

Chapter 8. Uncovering narrative roles of criminal and deviant action using the Narrative
Roles Questionnaire (NRQ): Comparisons with published research .............................167

8.1. Introduction ...........................................................................................................167
  8.1.2. Broader themes of criminal and socially unacceptable behaviour .........168

8.2. Method ....................................................................................................................169
  8.2.1. Data analysis strategy .....................................................................................169

8.3. Results ....................................................................................................................172
  8.3.1. Comparing NRQ findings to Youngs and Canter (2012) .........................172
    8.3.1.1. SSA configuration and dominant narrative structure .......................172
    8.3.1.2. Psychological component interpretations of SSA .......................177
    8.3.1.3. Correlating dominant narrative themes with narrative contexts for incarcerated offenders ..............................179
10.5.1. An aetiological approach to criminality .................................................. 234

10.6. Methodological contributions ......................................................................... 236

10.6.1. Narrative paradigm as a method for exploring criminal action ...... 236

10.6.2. Life As A Film (LAAF) ............................................................................... 237

10.6.3. Narrative Roles Questionnaire (NRQ) ..................................................... 238

10.7. Practical contributions .................................................................................... 238

10.7.1. Treatment and rehabilitation ................................................................. 238

10.7.2. Offender reintegration and crime reduction ......................................... 239

10.7.3. Conversation management tools .............................................................. 240

10.7.4. Police investigation and Criminal Justice System .................................... 241

10.8. Future directions ............................................................................................. 241

References............................................................................................................... 244

Appendices................................................................................................................ 266
List of Tables

Table 5.1. LAAF variables for life as a film narrative interview..............................................67
Table 5.2. LAAF variables for significant event narrative interview........................................90
Table 6.1. Frequency of LAAF items for the film and significant event narrative interviews for both incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals............................................................120
Table 7.1. Chronbach’s alpha for thematic regions of LAAF variables..................................151
Table 8.1. Internal consistency of NRQ items for each narrative role from the incarcerated offenders...............................................................................................................................174
Table 8.2. Internal consistency of NRQ items for each narrative role from the non-incarcerated sample..................................................................................................................................176
Table 8.3. Internal consistency of NRQ items for each narrative role from the combined incarcerated offenders and non-incarcerated individuals................................................182
Table 8.4. NRQ item loadings from PCA analysis using varimax rotation.............................183
Table 8.5. PCA component themes and central tendency comparisons of participant groups ..............................................................................................................................................186
Table 9.1. Summary of PPS classifications in criminal and deviant actions discussed by participants........................................................................................................................................193
Table 9.2. Crime classifications and NRQ items....................................................................194
Table 9.3. Deviant acts and NRQ items.................................................................................196
Table 9.4. Thematic analysis theme summary table.............................................................199
List of Figures

Figure 6.1. Thematic structure of LAAF variables for film narrative for incarcerated offenders.................................................................130

Figure 6.2. Thematic structure of LAAF variables for film narrative for non-incarcerated........................................................................131

Figure 6.3. Thematic structure of LAAF variables for significant event narrative for incarcerated offenders........................................132

Figure 6.4. Thematic structure of LAAF variables for the significant narrative for non-incarcerated..........................................................133

Figure 6.5. Thematic structure of LAAF items for Film narrative for incarcerated offenders with non-incarcerated LAAF items mapped on..............................................................................136

Figure 6.6. Thematic structure of LAAF items for significant event for incarcerated offenders with non-incarcerated LAAF items mapped on..................................................................................137

Figure 7.1. Thematic regions of LAAF variables for film narrative for incarcerated offenders..................................................................................149

Figure 7.2. Thematic regions of LAAF variables for significant event narrative for incarcerated offenders..................................................150

Figure 7.3. Summary of narrative themes in the configuration of the LAAF items from figure 7.1 and 7.2..........................................................152

Figure 8.1. SSA configuration of NRQ responses for the crime behaviours disclosed by the incarcerated sample.................................................................174

Figure 8.2. SSA configuration of NRQ responses for the socially unacceptable behaviours disclosed in the non-incarcerated sample.................................................................176

Figure 8.3. Psychological component SSA-I divisions for socially unacceptable behaviours..........................................................................................178

Figure 8.4. SSA of NRQ items for incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals..........................................................181

Figure 8.5. SSA-I configuration from Figure 8.3 with the PCA components identified..........................................................185
List of abbreviations

CJS...........Criminal Justice System
COA...........Coefficient Of Alienation
ICON.........International Comparison of Offenders Narratives project
IP..............Investigative Psychology
IRCIP.......International Research Centre for Investigative Psychology
LAAF.......Life As A Film, framework for eliciting and analysing offenders narratives
LIC.........Life Inside of Crime
LOOC......Life Outside Of Crime
MDS........Multidimensional Scaling
NAS.........Canter and Youngs (2009) Narrative Action System
NRQ.......Narrative Roles Questionnaire
PCA........Principal Component Analysis
PPS.........Person, Property and Sensory classifications used to differentiate crime types
SE.........Significant Event, a section of the narrative interview
SLT.........Social Learning Theory
SSA-I......Smallest Space Analysis, a multidimensional scaling method
SUBs.......Socially Unacceptable Behaviours
TAT.........Thematic Appreciation Test
Chapter 1

A Crime, A Criminal, A Narrative, Does this Exhibit An Agenda of Study?

Asking the criminal, as the expert of their life, behaviours, and choices, to describe their offending action provides an avenue to explore antecedent factors and a diverse range of direct psychological processes that are involved in the commissioning and execution of the action. Through narratives, crime action can be uncovered the way it makes sense to those who commit the crimes and how the action exists within their reality. The idea of getting closer to the crime, from the perspective of the offender, is a concept that has been commonly noted within criminological and psychological literature (e.g. Canter, 1994; Maruna, 1999; Matza, 1970; Nee, 2004; Presser, 2009; Toch, 1987). The development of a narrative paradigm for researching criminal action has started to emerge more frequently within academic literature over recent decades. Uncovering a criminal’s narrative as a research tool sheds light on, what Polkinghorne (1988) describes as, lived experience; providing a psychologically rich source of data.

Practitioners within the Criminal Justice System (CJS) spend a large proportion of their time working with criminals’ narrative experience of the crimes they have committed; still, researchers tend to overlook the usefulness of narrative experience as raw data in favour of analysing datasets and statistical models (Nee, 2004, pg.3). Much knowledge about crime and criminals has emphasis on background and environmental features and has supported a lot of developments in theoretical explanations of criminality. Agnew (2006) raises an important point that when criminals’ discuss their crimes they narrate storied accounts of their actions rather than describing background and environmental features. However, the potential use of storied narratives as explanatory methods to the aetiology of crime is lacking as a substantial contribution to the existing literature (Presser, 2009).

The use of criminals’ narratives as research data opens up a debate to how such information can be used in a systematic way which extends existing knowledge of criminality. Presser (2010) highlights the lack of a knowledge base for methodological approaches to elicit, interpret and analyse criminals’ narratives. To establish the contribution of narratives to criminal research it is necessary to explore two key areas: the
method of collecting the data and the type of data to be collected. Each theme is explored in the following sections.

1.1. Using Criminals As A First-hand Data Source

Within Investigative Psychology (IP), collecting data from the offenders’ crime scene actions offers a way of viewing crimes from the perspective of the offenders. This approach has been successful in the study of a number of crimes, such as rape (Canter & Heritage, 1990), stalking (Canter & Ioannou, 2004), homicide (Salfati, 2000), burglary (Merry & Harsent, 2000) and terrorism (Wilson, 2000), case linkage of sex offenders (Woodhams & Labuschagne, 2012), case linkage of homicide (Labuschagne, 2006), case linkage of burglary (Markson, Woodhams, & Bond, 2010), and criminals spatial movements (Lundringan, Czarnomski & Wilson, 2010). However, such methods are limited to police data files, crime scene information, and witness statements; each holds a number of biases due to the data not being collected for academic research purposes and requires a strong element of interpretation by the researcher. One way to overcome this is to develop direct data sources from interviewing offenders.

Nee (2004) reviews the usefulness of interviewing offenders about their crimes; this approach is particularly valuable in gaining the offenders perspective of the crimes they commit. Taylor and Nee (1988), for example, examined simulations of offenders’ reactions to viewing properties as targets for burglaries. Thought patterns were narrated aloud by the offenders uncovering information to what the offenders considered as ‘attractive’ features of the properties as potential targets for crimes. Canter (2003) implemented a similar narrative simulation method by asking offenders to draw maps of their ‘crime space’ and provide a narrative of the map discussing how it relates to geographical distribution of the crimes they have committed. The simulation method allows researchers the opportunity to explore the psycho-geography of the offenders’ spatial awareness, mental boundaries, and opportunities for crime (Canter & Youngs, 2009). Simulation methods demonstrate the value of information that can be obtained by examining offenders’ narratives of their crime commissioning. Such approaches provide a way of reviewing target selection of the crimes using a method of inspecting cognitive scripts that are evolved around the offender’s choices of the crimes he commits. The simulation methods offer an adequate method for
eliciting narrative data that is rich in the lived experience of the offenders exploring the why elements of the crimes. However, such methods tend to focus on one aspect of the crime such as geographical features or target selection rather than encompassing the full range of psychological components that occur during the crime commissioning. Nonetheless, the simulation methods demonstrate the usefulness of criminals narrated accounts of their crime action.

Criminality is a complex set of processes and quite often extends beyond the crime actions. By only focusing on the crimes scene actions or methods of target selection, other important details from the offenders broader concept of criminality i.e. motivations for action, environmental influences, interactions, emotions, identity, and goals, are overlooked. The use of criminals’ narratives, as a research tool, has a lot to offer in relation to the amount of information that can be obtained about their criminal action. Canter (1994) posits narratives provide a tool for uncovering the processes driving the action; an idea that has been more recently echoed by Presser (2009). One approach, as Cornish (1994) argues, is the adaption of cognitive script theory to criminal action. Here, Cornish states that criminal action is considered as a schematic process which the offender follows for each crime; creating a script. Through analysis of the script the offenders decision making process for the commissioning of crimes can be obtained.

Cognitive script theories, suggest that each type of behaviour has a script that is followed. Script theory has been regularly implemented in to researching criminal action (e.g. Beauregard, Proulx, Rossmo, Leclerc & Allaire, 2007; Gavin & Hockey, 2010; Rumgay, 2004; Yun & Roth, 2008); however, the theory is limited by focusing on the commissioning of the crime and the situation in which it occurred. Although script theory has been useful in crime prevention strategies; it is limited by its assumption that the commission of a crime is a stable feature; overlooking other processes that may influence criminal action which are a product of the broader life-story. Agnew (2006) argues that a crime accounts for only one moment in time, whereas the situation which the crime occurred may be part of a broader storyline where the build-up to the crime and consequences of the action have a much longer influence on the criminal. One interpretation of a cognitive script is the role of a habitual storyline that the criminal, as the protagonist, follows when acting out a crime.
1.2. Storylines of Criminal Action

Agnew (2006) defines a storyline as “...an interrelated set of events and conditions that increase the likelihood that individuals will engage in a crime or series of related crimes...” (pg. 121). Agnew states that within storylines the conditions in which the crime occurred, the offender’s perception, reaction, emotional states, and interactions with others are available; which extends beyond traditional methods of script theory. Canter (2010) extends this idea stating that the story of the crime is not a fictional account but rather it is the offenders’ account which has been developed from interactions and events. Both Agnew and Canter point toward an underlying plot for which the sequence of events are uncovered and the protagonist (the offender) takes the central role in acting out the sequence. Presser (2009) argues that that plot of the storyline leads to explanations of why the action occurs. The plot or storyline encompasses a number of factors that lead to the explanation of the action such as the conditions of how the crime occurred and the offender’s interactions with other, rather than solely focusing on one element.

Agnew (2006) proposes five storylines for criminal action: ‘a desperate need for money’, ‘an unresolved dispute’, ‘a brief, but close involvement with criminal others’, ‘a brief, tempting opportunity for crime’, and ‘a temporary break with conventional others/institutions’. Each storyline provides motivations and situational information about the crimes. One point to note is the storylines are not mutually exclusive. Agnew argues, like background features, storylines can contribute to other storylines and each storyline is not relevant to one type of crime. An advantage of exploring crime in this way is that background features of criminals can be explored in relation to how they vary for each of the storylines (Agnew, 2006). This approach provides a method for offending to be viewed from the intentions of the offender but also drawing on the broader components and situational factors in which the crime occurs. How the offenders’ identify themselves within the crime and the circumstances in which it occurred is an important aspect of the use of storylines within criminal research.

In a similar vein, Katz (1988) describes different seductions of criminal acts as a series of storylines which he uses to explore criminal action such as, ‘righteous slaughter’, ‘sneaky thrills’ ‘ways of the badass’ and ‘doing stick up’. Katz assumes that the level of self-
understanding is an important aspect of how an offence appears to the individual. For example, the ways in which an individual perceives themselves and their perceptions of others; are used to interpret how the crime is portrayed. One of the main points that Katz makes is the view that criminal action is best understood by exploring how it is experienced by the criminals who commit the crimes. The role of background features such as age, gender, economic status provides broad spectrums of people who commit crimes; such features are often referenced by psychologists and criminologists in explanations of criminal behaviour. However, Katz argues that such features are too vague to provide clear explanations of criminal action. For example, background features associated with offenders are also background features of many people who do not commit crimes. He further adds that for clear explanations to be made crime should be understood from the foreground of the people who commit the offences.

Both Agnew (2006) and Katz (1988) express the potential explanatory power of storylines as a method of classifying different styles of criminal action. However, neither study draws directly on offenders’ accounts of their crimes as data to developing such storylines. For example, Agnew draws on thematic analysis of theoretical criminology to provide background examples to the storylines he proposes. Katz, on the other hand, draws primarily on descriptions provided by a set of university students and pre-published reports. Although, both studies recognize the importance of the storied-action in exploring the offenders’ experience, neither author draws their conclusions from systematically analysing the narrative of the offenders’ experiences of the crimes they commit.

In a more direct approach Alison, Rockett, Deprez and Watts (2000), uncovered narrative themes through thematic analysis of the crime scene actions exhibited in a set of armed robberies. Three dominant roles offenders portrayed during their crime action were based on the level of planning and impulsive behaviours displayed during the robberies they found three dominant roles that the offenders portrayed during their crime action; namely: ‘Robin’s men’, ‘Bandits’ and ‘Cowboys’. Like the storylines suggested by Agnew and Katz, each of the dominant roles discussed by Alison, et al. show variations in the psychological features of the offenders such as motive, commissioning of the offence, emotions and self-identity within the crimes. As previously mentioned, analysis of crime scene behaviours is
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regularly used within investigative psychology; this method allows themes of behaviours to be established.

One important study by Canter and Heritage (1990) demonstrated how different modes of interactions between the offenders and victims were presented from thematic review of crime scene actions in stranger rape cases. The study demonstrates how offenders assign roles to their victims based on themes of vehicle, object and person; each projecting a different level of violation. Each theme presents an altered set of actions and interactions which the offender uses with the victim during the crimes; suggesting the offender is following some form of plot depending on the character role assigned to the victim. In a more recent study of youth violence, McMurrain, Hoyte and Jinks (2012) reviewed a set of narrated accounts of alcohol related violence from the youths involved. They found the violence was able to be classified into various themes based on the youths accounts of their interaction with others; presenting different modalities in the levels of violence and motivation for the action.

A further approach to exploring storylines was offered by Luckenbill (1977). He reviewed a number of murder cases exploring the transactions between the victims and the offenders obtained through case files, offender statements and court transcripts. He proposed, in the case of murder, the offender conformed to a ‘character contest’ where the offenders and victims acted out a plot of interactions. Luckenbill’s study indicates that murder offences follow similar storylines. He concluded that acts of murder are not one-sided to the offenders but they are a set of transactions between the victim and offender; the offenders and the victims both play a character role, acting out the script that assumes the storyline.

The research on storylines has shown success in developing knowledge of criminal action by focusing on the people that commit the crimes; getting to the forefront of the action like Katz (1988) suggests. Storylines readily demonstrate a method of how the offenders might experience the crime from the actions that precede the crime to the consequences following the crime and at each stage indicating the offenders experience throughout. The role of the storyline is to portray the action of the inner narrative the offenders hold. Canter (1994) explains how the inner narrative – the stories we live by – is
the source of the different storied formations discussed. The inner narrative provides a tool for the offender to assign himself as the main character in his life story; others can then be assigned subsequent character roles within the narrative plot. The inner narrative provides a tool in which self-identity is developed through interactions with others and the environment. The storyline provides a way of reviewing the internal narrative; the internal narrative is a tool to which complex psychological issues such as identity can be explored. However, the research presented here is lacking in data obtained regarding the criminals’ actual narrative experience of the crime.

1.3. Researching the Offenders’ Perspective

Messerschmidt (2000) highlights the importance of understanding the crime as it makes sense to the criminal. He used a method of interviewing adolescent males about their life-history in an attempt to uncover information about their violent action. By looking at the stories the adolescents told about different episodes of their life he was able to explore the factors that lead some adolescent males to violence. Through this mode of analysis Messerschmidt demonstrates the importance of uncovering life-story accounts, as a source of information gathering, that allows for the personal experiences and transformations that the narrators encounter during their life-process. Such information is important to reveal how the crimes make sense to the individuals and uncovers important information relating to pathways into criminality.

In a later study, Canter, Kaouri and Ioannou (2003) examined dominant story plots presented by criminals’. In this research offenders were asked to complete an experience of offending questionnaire for a crime they had committed. The responses were classified into four themes: adventure, revenger, victim, and professional. Each theme is underpinned by Frye’s (1957) fictional mythoi and demonstrates a different set of psychological processes exhibited by the offenders. This research explains that storylines are also present within criminals’ own accounts of their offending action rather than storylines being a product of themed analysis of criminological literature as presented by the researcher.

More recently, a series of research by Youngs and Canter (2011; 2012) interviewed incarcerated offenders about their offending action. In the first study, Youngs and Canter
(2011) presented a case-study review of offenders’ narrated accounts which revealed different forms of dominant narrative roles. Each role presents a set of psychological precursors to the criminal actions disclosed by the offenders. In the second study, Youngs and Canter (2012) further explored the narrative roles by reviewing a quantitative self-report measure which the criminals completed in relation to their offending action. The results demonstrate that the dominant narrative roles can be differentiated by variations in psychological underpinning; highlighting the importance of using the offenders’ perspective of the crimes they commit to develop a more enriched knowledge of criminality.

In a qualitative analysis of child sex offenders Farmer, Beech and Ward (2012) found two distinct narrative patterns when comparing those who were seen to be desisting from offending and those child sex offenders who were considered as still active. The narrative patterns mirrored earlier findings of Maruna (2001) who explored life-story narratives of offenders who had desisted from crime and persisting offenders. In both studies the desisting offenders had more positive narrative patterns whereas as the persisting offenders showed a more contaminated narrative pattern through negatively discussing events and attributing blame of their behaviour to others.

1.4. Linguistic Examination of Crime Narratives

Linguistic examinations of criminals narrated versions of their crime accounts are primarily derived from interpersonal interactions within the broad literature of investigative interviewing. Narrative research, in this area, tends to reside in linguistic complexity of the questions asked by interviewers (e.g. Carter, Bottoms & Levine, 1996; Lamb, Sternberg & Esplin, 1994) and detecting deception (e.g. Burgoon, Blair, Qin & Nunamaker, 2003). This research is dominated by the narratives of crimes from witness and victim accounts. The investigative interview, in particular, provides police with a first-hand account of the events that unfolded as the crimes were carried out. Language based analysis of police interviews can offer a more detailed analysis of the interviews for a wider range of interviewees, even those that are uncooperative (Heydon, 2012). One strand of research, known as forensic linguistics, seeks to obtain a degree of identification of a person or characteristics that are useful within the investigative arena through speaker identification. The application of this
method has been demonstrated in rapists’ linguistic patterns by differentiating different forms of rape encounters (Grant & Woodhams, 2007).

Speaker identification, within the narrative, is extended by O’Connor (2000) who explored linguistic patterns of men in maximum security prisons through the analysis of their speaking styles when providing information about their crimes and imprisonment. In particular, O’Connor draws attention to the level of (or lack of) agency within the narratives that the incarcerated men tell about their lives. From her interviews with incarcerated males she was able to formulate a framework of linguistic devices that offenders use in the stories about their lives. The study of linguistic patterns demonstrates how particular wording and phrasing can be categorised to provide themes of verbal behaviours. The linguistic method of analysing the narrative is particularly useful for providing a basis for linguistic structures that offenders employ when discussing their crimes (e.g. O’Connor, 2000) or during their crimes (e.g. Grant and Woodhams, 2007).

1.5. Limitations in the research

Offered in the research outlined above is the vast scope that methodologies encompassing criminals as sources of data have to offer in the area of understanding criminality. The research also highlights the fruitfulness of narratives as a method for uncovering motivations for action. Story plots suggest a limited number of stories that exist in relation to criminal action; this is a topic that is regularly debated within narrative psychology in the form of a dominant narrative or habitual stories that people use to describe events in their life. Motivational trends of the precursors to the events that are described can be uncovered through the personal agency that narrative allows. However, research examining narratives, in a criminal arena, is limited by a lack of methodological approaches for eliciting, analysing, and exploring criminals’ narratives. Researchers drawing on interviews with offenders have tended to focus on their criminal action and fail to encompass life-story accounts as a general theme for uncovering psychological aspects that can be useful in understanding crime actions. Presser (2010) highlights the issue of a lack of knowledge base for collecting and analysing criminals’ stories; stating that a number of methodological problems such as the level of truthfulness and the possibility of some form
of social reward for explaining ones behaviour, may add to the lack of research drawing on criminals’ narratives.

The impact of social reward and the level of truthfulness were also touched on by Stevens (1994). In Stevens’ research, incarcerated offenders interviewed each other about their target selection in rape attacks. Although this method provided knowledge on the opportunity for crime, it was biased due to offenders interviewing offenders. Stevens commented that such a methodology has the potential to create a situation for offenders’ to sensationalise their actions to increase social status among their peers. Still, the issue of veracity and social reward is a problem for any form of self-report method. How the narrative is conceptualised by the researcher can also be problematic to the research; however, the issue of biased conceptualisations is an issue for all qualitative methods (Presser, 2009). That aside, narrative offers a data source that encompasses realism to the behaviours and events discussed and can offer psychologically rich data for empirical analysis. A psychological framework for uncovering criminals narratives is reviewed in the following chapter.
Chapter 2

A Psychological Framework for Criminal Narrative Deconstruction

The stories people tell about their lives is an important aspect to understanding their reality and sense of self. The plot of a narrative, Polkinghorne (1988; 1991) argues, incurs meaning. Canter (1994) extends this point suggesting that, within a criminal context, the plot of the narrative can imply intention to the action. Therefore uncovering the narratives that criminals use to tell stories about their lives can provide fruitful information of instigators to criminal actions. The narrative approach has the potential of developing accepted explanations of criminality through exploring key psychological aspects of narrative – identity, emotion, and cognition - and how they interact with each other within the narrative context (Presser, 2009). However, concerns around the lack of definition, conceptualisations, and methodical input have readily been discussed (Presser, 2009; Ward, 2012). The previous chapter focused on research that has implemented criminals’ as data sources, incorporating studies focused on narrative aspects and the role of story-plots; highlighting how such research can exploit the offenders’ version of events, interactions with environment and others and also how dominant roles (or story plots) are formed. From the research it is apparent that no clear methodology for eliciting and interpreting criminals’ narratives is available. Outlined in the following sections is a summary of ideas demonstrating the potential of a narrative perspective in researching criminality.

2.1. Defining Narratives

One criticism of the narrative approach, particularly in the use of narratives in criminal research, is the definitional vagueness of what narrative is and what narrative identity is (Presser, 2009; Ward, 2012). A number of different, interchangeable terminologies such as, narrative-identity, self-narratives, and autobiographical narratives are used by narrative researchers; therefore it is important to provide definitional clarity for the use of narratives in the present study.

The underlying concept of a narrative is “...coherent, follow-able accounts of perceived past experience. When preformed, they present selected, interpreted, and narrativised experience of an individual’s coherent sequence of events...” (Braid, 1996, pg.
6). Based on Braids definition, the following definitions are presented. Personal narratives are narrated constructions of an event that is personal to the narrator; the narrator was part of the event, and not a reconstruction of an event narrated by another person. Life-narratives are reconstructions of different episodes and events that have occurred throughout the narrator’s life and described by the narrator. Narrative-identity refers to the person’s identity within the narrated context. Personal-stories and life-stories are the constructions of a storied form of events which contain similar features in literacy-storied fashion e.g. character roles and plots. In the present discussion, narrative is used to represent the storied formation that people use to describe different events and experiences.

Agency in narrative identity refers to the conscious awareness of the person committing the action. For example, Bandura (2001) explains that being an agent of action requires the person to intentionally commit the action through his or her cognitive and motivational processes. The term ‘the agentic nature of the narrative’ refers to Bandura’s idea of a person as an agent of their own actions and the narrative as a tool for external expression. However, agency is also incorporated as a psychological theme within the context of a narrative. In this case, McAdams (1993) describes agency as a person’s motivation for power and achievement. The key distinction is that agency in the former refers to a person being an agent of their action and relates mainly to what can be achieved through narrative research. Agency in the latter refers to agency as a psychological motivation that is a fundamental to personality.

2.2. Autobiographical Narratives

The stories people tell about their lives offers a form of self-reflection allowing them to create meaning from the experiences they have encountered. The narrative paradigm, in criminal research, provides an opportunity for the listener to gain perspective of the narrator’s interpretations of the experiences they are disclosing. This form of autobiographical event reconstruction is regularly used within forensic and investigative arenas’, from investigative interviews and court appearances to therapeutic and probationary practices.
Autobiographical memory is an important part of the memory system; it allows a person to understand the self, emotions, and experiences in a temporal formation (Conway & Pleydell-Pearce, 2000). Like all memory systems, it is limited to cue-retrieval sensitivity, distortion, and decay; making the memories subjective to the person describing them. Nonetheless, autobiographical memories are derived from social-cognitive factors such as social interactions and language, making them an important part of self-awareness through insight from past events (Reese, Jack & White, 2010). Due to the real-life nature of autobiographical memory, the memories disclosed can include emotional content in addition to temporal and spatial information (Rubin, 2005). Memories can be distorted by subjective aspects to the person disclosing them due to the multi-modal elements involved in the autobiographical memory system being person relevant. Knowledge of how a person experiences an event, their interactions, emotions, and temporal and spatial elements all provide psychologically rich material. Uncovering a series of autobiographical events, through the exploration of life episodes; can unearth a lot of information about a person or their perception of an event.

Exploration of autobiographical memories (or life-episodes) is regularly used in forensic and investigative settings. For example, the investigative interview is based on uncovering knowledge of an autobiographical memory of an event; and within therapeutic settings, previous life episodes are explored to uncover details of the present state of the individual. Uncovering knowledge of the stories people tell about their lives has direct implications for forensic and investigative psychology. The autobiographical nature of narrative construction is important in providing interpretation and meaning to the events that are disclosed. It allows each individual to portray their version of events, as it makes sense to them. Recognition of such knowledge allows for a greater understanding of the offenders experience of their actions during the commissioning and execution of criminal proceedings. In turn, providing a basis for distinguishing the suspect’s interview behaviour with the potential application of a framework for an interviewing strategy based on the psychological profile within the narrative theme (Youngs & Canter, 2009).

The construction of the narrative creates a role for both the narrator and the listener. The narrator is able to make sense of and take meaning from the events being
discussed (McAdams, 1993; Murray, 2000) and the listener is able to follow, make sense, and make interpretations from the presentation of the narrative (Braid, 1996). Bruner (1991) puts forward the role of the underlying context of the narrative and its influence in the interpretations from both the narrator and listener. Bruner highlights the role of background knowledge the narrators and listeners may have of the event under discussion; stating that the level of background knowledge could influence how the narrative is interpreted. For the narrator, their perception of the event may influence how they interpret it and, as a result, how they disclose it. For the listener, their knowledge of the event or the knowledge they wish to obtain about the event may also bias their interpretations. Presser (2004; 2010) also notes that the setting in which the narrative is disclosed and the reasons for the disclosure can also influence the stories being told.

Autobiographical accounts of crimes are a key feature of criminal investigations and proceedings. Exploring the narrative from both the narrator’s and listener’s perspective has direct implications for investigative procedures. During investigations the narrative formation of the autobiographical event, for example the crime, is constructed by the narrator and interpreted by the listener. The investigation and prosecution of crimes is a process of narrations and interpretations of autobiographical events. For example, a suspect (the narrator) provides their version of events to the investigating officers and the legal team during the investigation, and the judge and the jury during trial (all are listeners). Therefore developing a greater knowledge of criminals narratives has strong implications for informing forensic settings (the listeners) resulting in more depth of knowledge to inferences being made by the listeners as they interpret the narrative and other crime actions that are disclosed.

Recently, autobiographical episodes of crime actions have shown success in detecting distinct narrative themes among adult child-sex offenders (Farmer, Beech & Ward, 2012), adult offenders from a range of crimes (Youngs & Canter, 2011) and in violent youths (McMurran, Hoyte & Jinks, 2012). The mounting research that has focused on offenders’ narrated accounts of their offending action or broader life-stories show the potential of further development of narrative methodologies and their potential usage in the criminal arena. A methodological approach that has been particularly useful with non-offending
populations is the life-stories model (see McAdams, 1993; 1996; 2001; 2012). Adaptations of the life-story model have been successfully implemented with adult persistent and desisting offenders (Maruna, 2001) and violent actions of adolescents (Messerschmidt, 2000).

The life-story model explores a series of life-episodes offered by the individual. McAdams (1993) terms such snap-shots of events as nuclear episodes describing them as “...prominent positions in our understanding of who we were, and indeed who we are...” (pg. 296). The episodes resemble meaning to the individual whether it is positive or negative or a statement of continuity or change. In life-episodes elements of identity are based around themes of agency and communion; where the narrator can express themselves as a source of power or as part of a community (McAdams, 1993). Such interpersonal elements uncover intention to the action, such as to assert power over others or to be intimate with others. Canter (1994) argues that such themes are static components of a criminals life-story; suggesting that each component describes narrator at a particular point in time. Life-episodes provide an autobiographical representation of events and experiences of the narrator; so, much like reading a person’s autobiography, exploring a series of life-episodes provides a way of exploring the person from their self-perception; where themes of continuity (static narrative features) and change (turning points) can be uncovered through their unfolding life events. This is an important feature when establishing a narrative framework and methodological framework; exploring different life episodes allows an opportunity for the research to establish validity and reliability of narrative themes that are uncovered.

2.3. Agentic Benefits of Narrative

“...There is a landscape of action in which an event unfolds... there is a second landscape, a landscape of consciousness, the inner worlds of the protagonist involved in the action...” (Bruner, 2004, pg. 698).

In his interviews with incarcerated offenders, McKendy (2006) found that the narrative interviews provided a form of relief to the prisoners; supplying them with a form of externalisation - a way to express themselves beyond the cognitive boundaries imposed by the prison system. McKendy argues that the prison system does not allow the offenders
to talk freely about their lives due to the pressure to take responsibility for their actions. McKendy discusses the benefits of narrative in allowing offenders’ to take the time to think about their actions and claim responsibility; still, he noted that there was a forced discourse among the men he interviewed which had the reverse effect. In contrast, Presser (2010) writes that the prison system provides an environment where telling stories about their crimes is a normalised aspect of an offenders’ discourse.

Exploring narratives of life-episodes creates a situation in which offenders can provide their account without judgment or forced discourse that McKendy (2006) discusses. Exploring behaviours through narrated descriptions provides a basis for the narrator to show their intentions, forethought, self-reaction, and self-reflection – or lack of, as Bandura (2001) recommends. For the listeners interpreting the account, the narrative offers a form of agency in terms of the narrator’s interpretation of the event rather than the prospect of the narrator taking full responsibility for their actions. Canter (1994) proposes the idea that criminal acts are committed with internal logic rather than the irrational thought that is commonly assumed. The narrative disclosure provides a tool for the internal logic to be uncovered; such internal logic is what drives the action and is presented in the plot of the narrative. Uncovering such logic will expose the intention of the action (Canter, 1994).

White and Epston (1990) put forward a model for externalising dominant narratives based on the notion of externalising oneself from the problem and the ability to see oneself in relation to the problem rather than as the problem. This method produces the opportunity for the individual to imagine oneself in a different relationship to the problem (Weingarten, 1998). The concept of externalisation is important in understanding criminal action. Psychological understanding of the person tends to be described by focusing on specific traits derived from scale scores (Baumeister & Newman, 1994). Agnew (2006) argues when people talk about crimes they do not talk about the events in terms of specific traits but as stories. By allowing those involved in crime to externalise their problem behaviours - the crimes they have committed - in a storied format, would provide an opportunity for researchers to get closer to the action.
2.4. The Role of Narrative in Understanding Criminality: A summary of ideas

Bamberg (2009) highlights three problematic areas for identity within narratives. The first is continuity of self in changes over time, the second is distinctiveness of the self, and the third is the agency of the self. He states that all activities require an aspect of self-identity and therefore the narrative is a method of self-reflection; this element of self-reflection and need of continuity is what White and Epston (1995) propose as the processors for formulating the dominant narrative. For example, externalising problematic behaviour is a form of self-reflection and there is continuity in how the language is used to express the problematic behaviours and other associated aspects. In criminal action, continuity in self-reflection can be extrapolated to draw themes of action in behaviour creating a dominant narrative. Characteristics that underpin the dominant narrative can then be used as methods of differentiating modes of action. This has particular benefits to a criminal context when little might be known about the offender; the narrative theme can help differentiate between types of offenders through their crime actions.

Canter and Youngs (2009) have demonstrated how crime action, from a variety of offences, can be differentiated using a Narrative Action System (NAS). However, this research is heavily focused on themes of crime scene actions; little research has explored how narrated accounts of crimes can be differentiated by narrative themes. Presser (2009) points out the possibility of different narrative themes underpinning certain crimes. However, to do so would require a careful research design focusing on what is consistent and what varies within offenders narratives. For example, the consistency of the narrative may change with the different audiences and settings in which it is disclosed; therefore it is important to explore underlying psychological concepts that are encompassed within in the narrative which uncover stable features of narrative identity, such as the themes of agency and communion (McAdams, 1993; Canter, 1994).

Labov (2006) advises that narrative accounts are formulated from a process of cognitive construction of events. How offenders construct their crimes should uncover psychological aspects like the cognitive constructing of life—stories. In a criminal context, the self-identity and cognitive interpretations presented in the narrative provides information that relates to precursors of the crime and the forefront of the action. The
following sections will evaluate psychological themes that have been presented in narrative research from both criminal and non-criminal samples. First, a case is put forward for exploring broader themes of criminal and deviant episodes, alongside life-outside-of-crime episodes.

2.4.1. Exploring deviancy

A narrative approach to understanding deviancy allows the accountability of the act to be explored through the interpretation of the protagonist (DeGregorio, 2009). Youngs and Canter (in press) point out a need to explore where the boundary is for general public offending and activities that are considered criminal. One thought is that lower levels of crime are precursors of more serious offences; however, not everyone who commits low levels of crime will go on to commit more serious offences. The distinction between what makes one person not a criminal and the other person a criminal is a legal, rather than a psychological, distinction.

Due to the wide variety of actions involved in criminal behaviours, within and across crimes, it is important for distinctions to be made that help classify offence types. Drawing distinctions between those who are and those who are not criminals has many limitations. One way of approaching this is to consider antisocial behaviour as a continuum where people show lesser or greater degree of the acts (Rutter, Giller & Hagel, 1998). A method of measuring such a continuum is through self-reports of offending (Rutter, Giller & Hagel, 1998; Youngs & Canter, in press). Still, one problem is that only some behaviour is recognised by the general public as criminal (Rutter, Giller & Hagel, 1998). With this in mind, one person may carry out an act not realising it as a potential criminal act, whereas another person may carry out the same act with the intention of it being criminal. An example of this can often be seen in victimless crimes. For example, the victim of some crimes i.e. driving and drugs offences is sometimes considered as a ‘red herring’, until there are serious consequences, such as death. Legally, dangerous driving is a crime but because a direct victim is not always present; it may be psychologically difficult to classify it as a crime. An example of this can be seen the following scenarios:
Person A is late leaving for work and as a result drives over the speed limit to get to work on time, whereas person B goes for a ‘joy ride’ with the intention to drive over the speed limit for the full journey.

Person A has a batch of cannabis and shares it with friends, whereas person B has a batch of cannabis which is then sold to friends.

In both scenarios the individual is breaking the law and committing a crime however the psychological difference is the level of intent; even though, from a legal stance, both A and B, are committing the same offence. The point here is that criminal and deviant acts can be differentiated psychologically by exploring the circumstances and the intentions that precede the actions.

2.4.1.1. Definitional issues and limitations for offender – non-offender comparisons

One problem with offender – non-offender comparative research is the premise that for an individual to be a non-offender they have not committed a crime. For such research to have validity the assumption is that offenders are always going to be offenders and non-offenders are always going to be non-offenders. This is not always the case. For example, Harris (2011) explored first-time adult-onset offending, demonstrating that offending at this age was mostly due to changes in stability factors such as employment and relationship problems. Sampson and Laub (1995) also found adult offending to be due to the lack of similar stability factors. Harris (2011) suggests differences between adult-onset offending and persistent offending is due to the lack of deviant lifestyle in adult on-set offenders. This research supports the notion that offending is due to circumstantial features. In addition to adult-on-set offending, some offenders are one-time only offenders. Such offenders do not fit in to general theories of offending. Theories of offending tend to be limited to research exploring life-course persistent offenders or adolescent offending (Harris, 2011). The literature exploring criminality suggests that salient life events influence behaviour and modify life-trajectories (Farrington, 1996; Palmer, 2003b; Sampson & Laub, 1995). Examining how a person perceives their life and the influence of this self-identity on their behaviour, in a way that the narrative paradigm allows; offers an additional way of exploring criminality which expands existing explanations.
Bush, Mullis and Mullis (1999) argue that offender status, within research studies, is a poor definition. In their sample, 67% of the males and 55% of females in the non-offender group had reported conducting delinquent acts. One problem with classifying a group of participants as offenders and another as non-offenders is that it is based on a legal rather than psychological definition (Bush, Mullis & Mullis, 1999; Bartol & Bartol, 2004; Canter & Youngs, 2009; Howitt, 2009). Disciplines of psychology and law make attempts to understand criminal behaviours; but both are incompatible due to each searching for different meanings. When searching for psychological understanding of crimes it is important for research to focus on the psychological constructs, such as the modes of interaction rather than a legal framework for selecting samples (Bush, Mullis & Mullis, 1999; Canter & Youngs, 2009).

Tarry and Emler (2007) advocate differences found in offender – non-offender comparative research are due to the differences within the two groups, such as offenders and non-offenders being too widely spread on the delinquency continuum. One reason is due to the offender samples selected for the research. As previously highlighted, the research is dominated by either life-time persistent offenders or adolescent on-set offenders; each does not create a clear picture of offending action. Previous research has suggested that stability and employment can, if maintained, break (Sampsons & Laub, 1995; Maruna, 2001) and, if lost, make (Harris, 2011) a criminal career. The suggestion that legally a person can be classified as an offender or non-offender is naive in terms of supplying valid research assumptions. For example, studies that have focused on cognitive processes of offenders are heavily based on sex-offenders and other research tends to generalise from a group of offenders that may have committed a range of crimes. Few studies have focused on differences in crime types.

Canter and Youngs (2009) suggest there is no strong evidence of a psychological diagnosis on crime style. The comparison of different crime types, in addition to offender - non-offender comparisons, would offer a psychological framework to underpin the ‘delinquency continuum’ into a more generalised scale of criminality. Exploring different crime-type offenders over different psychological concepts, such as moral reasoning (Palmer & Hollin, 1998; Chen & Howitt, 2007), social and family influences (Johnson &
Menard, 2012), and narrative elements (Canter, Kaouri & Ioannou, 2003), has been useful in understanding the variation of behaviours involved in offending action. One problem, however, is the range of behaviours and incentives within different types of crime. Psychological definitions applied to crime types are necessary for research in this area to have validity.

A final limitation is that most of the research applies questionnaire designs or occasional interviews. Psychometric testing that questionnaires offer are a standard method of data collection when comparing offenders and non-offenders. There are positives to generating quantitative data, such as a quick and easy method of exploring psychological concepts. Still, interview data can allow an in-depth analysis of the findings and provides the offenders an opportunity to present their interpretations of the events. The application of a narrative paradigm, in criminal research, that incorporates a life story model allows the person to describe parts of their life rather than just focusing on traits. The incorporation of a group of legally classed non-offenders allows for a greater spectrum of psychological variance, within the narrative context to be explored; in addition to acting as a control population to aid exploitation of what is constituted as a criminal narrative.

2.4.2. The role of time and place accounting for change in narrative

A number of temporal elements are involved in criminal action. The first, relates to the concept of a criminal career and the advancement of delinquent acts to a specialised offender (Wright & Hensky, 2003; Wright, Pratt & DeLisi, 2008). Changes in the behaviour patterns of offenders, in terms of refinement, would be difficult to identify when solely exploring traits. Youngs (2004) articulated this point; showing personality traits of offenders had very little relevance to understanding the actions of their offences. The narrative paradigm, however, allows for a dialogue to occur where changes and developments in action can be openly disclosed. The second relates to criminal differentiation i.e. fluctuations in behaviours between crimes and behaviours within crimes (see Canter, 1994; 2000). Such modes of differentiation can offer a method of formulating salient characteristics for offence types and offenders. This information has visible advantages to the investigation of crimes. What narrative can offer are interpretations of the fluctuations in behavioural changes from the experience of the offenders themselves. The third, relates
to offending behaviour at different times in life. Maruna (2001) identified themed scripts which provided insight into why some people choose to move away from a life of crime and why others do not. In addition to desistance, there is an issue of one time only offenders. The assumption that criminals share similar traits suggests that those involved in criminal action are a sub-set of the population. Such theories do not account for changes in criminal action such as desistence; a narrative based approach allows other traits to be exposed which can directly instigate action such as themes of agency and communion; providing the opportunity for behaviour to be understood as a process over time.

The narrative approach has two important contributions to understanding criminal action in relation to environmental influences. The first is the impact of criminal development and the opportunity for crime. A number of studies have shown factors such as a deprived up-brining, lack of employment options, and peer influences can create more opportunities for a person to commit a crime (e.g. Blackburn, 1993; Sampson & Laub, 1995; Farrington, 1996; Maruna, 2001). The second relates to the spatial movement and situational features of crime. Psychological research has assessed the relevance of spatial movements in relation to understanding criminal action (for examples see Canter, 2003; Canter & Youngs, 2008a; Canter & Youngs, 2008b). During explorations of discourse structure, Howald and Katz (2011) found that spatial information was a fundamental element of the narrative. The incorporation of narrative to exploring offending actions has benefits for understanding the role of space, an aspect that is overlooked in conventional trait methodologies.

2.4.3. Narrative identity

“...Humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially, lead storied lives. The study of narrative, therefore, is the study of the ways humans experience the world...” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, pg. 2).

McAdams (1993) explains how the approach to understanding the narrative is reliant on how events are described rather than the content that is used to describe the event. Describing an event, in a way that makes sense to the narrator, allows their perceptions and interpretations of the circumstances (Agnew, 2006), actions (Canter, 1994), and interactions
Ibarra & Barbulescu, 2010), of the event, to be acknowledged. During criminal investigations interpretations of the narratives disclosed is a regular part of the process. The identity of the narrator within the context of the narrative can hold details relevant to establishing: offence *Modus Operandi* (MO) where the methods of operation and habits of carrying out the crime are established; and *Mens Rea* (MR) where the level of criminal responsibility is determined. One point to note, is that being sympathetic to narrative identity is not a method of excusing a person of a crime they have committed. Being sensitive to narrative identity offers an approach to understanding and researching criminality that is sensitive to a range of psychological and identity related components.

Within a legal context, emphasis is made on the veracity of the narrative provided, whether this is by the victim, the witness, or the suspect. In the use of exploring a person’s narrative, as an information gathering tool, the veracity of the statement is not necessary. It is the context of narrative that holds the most psychologically-rich information in relation to features of identity (McAdams, 1993). Methodologically speaking, veracity is at the heart of validity and reliability of all research therefore to build on something that is at risk of not being true or distorted would question the soundness of the research. However, the issue of participant truthfulness is a key aspect to all self-report methodologies. Psychometric testing is at the heart of psychological research. The issue of participant truthfulness, within self-reported measures, has a greater impact on the findings of the results than it does in narrative interpretation. Psychometric testing relies on the selection of a forced choice response format; a respondent has no choice but to respond to the question in the required way. Psychometric testing is regularly incorporated into trait methodologies exploring differences of offenders and non-offenders; however the use of narrative exploration is not regularly implemented.

In his work on life stories, McAdams (1993) offers a developmental approach to narrative identity, he states “...due to the biological, cognitive and social changes that seem to occur in the adolescent years, the stage is psychosocially set for the emergence of identity...’ (pg75). It is during adolescences that most individuals, with the potential to offend, will start their criminal journey. Delinquency research (e.g. Agnew, 2003; Farrington, 1986; Moffitt, 1997) shows a peak in offending action during this time. Based on this
principle, formulating an understanding of criminality, from the narrative perspective, is a sensible inference in understanding how the offender perceives themselves within their crime actions. This can lead to developments in understanding dominant narrative within the criminal action, which is central to the self expressed in the narrative and the script it provides for the life-story.

2.4.3.1. Dominant narratives

“...The self is indeed constructed through interactions with the world...” (Bruner, 1997, pg. 146)

Through storied experiences a person is able to maintain continuity and meaning to constant changes in his or her life (White & Espton, 1990; Murray, 2000). The structuring of the narrative becomes a selective process whereby accounts of events that do not fit with the dominant narrative are excluded. The narrative then provides meaning for life and relationships, and is active in shaping the interactions in which they occur (White & Espton, 1990). McAdams (2005) explains that through the aid of therapeutic practices new narratives can be formulated from previously disorganised ones. White and Epston (1990) advise the process of dealing with the dominant narrative can be separated into three key elements: 1) externalising the problem, 2) mapping the influence of the problem, and 3) the influence of the person within their life narrative and the narrative of the problem. In doing so, the person is able to externalise themselves from the dominant narrative and the habitual reading that is part of it.

White and Epston (1990) first discussed the concept of externalising problematic behaviour to allow a person to differentiate the self from the problem behaviour and the language (or narrative) that is associated with that behaviour. The language used to narrate the story holds information about how the individual sees themselves, which is what McAdams (1993) draws on in his life-story model. This concept of the learned self becomes the dominant narrative and, consequently, is important in person-centred interpretations of events. Canter (1994) advocates that this self image can be used to understand criminal action, suggesting the crime is an enactment of a story where the criminal is the central character. This storied form of the self creates a dominant narrative.
As previously stated, there are three problematic areas for identity in narrative: continuity of self over time, and distinctiveness and agency of the self; all three activities require an aspect of self-identity allowing the narrative to become a method of self-reflection (Bamberg, 2009). It is the self reflection and need for continuity that formulates the dominant narrative; this is then be extrapolated to describe themes of action in behaviour. Youngs and Canter (2011; 2012) have demonstrated how offenders’ narratives of their crime action, through analysis of case studies and a narrative roles questionnaire, can be differentiated into narrative themes. Further reports of dominant narratives of offenders have been presented in the form of storylines which can underpin different modes of offending action (e.g. Alison, et al 2000; Agnew, 2006).

The more conventional explanations of criminal behaviour highlight the role of identity in criminality. For example, labelling theorists centralise on the concept of the self and identity which is developed through a process of socialisation. The theory posits when a person is assigned a ‘label’, the label then becomes affiliated with their self identity, and impacts continued psychological and behavioural development. Formally classifying an offence, such as an arrest, caution, or conviction will create an enhanced reputation of that person being associated with the offence among their social networks (Bernberg, Krohn & Rivera, 2006). The enhanced reputation positively reinforces the label as a criminal. Becker (1963) describes labelling theory as not the only precursor to deviant action but a way of placing the actor within the action. The process of labelling has been found to be correlated with increased deviant behaviour (Farrington, 1977). However, the theory has been criticised for referring to criminals as passive victims of other people’s labelling (Marsh, Melville, Morgan, Norris & Walkington, 2006). A narrative paradigm has the potential to extend the theory by offering the impact of the labelling process to be understood as it makes sense to the individual. For example, the language that used to disclose the behaviour holds information about how the individual sees themselves. The concept of a learned self, that labelling theorists offer, becomes the sequence for developing a dominant narrative as the dominant narrative is based on a script of regular occurring language – the scripted self, which is important in personal interpretations of events.

2.4.3.2. Portrayal of a character role
McAdams (1993) argues that narrative identity is based on a dichotomy of communion and agency themes. The themes are fundamental in an individual’s communication of goals, strivings, needs, and desires which are important to their life-story and their construction of identity within the story. Both agency and communion are measurable through interviews when life-episodes are explored, in particular when discussing a meaningful event (McAdams, 2001). Within the themes of agency and communion McAdams (1993, pg. 124) highlights a number of character plots which he terms as imagoes – the illustration of “…a personified and idealised concept of the self…” (pg. 122). McAdams describes the qualities within the agency imago themes as masculine and, in contrast, the communion imago themes as feminine. He also discusses a number of imago themes that are both agency and communion in nature, in addition to imago themes that are low in both agency and communion.

McAdams (1993) explains that the use of the imago is to create the central viewpoint of the life story. White and Epston (1990) argue that a person has one dominant narrative present; however McAdams suggests more than one dominant imago can be present and claims that having two conflicting dominant imagoes is common. In terms of the narrative, McAdams explains the imago is not the whole concept; this is simply the projection which the protagonist – the narrator- uses to represent oneself. Nevertheless, the imago is not a real self; it is the idealised self that is projected in the stories we tell about our lives and this is used to illustrate the character role one sees oneself playing within the life story.

McAdams (1993) highlights an important issue about the emotions that accompany the imago. He suggests the portrayal of the imago can be from both a positive and negative position within the narrative. He also suggests that both positive and negative imagoes are common and unique in their formation within the life story. Each imago represents a model for interpretation and understanding of the self within the narrative.

Currie (2009) also discusses the psychological concept of a character in narrative form. He advances the idea that intentions and behaviours are fundamental aspects of character development. For example, the intent forms the behaviour and is attributed to a particular character trait. Attributions can then be made from the sorts of intentions that are used to
explain the behaviour. Currie proposes that this formation of a character suggests a stability of traits of the character.

Within the narrative, positions and characters are created for others in the story (Wiengarten, 1998). For a crime narrative, the positioning of the other person can uncover important information of the interactions between the offender and victim(s) during the crime. The formulation of the crime will be constructed in the story-plot that the individual creates. The actions within the crimes are the re-enactments of the plot. This concept has been demonstrated in an analysis of criminal actions by Canter and Herritage (1990) who found offenders assigned different roles to the victims of stranger-rapes based on themes of crime actions. Canter and Youngs (2009) developed this further, using the same data set they illustrated how modes of interaction demonstrated in the offenders’ crime actions were also categorised by dominant narrative themes.

2.4.3.3. Creating meaning

The idea that stories are derived from social functions to illustrate how something happened and how it was meaningful to the person telling the story is commonly cited within narrative literature (e.g. Baumeister, Stillwell & Wotman, 1990; McAdams, 2005; Riessman, 2008; Bawell, 2009; Stevens, 2012). The function of a narrative is to provide a distinct understanding of the event that is being disclosed (Bawell, 2009, pg. 2). Bruner (1991) argues that the role of narrative construction is a method of understanding reality and how that reality exists to the narrator. Bruner continues to suggest that the mental organisation of information (i.e. events, behaviours, and interactions) is understood through the reflective process that narrative allows. Bruner (2004) later argues that narratives are developed culturally to provide a mode of organising memories of life events, suggesting “…in the end, we become the autobiographical narratives by which we tell about our lives…” (pg. 694). In this statement, Bruner recommends some form of dominant narrative or role that we each use is directly related to the stories we tell about ourselves. This concept is similar to Canter’s (1994) suggestions of criminals’ acting out plots where they see themselves as the central character in the crimes they commit. The plots are purpose built structures that are formed, by the individual, to make sense and create meaning of their lives through the autobiographical events they disclose. This creation of a plot suggests the
individual will have a sense of their self-identity, or at least how they perceive their identity within their life-story. The created role of the self, within the narrative, provides the formulation of a dominant narrative script, in which the meaning of the self is created.

Canter (1994) extends this idea of a dominant narrative script in the criminal arena. He claims that the actions which formulate the crime provide key details about the type of person that has committed the crime. Murray (2000) supports this notion, suggesting the environment in which the narrative is expressed does not implicate the meaning of the narrative because the narrative is a constant feature within the person’s identity. The role of a dominant narrative script suggests a person has some psychological consistency in the role they see themselves playing across different life-events. Using this line of reasoning, the narrative role a person assigns themselves is a consistent feature – a dominant narrative. However, through therapeutic efforts this narrative may change, which is often the aim of such interventions.

Rehabilitation and therapeutic practices, of both offenders and non-offenders, are driven by the individual’s construction of the event; a primary aim for much therapeutic practice is for the individual to take responsibility for their actions (Maruna & Mann, 2006). When distorted views already exist, developing an understanding of the background story is useful in understanding the individual’s cognitive interpretation of the behaviours disclosed in the narrative. The narrative approach, in a clinical sense, allows a person the opportunity to describe life events providing the prospect of exploring descriptions of the self and how the impact of those self images have influenced psychological functioning (Winsdale & Smith, 1997). This method has had success in narrative therapy but can also be applied to opening up a new method of understanding the acts of criminals, their self descriptions, and the impact such images hold during offending behaviour.

Identity is an important part of narrative construction; the stories people tell about their lives outline who they believe to be in the world. McAdams’ (1993) interpretation of identity resides on different modalities of agency and communion. It is expected that high agency would demonstrate a strong self focus within the narrative and high communion would include influence from others that are central to the content of the narrative. Youngs and Canter (2011; 2012) also demonstrate how different modalities of self-identity and
identity of others are present among different narrative roles. For example, in the
revengeful mission narrative role, self identity of the protagonist is strong and others are
significant. How the narrator perceives himself and others within the context of the
narrative can disclose important psychological functions underpinning the behavioural
attributes of the narrator.

2.4.3.4. Idealised persons: Imagoes of the self and others

The idea of a limited number of stories people tell has seen much focus among
academic discussions of fictional narratives (e.g. Frye, 1957; Brooker, 2004). The role of a
dominant narrative form, within the stories people tell about their lives, has also found
relevance within narrative psychology. White and Epston (1990) argue that the stories
people tell about their lives are based on a dominant narrative structure or on a centralised
story plot where they present themselves as the protagonist; Canter (1994) echoes this
concept. Research focusing on criminals (e.g. Maruna, 2001; Canter & Youngs, 2009) and
non-criminals (e.g. McAdams, 1993) have demonstrated that dominant narrative themes
that are presented within life-stories. In his research of the life-stories of non-criminal
American adults, McAdams (1993) found the life-stories presented a set of internalised
scripts that were centralised around two personality elements of agency and communion.
The dominant scripts are formulated around the character roles people create, for
themselves, as the central protagonist within their life-story. The imago is a central element
to identity within the context of the narrative and provides a unique way of understanding
the stories people tell about their lives.

Youngs and Canter (2012) argue that not all of McAdams imago themes would be
relevant to narratives of crime due to high levels of communion within the themes. Youngs
and Canter do suggest the imagoes of high agency and little intimacy would be expected to
be presented in narratives of crime episodes. The imagoes include: the battle presented by
the Warrior, the Travellers ability to overcome obstacles, the productive nature of the
Maker, the Sage’s expertise; each show a high level of power by the protagonist (pg. 237).
The Escapist and the Survivor are also considered to be part of a crime narrative. Each
imago presents a differing script that is presented within the narrative context. The idea of
whether a ‘power imago’ is presented in criminals’ narratives of their crimes is an
interesting concept; more interesting is whether the same imagoes would be present in other life-episodes of the criminals’ that are not centralised on crime episodes.

2.4.4. Behaviours and incentives

Level of self-control is an important aspect of behaviour, it helps develop knowledge of why certain behaviours are expressed (Buker, 2011); criminality is thought to be an aspect of low-self control. The low level of self-control in criminals relates to behaviours that require quick gain, lack of skill development, and are self-centred (DeLisi & Berg, 2006). In reviewing the role of self control in the CJS, DeLisi and Berg (2006) found that people with low self control were responded to negatively by CJS practitioners; they concluded it was due to low-self control relating to “...short tempered and generally unlikable people...” (pg. 161). The self-centred nature of individuals with low self control and short temper is thought to lead to reactive behaviours. In contrast, high self-control is associated with proactive traits; such people lack in ‘out of control’ behaviours and tend to be more likely to succeed (Delisi & Berg, 2006). In their theory of crime, Gottfredson and Hirschi (1990) claim self-control to be strongly related to criminality. They advocate that the role of low self control in risk taking behaviours underpins a range of criminal actions. However, Drasgow, Palau, Taibi, and Drasgow (1974) explored locus of control and levels of functioning among non-offenders, offenders and a clinical sample of alcoholics; concluding that the alcoholic group was ‘sicker’ than the prisoners in their levels of functioning and locus of control. Little differences were found between the offenders and non-offenders. In contrast, more recently, Goodman, Leggett & Garrett (2007) found offenders presented an external locus of control when compared to a group of non-offenders.

When asked to discuss life episodes, the narrator’s discuss events and behaviours. The narrator’s locus of control is something that can be accessed through the discussions of their behaviours as reactive or proactive; this will also demonstrate how the narrator perceives their behaviour in the overall course of their life-story. It would be interesting to see if locus of control is depicted in the dominant narrative roles. For example, would narrative roles that are higher in agency display an internal locus of control?
2.4.5. Polarising aspects of interpersonal behaviour

Canter (1994) advocates that offending action is made up of a number of interpersonal transactions; outlining three modes of victim interaction of person, object and vehicle. Canter and Heritage (1990) supported the three modes of victim interaction in sexual offending. This research offers a hypothesis that crimes can be differentiated by the interpersonal style displayed by the offender. Canter (1994) also suggests that aspects of the offender’s personality can be found through the actions they commit during their crimes e.g. means of dominating and controlling the victim or ways of trying to create intimacy with the victim. Interpersonal personality theorist’s (e.g. Leary, 1957) advise that personality is made up of a circumplex of behaviours that are based around two polarising facets of dominance and love. McAdams (1993) also argues that similar themes, in the form of agency and communion, are central to narrative identity. In a similar vein, Hermans (1996) offers an interpersonal dichotomy in the form of superiority and power achievements and contact and intimacy achievements. The themes offered by Leary (1957), McAdams (1993) and Hermans (1996) propose strong support for two key dimensions: one based on power and the other based on intimacy. In the form of life-story narratives, it is a reasonable assumption that such interpersonal themes can be projected through the narrator’s description of their behaviours.

Furr (2009) argues that personality links to understanding why people display certain behaviours; Alden, Wiggins and Pincus (2009) suggest that interpersonal tendencies are what govern behaviour. Within interpersonal personality theory it is thought that personality exists on a number of levels, such as in public - behaviour is rated by others, in the consciousness - behaviour is rated by the self, and in private - behaviour is rated by projective techniques; interpersonal behaviour is the interaction among these levels (Freedman, Leary, Ossoiro, & Coffey, 1951; LaForge, Leary, Naboisek, Coffey & Freedman, 1954; LaForge & Suczek, 1955). It is this complex nature of personality that can be problematic for instruments to successfully measure due to the multi-levels in which behaviour lies (Furr, 2009), for example, personality would affect behaviour in a specific situation. Leary (1957) believed it was the interpersonal reflexes held by each individual that made up their personality (Paddock & Norwich, 1986).
A method of measuring the complex nature of interpersonal personality is through the analysis of narrative construction in the form of the narrator describing the behaviour. The interpersonal reflexes that Leary suggests can be depicted in the narrated account. One approach to exploring personality, using the narrative paradigm, is through McAdams (e.g. 1993; 2001; 2006) work on life-story narratives as a new model of personality. Like Leary’s idea of dominance, McAdams (1993) describes agency as an individual’s motivation for power. The communion theme, like Leary’s idea of love, is expressed in individuals with a high need for intimacy. Like dominance and agency, Youngs and Canter (2011) suggest that potency, in criminal action, is characterised by the offender taking charge of the offence, this can be considered as “…conquering or mastering of the environment…” (pg. 236). Intimacy, like love and communion, in criminal action is characterised through awareness of the victim, “…the criminal activity would be conceptualised by the offender as some form of interpersonal transaction between himself and the victim…” (pg. 236). McAdams (2001) refers to agency and communion as thematic clusters of life narratives. He argues that people differ in terms of how agency and communion features are incorporated into their narrative content and provides established measures of the differences of agency and communion through definitions of different types of themes that occur in each (see McAdams, 2001). McAdams (2001) further proposes that the themes of agency and communion will demonstrate low points, high points and turning points within the narrative construct.

The exploration of agentic themes within a person’s life-story narrative allows for a number of psychological ideals to be identified due to the high focus on the self that agency offers. Psychological concepts, such as dominance ideals e.g. strength, control and mastery, and other aspects, such as motivations, will be uncovered as part of the agency theme. For example, in the theme of self mastery the protagonist aims to become more powerful or wiser, this can be presented through forceful or affective action. The exploration of communion, on the other hand, sees the person as part of community; therefore the psychological constructs involved in this narrative theme differ to the agency theme. For communion the narrative explores psychological aspects of love, intimacy, friendship and belongingness. For example, the theme of love and friendship focuses on love and
friendship in peer groups but also love and friendship between couples but is different to
the nurturance of others or caring like presented in the parent-child relationship which is
accounted for in the caring/help theme. Within the life-stories of criminals, agency and
communion may be presented differently depending on the life-episode they are discussing.
For example, in crime episodes Youngs and Canter (2012) describe high levels of intimacy as
the offender “…having some form of interpersonal transaction with the victim...” (pg. 236).
However, in other life episodes high intimacy may be described as love or unity with others.

2.4.6. Life-story themes: A redemption script and a contamination script

McAdams, Diamond, St Aubin & Mansfield (1997) identified two types of stories
people tell about their lives: the script of the redemptive self and the contamination script.
The development of the two stories was derived from the analysis of reoccurring themes
presented in life-stories of ‘normal’ American adults. With the redemptive script individuals
are able to see positive outcomes that followed negative events; on the other hand, the
contaminated script is centralized around negative outcomes. Maruna (2001) found
redemption and contamination sequences as fundamental story plots that differentiated
persisting and desisting criminals. Similar scripts were found among persisting and desisting
child-molesters; with the desisting group showing a more positive script and the desisting a
negative script (Farmer, et al., 2012). Based on the findings, a reasonable hypothesis is that
differences in redemptive and contamination script would be present in the narratives of
offenders and non-offenders; with the likelihood of active offenders showing aspects of the
contamination script over different episodes in their life-story.

2.4.6.1. A move towards the light: the redemption script

A common life-story theme identified among American adults is the redemptive
script; this was found to be more likely to be present among the high generativity adults
within the sample in McAdams, et al. (1997). The redemptive script demonstrates how
individuals are productive in making positive changes through their life course and are able
to create positive outcomes. The redemption sequence is represented by the movement of
bad to good within the structure and context of the narrative. The redemptive sequence
demonstrates elements of empowerment and agency by the individuals. For example, the
narrators in McAdams, et al. (1997) disclosed events that demonstrated how they were able to change their lives by taking control of the situation and making positive changes where other people may have failed. Such a script demonstrates a positive self-evaluation and the individual is able to focus on the strengths and achievements that are represented in their life-story.

Although the way in which a life-story is presented is dependent on narrator and the experiences they have encountered, a general theme of a redemptive script is able to be obtained through identification of several sub-themes. For example, the context of the sequence includes scenes where the protagonist enjoys “...a special advantage... clear and enduring values... confidence of early blessing and steadfast belief...bad events become transformed, or redeemed into good outcomes... bad things happen, but are often turned to good, whereas when good things happen they rarely turn to bad...” (McAdams, et al., 1997, pg. 687). The sequence of positive life-scripts is also demonstrated in a similar vein in the lives of mature, happy people. When analysing autobiographical memories of mature individuals, Bauer, McAdams & Sakaeda (2005) found the individual’s who were living the ‘happy life’ were able to view their past events as a means of providing them with an area of growth. An interesting interpretation of the findings presented by both studies is that ‘psychologically’ healthy adults would be expected to demonstrate life-stories that present redemptive and happy lives.

Exploring how the redemption sequence is presented in the life-stories of offenders has a lot to offer for understanding their psychological well-being. The role of negative life events, environments and turning points is all considered as antecedents to criminal action (e.g. Sampson & Laub, 1995; 2003). Understanding how offenders’ interpret those negative influences, in relation to a redemptive or contamination script, would provide information for uncovering the stories offenders’ tell about their lives. One interesting interpretation of the redemptive sequence was presented by Maruna (2001) who found a similar script among desisting criminals. Maruna states that the life-course of a persistent criminal encompasses similar scenes of their criminal action which spans over years of their life; therefore to change the script, and desist from crime, is not a simple process. Maruna argues that “...offenders need to have a believable story of why they are going straight to
convince themselves and that is the real change...” (pg. 86). He notes a redemptive script of a criminal includes a number of components, such as the help of an outside force which aids the individual in gaining empowerment and finding ‘good’ in the self; deep down the true self was good which desisting offenders presented as finding the old self; and ex-offenders were able to differentiate themselves from crime, which Maruna argues allowed them to create a sense of ‘it wasn’t me’ when reflecting on their action.

2.4.6.2. Descending from the light: a contamination script

In contrast to the redemptive script, McAdams, et al. (1997) found those who were lower in generativity displayed themes in their life-story focused around a contaminated script. The contaminated script represents a movement from good to bad within the narrative. McAdams, et al., state that the life-stories demonstrating the redemptive script were not more positive than those with the contaminated script but more so that the group was more likely to describe positive outcomes to negative events. More recently a similar contamination script was shown by Cox, Casablanca and McAdams (2012) in a group of Nicaraguan sex workers. Low levels of life satisfaction, scenes of family conflict and relationship problems were described in their life-narratives. McAdams, Reynolds, Lewis, Patten and Bowman (2001) also found that the contamination sequence, in life-narratives, predicted lower levels of well-being among their adult participants. This form contamination in the life-story, can be caused through life-situations being processed in a more linear way; the negative self that is presented in the present formation of the narrative is formulated from the negative self in past (Hankiss, 1981).

An interesting use of the contaminated script is presented in Maruna’s (2001) work on the persisting and desisting criminals. He found that persisting criminals tended to show more of a contaminated script within their life story. Maruna proposes that the script is created from the lack of opportunities for a persistent criminal to make positive changes. Maruna describes the contaminated script, presented by the offenders, as not having any other choice but to offend whether to make money or due to drug addiction and not seeing much hope for change in their life-story. Turing points tended to be childhood episodes; and criminality was blamed on receiving prison sentences. Furthermore, the persisting group
lacked elements of agency in comparison to the desisting group; in addition to describing more scenes of victimisation in their life stories.

2.4.7. Justifying behaviour: Cognitive interpretations expressed in narrative

The research in this area has tended to focus on one single element of cognition at a time such as locus of control, attributions, neutralisations, and cognitive scripts known as cognitive distortions, rather than cognitive functioning as a whole. In addition, research in this area is heavily focused on clinical samples and fixed on treatment methods. Cognitive based explanations for criminal behaviour is based on the assumption that the behaviour is largely governed by rational processes as opposed to irrational ones (Feldman 1993). Bandura (1986) puts forward a set of rationalisation methods using basic abilities that include symbolising, forethought, vicarious self-regulation, and self-reflecting capabilities. However, for this theory to work, it assumes a person is always of sound cognitive functioning which is limited when the onset of criminal behaviour is often influenced by intoxication or other cognitive deficits.

Cognitive rationalisations, in the role of cognitive distortions and neutralisations, have had significant influence in criminal research. The premise is that people endeavour to maintain a sense of cognitive consistency; when a person experiences an internal conflict it is easier to adjust cognitions instead of the behaviour, resulting in distorted thinking patterns that are maintained to justify behavioural inconsistencies (Feldman, 1993). Moreover, neutralisations and minimisations are based on the premise that when we are challenged due to our behaviour we make attempts to justify it. This is considered as criminal thinking, and, accordingly, has influenced treatment of offenders (Maruna & Mann, 2006).

Narratives are an important part of understanding the world from another person’s reality; therefore narrative transactions include a number of cognitive interpretations based on the narrator’s perception of the events that exists in their reality. Research exploring criminal thinking styles is important in uncovering different forms of narrative processes that are involved in offending action (Maruna & Mann, 2006). In particular, Sykes and Matza’s (1957) neutralisation theory is considered as one of the most widely cited theories of criminal behaviour and is centralised around narratives of offenders (Maruna & Corpes,
The application of the theory has been adapted beyond its original research into delinquency to be used as a method of understanding a range of violent crimes. The theory is centralised around five key neutralisation techniques that allow a person to engage in criminal action: denial of responsibility, denial of injury, denial of victim, condemnation of condemners, and the appeal to higher loyalties. Denial of responsibility provides the individual with a method of avoiding failing or disproving responses. The central thesis is that individuals are limited by their moral obligation and thus creating coping strategies when an internal conflict arises. The neutralisations are formulated as the coping strategies.

In a linguistic analysis of offenders’ narratives, O’Connor (2000) found offenders’ used justifying techniques, alongside different arrangement patterns, during the narration of crime events. The narrators regularly shifted the focus of their own agentic nature in the acts they were describing depending on the justification method they were implementing. In short, the narrators’ shifted the focus of act from the self as the agent to the focus of the act on to others as the active agent. This shift in the use of agency can be explained as a method of diffusion or displacement using Bandura’s (1999) methods of moral disengagement. Bandura (1999) argues that moral disengagement allows a person to avoid self-condemnation when moral standards have been violated. Much like neutralisation theory, the individuals employs a set of scripts of disengagement to formulate reconstructions of the self to allow the perception of morality to not be broken. The majority of the research on moral disengagement is focused on military samples; however, due to the violation of moral judgment that is displayed in criminality; moral disengagement strategies are expected to be presented within the offenders’ narratives.

How the language of the narrative is used, in addition to the language itself are both important aspects to consider in interpreting the construction of a narrative (Beasely, 2002). For example, the language that is used may distort the event and impact how we think, feel, and act (White, 1995). The use of language may also impact how the narrative is interpreted by a listener. In their earlier work, Sykes and Matza (1957) suggested a number of neutralisation strategies that delinquents use in order to justify their behaviours. The methods of neutralisations become part of the narrative used to describe the behaviour;
therefore the methods of justification are used as a method of distorting the event in order to reduce the cognitive stress of knowing that it was wrong to commit the delinquent act. Bandura (1999) also extends on this idea providing a theory of moral justification. He proposes a set of scripts that people use to justify their acts to reduce their internal moral conflict.

One hypothesis is that the less moral a person’s actions are the more use they have for neutralisation techniques. For example, Linde (1993) explains that the narrative occurs after the event and therefore has the potential for the narrator to present himself as moral, even when he is not. The level of moral disengagement an offender uses when discussing life-episodes can uncover useful information to how he sees himself in the act. Furthermore, how different neutralisation and moral disengagement methods interact with other important parts of narrative, such as emotions and identity, provides an opportunity to uncover how such functions can formulate dominant narrative roles.

2.4.8. Emotions

In his book on the seductions of crime, Katz (1988) outlines the emotional content that crimes create for those who commit them. This emotion is not just based on aggressive outbursts but on the positive, and apparently addictive, qualities that crimes create. Katz argues that considering the emotional aspect of crime can bring researchers closer to understanding the action as it is experienced by the offender during the course of the crime. Canter and Ioannou (2004) argue that developing knowledge of the emotions encountered during the crime action provides a greater insight to the agency of the offender during the crime experience.

An interesting method of measuring emotions during crime was presented by Canter and Ioannou (2004) who explored criminals’ emotional experience in a sample of offenders who had committed a range of crimes. Drawing on the circumplex structure of emotions presented by Russell (1997), Canter and Ioannou were able to indicate a range of emotional responses that were experienced across different types of crime. They concluded that during interpersonal crimes offenders were more likely to exhibit negative emotions and
more likely to exhibit positive emotions during property focused crimes. The authors also demonstrated the usefulness of Russell’s emotion circumplex in the study of criminal action.

In Russell’s (1997) emotional circumplex, a variety of emotions are underpinned by two polarising facets of arousal and pleasure. The polarising facets create varying modalities of high arousal and low arousal and high pleasure and low pleasure; a range of emotions fit within each modality. For example, high arousal and high pleasure is represented by emotions such as excitement and happiness creating a broad theme of elation. The structure of the emotions creates four classes of emotional states. More recently Youngs and Canter (2011) have demonstrated how the four classes of emotional states: elation (high arousal high pleasure), distress (high arousal high displeasure), depression (low arousal low pleasure) and calm (low arousal high pleasure) (cited from Youngs & Canter, 2011, pg. 238) are demonstrated in criminals’ narratives of their crime episodes. Youngs and Canter found that the four dominant narrative roles the offenders presented were associated to different emotional states demonstrated by the four emotional categories. The revengeful mission presented emotional states of calm and displeasure, the tragic hero presented emotional states of aroused and neutral, the professional presented emotional states of calm and neutral, and the victim presented emotional states of aroused and displeasure. Youngs and Canter also demonstrate how different emotional experiences are expressed in different narrative roles. Ioannou, Canter and Youngs (2013) add support to this finding showing that the four narrative roles narratives roles were underpinned by different emotional states when examining offenders’ experience of their crimes. One of the advantages of the narrative approach is that that the individual's full experience of the event they are describing; including emotional content, is able to be explored.

2.5. A Psychological Framework for Narrative

Outlined in the chapter is the usefulness of the narrative approach in exploring criminality. The use of narrative allows the offenders’ experience of the crimes they commit to be uncovered. From a review of the literature aimed at exploring psychological processors in narrative a number of key psychological elements based around identity, emotion and cognitive interpretations; can be uncovered through examination of the stories people tell about their lives. A large proportion of narrative research has been derived from
non-criminal samples; however, the usefulness of the narrative approach among a criminal population has started to develop within academic literature (see, Maruna, 2001; Presser, 2009; Youngs & Canter, 2011; 2012). With the right method of analysis a number of psychological components that occur within the narrative can be examined together as they occur within the context of the narrative; something that is limited with questionnaire designs. The narrative approach is psychologically rich in the information that can be extracted from the narrators; information that is at the foreground of the action. One way of exploring how the psychological components of narrative work together is the development of a Narrative Action System.

2.5.1. Development of a Narrative Action System (NAS)

An individual’s self consists of what they consider to be unique about them, what they believe they are, and the accuracy of this self-knowledge (Ward, 2011). This perception of the self is what is missed in the background features that psychological explanations of crime aim to explore. For example, focusing on deprivation, environment, and even personality do not provide an understanding to what an individual’s self-perception is. This self-perception can influence the existence of cognitive and emotional competencies within the individual impacting personal perceptions, thus resulting in incorrect inferences about the self to be made (Ward, 2011). Youngs and Canter (2011) suggest narrative themes can be utilised for understanding the immediate processors that drive criminal action patterns. The concept of this extends the Good Lives Model put forward by Ward, Mann & Gannon (2007). Ward et al. (2007) outline a number of features that are directed to understanding the offender’s goals, values, and self in relation to the crimes they have committed. The narrative approach, to understanding criminality, extends this view by extending the goals, values, and understanding of the self within the crimes, from the perspective of the offender. This method allows insight to the individuals understanding of the motive underpinning the crimes they have committed. The motivation and meaning of the crime to the person, becomes their intention to act.

Investigative Psychology (IP) allows for a coherent understanding of offending actions, this allows for the interpretation of the crime to be presented by the offender as it is makes sense to them (Youngs & Canter, 2012). In their earlier work, Canter and Youngs
(2009) offer the proposal of a NAS. The idea of an action system is based on the earlier work of Shye (1985) and aims to provide a robust arrangement of interactions which provides organised and structured relationships that are then open to empirical testing. The NAS can be applied to criminality through relationships in modes of action. The four modes that formulate the action system are the basis of the narrative themes presented within the NAS.

The use of a NAS was first introduced by Canter and Youngs (2009). More recently, Youngs and Canter (2011; 2012) have developed this action system further through the personal accounts of crimes provided by incarcerated offenders. The research has presented four narrative themes that have shown consistency in the thematic divisions of crime scene actions of different crimes and through offenders own narrative accounts of their crimes from a range of offences. The narrative themes have their origins in the earlier work of Frye’s (1957) fictional mythoi and include: Irony plot victim narrative, adventure plot professional narrative, tragedy plot revenger narrative, and a quest plot hero narrative. Each of the narrative themes includes a set of underpinning psychological components.

Based on Youngs and Canter’s (2012) classifications, the victim narrative presents high level of intimacy, low self identity and external attribution of blame. The professional narrative has high potency, strong self awareness and takes responsibility for their actions. The revenger narrative presents low potency and low intimacy, weak self awareness and attributes responsibility by minimising harm. The hero narrative shows high potency and high intimacy, strong self awareness, takes responsibility but presents own interpretations. This NAS provides a structured way of classifying narratives of criminal action. Although the model is in its infancy, the narrative themes have presented stability over a range of crimes and modes of exploration e.g. crime actions (Canter & Youngs, 2009), narrated accounts (Youngs & Canter, 2011), and questionnaire responses (Youngs & Canter, 2012). The robustness of the narratives themes within the broader life-narratives of offenders is yet to be explored; this will be examined in the following chapters.
Chapter 3

Rationale for Research

Few empirical studies have systematically examined how criminals’ narrated their crimes. Fewer still, have examined how criminals narrate their life-stories, outside of the crimes they have committed, and how this relates to their offending behaviour. The present study aims to examine offenders’ life-stories and crime action extending the existing narrative studies such as Presser’s (2005; 2009; 2010) and Youngs and Canter’s (2011; 2012) work with offenders’ narratives, extending beyond narratives of crime action by a) drawing on comparisons to non-offenders, and b) uncovering narrative features across distinct life events. Exploring offenders’ narratives across distinct events uncovers pathways to offending which can be compared to the life-story narratives of a sample of narrators considered as a non-offender population.

McAdams work on life-stories (e.g. 1993; 1996; 2001; 2012) illustrates a methodology for collating narrative accounts of autobiographical life-episodes across distinct events; this method provides a tool for systematically uncovering a number of psychological components that are presented within the narrative structure. The use of this life-story model, although has been widely cited and is the basis of theories and methods from narrative psychology (for example, see Crossley, 2000), it has had little input in a criminal arena. One use of life-stories to develop knowledge of criminal action has been seen in the work of Maruna (1999; 2001).

The life-story model is based on extensive research by McAdams (e.g. 1993, 1996, 2001, 2012) and is also underpinned by other key researchers within the area of life narratives such as Bruner (1991) and identity in narrative (e.g. Bamberg, 2009; 2010). One problem is the lack of application of the narrative approach to criminal populations. McAdams and his colleagues have developed a number of extensive coding systems for exploring narratives; however apart from Maruna’s work, the coding systems have had little use within a criminal arena. As the life-story model is concerned with how a person’s reality makes sense to them, it is important that coding frameworks are equipped to meet the narrative themes that may be present within the narrators’ accounts of their lives.
Moreover, researches employing the life-story model have focused on non-criminal samples (e.g. McAdams, 1993) or criminal samples (e.g. Maruna, 2001); little is known about how the narratives of criminals differ to those of non-criminals and how such methods can uncover, as Presser (2009) and Youngs and Canter (2011) put it, instigators to the criminal action. Therefore, the life-stories approach builds on existing conventional criminogenic research such as life-histories approaches that can be seen in the work of Farrington (1996) and Sampson and Laub (1995) which have provided explanations of criminal action by eliciting direct processes that drive the action.

Finally, the suggestion of narrative consistency through a person’s life episodes stems from White and Epston’s (1990) comments of a dominant narrative role that a person assigns to their self-identity. Further consideration of dominant narrative consistency has been commented on by McAdams (1993) in his discussion of narrated imago themes that are presented through life stories and by Canter and Youngs (2009) and Youngs and Canter (2011; 2012) who demonstrate ideas of dominant narrative roles within a criminal population. The consistency of dominant narrative roles, during life-story and in crime episodes, is a further theme that is explored in the following chapters.

In sum, the present research offers the following contributions to the study of criminality. The first is in the form of methodological contributions, through the development and a review of a novel approach to exploring criminals’ narratives. The approach is in the form of a systematic methodology based on the life-stories model – the LAAF framework, which has been developed for eliciting and analysing psychological themes within criminals’ narratives. In addition, the reliability and validity of pre-existing measures of criminals’ narratives through use of the Narrative Roles Questionnaire is presented. Each adds to a developing literature that demonstrates the usefulness of the narrative approach as a paradigm for researching criminal action.

The second is in the form of theoretical contributions. A new aetiological approach to differentiating between criminals and non-criminals through the exploration of the stories they tell about their lives, is offered. The criminal aspects of a person’s life story are also uncovered alongside psychological consistency over life episodes, supporting the theoretical standpoint of a narrative approach and its application to criminal research.
The final area of contributions is practical applications. Antecedent factors and opportunity for crime are uncovered in narrative accounts. Such knowledge has benefits for crime prevention strategies. The process of the investigation and prosecution of criminal action is a series of interpersonal transactions where the offender provides many narrated accounts of their crime action. A systematic framework for exploring narrated accounts of crime can provide useful conversation management tools for use within the legal arena. Understanding an individuals’ dominant narrative and the level of consistency that narrative has over life-episodes provides useful knowledge for reintegration of offenders after their period of incarceration. Knowledge of how the offender's life-story influences their offending action has implications for re-housing, employment and recidivism reduction programmes.

3.1. Themes of the Analysis

The interview protocol that is implemented for data collection requires participants to describe three life-episodes: a significant event, a crime or socially unacceptable event, their life described as a film. The analysis of the data is separated into two themes. The first relates to the Life Outside Of Crime (LOOC). This is the part of the offender’s life-story that does not directly relate to their crime action (the significant event and the life as a film description). The second assesses the Life Inside of Crime (LIC) and is the section of the life-story where narrators were asked to describe a criminal or deviant episode.

3.2. Research Aims and Questions

The central aim is to uncover what a criminal’s narrative is and propose a framework for a narrative paradigm for exploring criminality. A proposal for the use a narrative paradigm in criminal research has been put forward, thus far. Five consecutive studies will follow; each will serve to uncover psychological components of life-story narratives from an incarcerated group of offenders and drawing on comparisons to a group of males from the general public. An expansion of existing criminal narrative research is provided by exploring distinct life-events, in addition to criminal-episodes, through the issue of a novel framework for deconstructing narratives of offenders’.
The main research question is: What does an offender’s life-story uncover about their offending action? To fully answer the question a set of objectives were followed for each study.

Study 1 (Chapter 5)

1. To determine what types of stories incarcerated offenders tell about their lives. The LAAF content dictionary is implemented to draw out psychological themes from significant event and film narratives and allowing comparisons to be drawn between the offenders and non-incarcerated individuals.

Study 2 (Chapter 6)

2. The present research is the first study to implement the LAAF framework; a further objective is to find out if themed regions will occur in the LAAF items across different life-episodes.

3. To establish if the thematic structure of the LAAF can be differentiated in terms of the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. It is hypothesised that if different themes occur such knowledge will uncover pathways to criminal action.

Study 3 (Chapter 7)

4. To determine if archetypal themes, derived from narratives dominant within our culture, emerge within life-stories of offenders.

5. To establish if the same dominant narrative themes that are present within narrative themes of criminal action (e.g. Youngs and Canter, 2011; 2012) are found in criminal’s LOOC; and to see if they are underpinned by similar psychological processes.

6. To examine if psychological consistency is present in the archetypal themes across distinct narrative episodes described by the offenders e.g. significant event and film narratives.
Study 4 (Chapter 8)

7. To see if findings of dominant narrative themes of crime episodes found in Youngs and Canter (2012) are replicated in a sample of criminals’ NRQ responses of crime action and non-incarcerated NRQ responses for deviant action.

8. To determine if the broader themes of criminal and socially unacceptable behaviour is underpinned by the same psychological components as the dominant narrative themes.

9. To examine the validity and reliability of an emerging literature that has implemented the NRQ as tool for uncovering dominant narrative themes.

Study 5 (Chapter 9)

10. To examine if different dominant narrative roles are a product of different types of crime.

11. To uncover what psychological aspects differentiate the criminal actions of incarcerated offenders and deviant actions of non-incarcerated members of the general public in the commission and execution of the acts described.
Chapter 4

Thesis Methodology

4.1. Thesis statement

Presser (2009) puts forward the idea of generating what a criminal’s narrative is; a concept which has long been discussed by Canter e.g. Canter (1994). One problem with establishing what a criminal’s narrative is is the need to develop a control group of narratives for comparison. A further problem is the lack of a clear methodology for extracting and analysing the criminal narrative. The central aim of the current thesis is to establish what a criminal narrative is by drawing on comparisons with an incarcerated and convicted sample of criminals to non-incarcerated sample of males from the general public. The narratives will be extracted and analysed using the LAAF framework, developed from the CYNEOV1 (both are explained in the later sections).

Central hypothesis: McAdams (1993) purports that development of narrative identity occurs during adolescence, which is the same time that much delinquency begins (Farrington, 1996; Moffitt, 1997; Moffitt & Caspi, 2001; Agnew, 2003) thus it is safe to assume that dominant narrative scripts will be influenced by the actions committed in adolescence. Based on the aforementioned narrative aspects, differences between the life narratives of incarcerated offenders and the narratives of non-incarcerated individuals from the general public will be present. It is hypothesised that uncovering such differences will provide a clear representation of what a criminal narrative is in terms of life and crime episodes. Subsequent hypotheses are stated at the beginning of each study.

4.1.1. Epistemological and theoretical position

The epistemological and theoretical stand point is that the knowledge is obtained through narrative psychology. The use of narratives, as a methodological approach, draws on the reality of the self which is constructed from a set of social interactions (Crossely, 2000). Therefore, the narrative psychological approach takes a social constructionist perspective. The standpoint of social constructionist is that “…human experience, including perception, is mediated historically, culturally and linguistically...”(Willig, 2001, pg. 7).
Narratives aim to explore how an individual constructs their reality through the use of language. The central aim of narrative psychology is to examine how language and stories are used to represent how a person understands their self in reference to the individual as a person and the society in which they interact. Based on this, the narrative is consistent with the social constructionist approach.

In his review of the varieties of narrative analysis McAdams (2012) posits that narratives can be used in the context of discovery and in the context of justification. Narratives in the context of discovery make use of narrative accounts to look for patterns, themes and images in order to generate new theories. The use of narratives in the context of justification, on the other hand, focuses on exploring a particular phenomenon to provide ways of understanding it – this is the position of the current thesis. The use of narratives is used to explore the phenomena of criminality. This particular method has relevance to the central research question. The narrative approach is particularly useful in gaining the offenders perspective of their life and their offending action.

Bruner (1991) argues that narrative is a tool that is used to shape our reality. Narrative psychology focuses on the lived experience of the individual. There is a relationship between narrative and phenomenological meaning; this differentiates narrative psychology from other social constructionist approaches (Crossley, 2000). Narrative has links with what we say about ourselves and our cognitions and behaviours (White & Epston, 1990; Baumeister & Wilson, 1996; Crossley, 2000; Presser, 2009; Youngs & Canter 2012). The social constructionist approach suggests that language is important in knowledge. For example, the language used to describe an event may differ from person to person, but neither are right or wrong (Willig, 2001). This concept is directly represented by life-story narratives. For example, an event described by one person may differ to the description given by another. None are incorrect, what they represent is each person’s knowledge and interpretation of the reality they have experienced.

The central argument of the thesis is that the narrative approach offers an insightful method of exploring criminality. An approach that has been over-looked for preference of a more quantitative focus investigating background features of criminals rather than how crimes make sense to the individuals who commit them. Drawing on a social constructionist
approach, through narrative, allows the focus of the data collection and analysis to be on the perception of the criminal – their formulations of themselves, as criminals, and how their reality is socially constructed through self-reflection. Not only does the narrative approach allow data to be obtained through a person’s perception of their reality but it is also closely related to other social constructionist approaches such as Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) (Crossely, 2000). IPA is a method of exploring the reality of the self through the lived experience of the individual, which is also what narrative psychology aims to achieve.

4.2. Data

Semi-structured interviews and questionnaires were completed from a set of incarcerated male respondents; the second included the same semi-structured interviews and completed questionnaires from a sample of male respondents who were all members of the general public (classed as the non-incarcerated group). The Canter-Youngs Narrative Experience of Offending interview protocol (CY-NEOv1) was the main data collection tool. (Please see appendix 1).

A secondary data tool was incorporated for the analysis; the use of a content framework titled the LAAF framework. The tool is designed to capture psychological themes within the life-story. The use of content coding allows for direct comparisons to be drawn between the two respondent groups and provides a basis for empirical testing to be conducted on the narrative content provided. (Please see appendix 2 for LAAF content dictionary).

4.2.1. CY-NEOv1 narrative protocol

The Canter-Youngs Narrative Experience of Offending (CYNEOv1) interview protocol was developed by researchers at the Centre for Investigative Psychology at the University of Liverpool. The origins of the criminal narrative experience started with Canters (1994) book, Criminal Shadows. In this book Canter puts forward the concept of the inner narrative of the offender and argues that such narratives hold information of the experience of offending. The research has been headed by Professor Canter and his colleagues and over the past 7 years the protocol has been implemented as a data collection tool by students and
researchers exploring criminals’ narrative experience of offending. The protocol has demonstrated its use as a reliable method of eliciting criminals’ narratives. The combination of interview structure and a range of sections of the protocol, have demonstrated it is a sufficiently reliable and valid method for eliciting offenders narratives (e.g. analysis of NRQ Canter, Kaouri & Ioannou, 2003; analysis of emotions questionnaire Canter & Ioannou, 2004; analysis of crime narrative interview and re-analysis of NRQ Youngs and Canter, 2011; 2012). At time of writing, the protocol is in a second revision. The results presented in the following chapters demonstrate the rich information that can be extracted in the life as a film narrative section, and, as a result, a more in-depth interview structure has been developed to extract more detail of the life as a film from the participants.

The protocol aims to elicit core psychological information from participants. It comprises of 3 elements: qualitative data collection in the form of life-narrative interview, quantitative data collection through the use of a set of questionnaires, and demographic information. The design of the protocol allows for a triangulation of methods to be formulated. Triangulation is defined as “…the comparisons of results on the basis of different data (for example qualitative and quantitative) and using differing methods…” (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak & Vetter, 2000, pg. 94). The use of differing data sources to explore what a criminal narrative is will add to the validity of the findings. Hugh-Jones and Gibson (2012) support the idea that a triangulation of methods provides a mode of quality checking of the data which allows for the best possible interpretation of the results.

The protocol comprises of a semi-structured interview exploring three life-episodes. It is designed to provide the interviewer a structured guide through the process of obtaining information from the interviewees. The data was collected by multiple researchers; therefore a detailed interview structure was paramount for the consistency of data within the project. A semi-structured interview is particularly useful in generating data that is rich in meaning of the self and identity; the structured questions and prompts is used to guide the narrator rather than provide a rigid question and answer interview process (Crossley, 2000). A good example of this process can be seen in McAdams’ (1993) life-narrative interview structure. A further advantage of using of semi-structured interviews is that they
are compatible with a range of analysis methods (Willing, 2001; Hugh-Jones & Gibson, 2012).

4.2.1.1. Life-episodes

The qualitative element of the data collection is based on life-story narrative interviews. This is aimed at exploring key events in a person’s life story which can demonstrate the construction of meaning, self, and identity (Crossley, 2000; Hugh-Jones & Gibson, 2012) in addition to emotion and cognitive interpretations (Presser, 2009; Youngs & Canter, 2011). McAdams (1993) argues that obtaining life-story incorporates the exploration of several areas: life chapters; key events (nuclear episodes); significant people; future script; stresses and problems; and personal ideology. McAdams life-story extraction method is an in-depth data collection method which can be a long and complex system for both the interviewer and interviewee to endure. The CY-NEOv1 protocol has adapted this method to meet the requirements of a more time efficient and detailed way of collecting rich life-story data for use with an offender sample. It explores three areas of the life-story: a significant event, a crime (or most likely style of offending) (the non-incarcerated are asked to describe a socially unacceptable event), and to describe their life as a film.

4.2.1.2. NRQ

The Narrative Roles Questionnaire was first developed by Professor Canter and his students at the University of Surrey in the late 1990s. It was derived from a number of pilot studies that examined criminals’ experiences of offending such as the roles they played during the offence. From the pilot studies a number of statements provided by the offenders were developed into questionnaire statements. In the earlier versions of the scale (see Canter, Kaouri & Ioannou, 2003) the NRQ had only 20 statements and was scored using a five-point Likert scale ranging from strong disagreement (1) to strong agreement (5). This was designed to demonstrate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with each statement. Since, the development of the NRQ has seen a number of revisions of the statements in the more recent publications (see Youngs and Canter, 2012). The revisions have developed the scales validity and reliability. For example, an additional 13 items have been added and the measurement format was changed to assess the intensity using a five
point likert format of “Not at all” (1) to “Very much indeed” (5) with (3) being the mid-point “Some”. Previous research has found evidence for 4 dominant narrative roles measured by the scale; however, this has only tested the validity and reliability of the NRQ by analysing responses from incarcerated offenders and by employing the Facet theory method of Smallest Space Analysis. The present study aims to extend this further by exploring the NRQ with two different participant groups (incarcerated and non-incarcerated) and with additional analyses.

The Narrative Roles Questionnaire (NRQ) is the first of a series of questionnaires included in the CY-NEOv1. The NRQ is a 33-item self-report questionnaire. The items are designed to measure a set of narrative roles which relate to a range of items pertaining to self-identity, emotion, and cognitive interpretation (see Youngs & Canter, 2012 for an in-depth review). NRQ items were developed from discussions of offending behaviour from a set of incarcerated offenders. The items were then developed from quotes the offenders used to describe their actions and how they felt when conducting their actions. The NRQ is now in its second revision with a further additional items added, however the current projected data was collected using the original 33-item scale.

Self identity items include: ‘I was a victim’, ‘I was in control’, ‘I couldn’t stop myself’. Emotion items include: ‘It was fun’, ‘It was interesting’, ‘It was like a routine’. Cognitive interpretation items include: ‘I didn’t care what would happen’, ‘It all went to plan’, ‘It was like I wasn’t part of it’. The items are scored using a 5-point likert scale forced choice format: 1=Not at all, 2=Just a little, 3=Some, 4=A lot, 5=Very much. Respondents were asked to complete the NRQ after disclosing a significant event and after disclosing the crime or socially unacceptable event and were asked to complete the questionnaire in response to the events discussed in the interviews.

4.2.1.3. Demographic questions

A set of demographic questions are included in the CY-NEOv1, however there are differences in the questions asked between the two respondent groups. Both respondent groups were required to answer the same set of basic demographic questions, they included: age, ethnicity, qualifications and education questions. The non-incarcerated
individuals were also asked for occupation details, capacity of dealings with police officers, if they had committed a crime, and if they had been convicted of a crime.

The demographics obtained from the non-incarcerated individuals allowed for national comparisons of general public offending. For the incarcerated, additional questions asked related to education/schooling/courses obtained during time in prison, age of first crime/conviction/court appearances, number of convictions/times apprehended and incarcerated (including time in young offenders institutes), types of crimes have been convicted for, sentence length, and family background and convictions. The information obtained by the incarcerated individuals allows for a brief summary of family background and criminal history to be established. In doing so, background characteristics of the offenders such as whether they are one-time offenders or career criminals can be established; again this aspect is overlooked in previous comparisons with offenders and non-offenders. The role of environmental features such as family background has been identified as an influence of criminal lifestyles (e.g. Blackburn, 1993; Farrington, 1996); this information can also be established from the demographic information. Finally, like with the non-incarcerated individuals, the demographic information obtained allows for comparisons to be made in relation to national demographics.

4.2.1.4. LTQ, Emotions and D45

The protocol also includes a Life Trajectory Questionnaire (LTQ), Emotions questionnaire, and the Delinquency-D45 (a shortened version of the D100). As part of the current project data was collected from both participants for the LTQ and emotions questionnaire. The emotions questionnaire was completed after participants disclosed a significant life event and provided a narrative of a crime they had committed (or socially unacceptable event – for the non-incarcerated respondents). The D45, however, was only completed by the incarcerated offender respondent group. Both the emotions and D45 questionnaire data was not incorporated into the analysis of the current project, the data remains in storage within the IRCIP archives.

4.2.1.5. CY-NEOv1 in action
A number of papers have been published from data collected by the CY-NEOv1 see: Youngs & Canter (2012); Youngs and Canter (2011); Canter and Ioannou (2004); Canter, Kaouri and Ioannou (2003). The protocol is currently in its second revision, this has included extra items added to the NRQ component. The protocol has seen successful use with mentally disordered offenders (Canter & Youngs, 2012) and is the main data collection tool for the International Comparison of Offending Narratives (ICON) project commissioned by the International Research Centre for Investigative Psychology (IRCIP). The on-going usage of the protocol indicates the level of reliability and validity in this data collection tool for use in exploring offender narratives. However, the data collected for the current study is the only study, known to the current author, to have made use of this protocol for both incarcerated and non-incarcerated respondents.

4.1.2. Life As A Film (LAAF) framework

The LAAF methodology is a thematic coding-framework that is designed for use alongside the the CY-NEOv1. The LAAF is an acronym used for Life As A Film. This method is not concerned with how the individuals narrate their crime experiences or socially unacceptable events. The concept of the LAAF is taken from a previous narrative analysis method known as the TAT methodology, which aims to look at themed analysis of exploring narratives. The Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) is a projective test where participants are asked to describe an ambiguous picture providing a coherent account of their interpretation of the picture. The language and content that participants use to describe the picture is then analysed for themes of achievement, affiliation, and status and power. The LAAF extends this by first of all examining how individuals tell stories about their lives and in particular how they depict their life as a film; offering a method to elicit narratives aimed at use with offenders. The LAAF provides a framework for the words and language that are used within the narrative to be analysed for themes relating to the persons self perception and aspects of their identity.

The LAAF provides a content dictionary that is both testable and robust in examining thematic structure of life-narratives. The content dictionary contains 123 variables relating to various narrative components exploring different aspects of narrative. The first section explores the story genres by focusing on generic presentation e.g. comedy, action, crime;
and focal content e.g. birth, death, relationship problems, narrative tone and resolution. The second section explores the psychological content such as themes of agency and communion, redemption and contamination, and NAS components. Psychological complexity is examined in the third section and psychological components such as locus of control, justifications, identity and emotions are explored in the fourth section.

Each item is coded using a dichotomous format: 0=not present, 1=present, the majority of variables follow this format. Items that do not follow this format include: length in words, number of people cited, number of distinct events cited, and number of distinct psychological ideas; all are coded using a scale format.

4.3. Sample

One limitation of the offender – non-offender research is, outlined in the literature review is the difficulty in defining one person as a criminal and another as not. Defining a group of people as non-criminals assumes they have never and will never commit a crime. The demographics below show that a large proportion of the general public sample have admitted to committing crimes but not been convicted for them. Therefore the two sample groups are defined as: incarcerated (convicted offenders) and non-incarcerated (members of the general public).

All of the participants involved in this research are male and over the age of 18. The focus on males is due to the large proportion of males within the prison system. For example, Berman (2012) reports 80% of those sentenced and 14% of those waiting for sentencing, within the UK prison population, were males age 18 or over.

4.3.1. Incarcerated offenders’

The incarcerated offenders were recruited using an opportunity sampling method through the prison system. They were selected due to availability when the interviews took place.

The age range was 21-61 years old. The mean is 34 years (SD 9.4). Twenty-six of the incarcerated offenders were under the age of 30 years old when the interviews took place. The majority of the offenders were white (n= 50, 71%). The second largest ethnicity was
Black-Caribbean 9% (n=8). Chinese and Pakistani ethnicity was represented by 2% (n=2) of the sample (1% for each of the respective ethnicities). A further 4% (n=3) were from other ethnic backgrounds but did not state which.

According to Berman (2012) 74.3% of the prison population is white prisoners. This is fairly represented within the demographics of the current sample. The general UK population has 88.8% white people, which does suggest an under representation of white people in the UK prison system. Berman also reports 13.4% of the prison population is of black ethnicity, this is fairly represented within the current sample demographics. However, only 2.7% of the UK population is black ethnic demonstrating an over representation of black prisoners within the UK prison system. In the current sample Chinese and Pakistani prisoners represent only 2% of the sample, however Berman reports 7.4% of the prison population are Asian and a further 1.1% Chinese. Asian prisoners are underrepresented in the current sample. Overall, the prisoners, recruited for the current study, are representative the current UK prison population with regard to gender, age, and ethnicity.

The range of qualifications specified in the offender group varied from none to a number of different qualifications e.g. NVQ and BTEC national diplomas. The main qualifications stated by the group were GCSEs, however only 26 participants answered this question. In addition 11% (n=8) claimed to have A-levels, 74% (n=52) said no to having A-levels, 14% (n=10) did not answer this question.

The average age of the first official warning was 16.8 years. The youngest was 8 years old and the oldest was 60. The average age when first found guilty was 19.5 years. The youngest was 11 years and the oldest 60 years. The total number of convictions ranged from 1 to over 200. The largest proportion of offenders had less than 20 convictions (n=25), five offenders had 20-40 convictions, seven had 40-50, and five had over 100 convictions. The average number of convictions was 31.4. Current sentence ranged from 3 month to life imprisonment. The average sentence length was 7.5 years which fits with Berman’s (2012) review of the prison population. He found that over 1/3 of prisoners were sentenced for over 4 years. The majority of the prisoners, in the current sample, were serving sentences between 1 to 5 years (n=17) or serving 10+ years (including life sentences) (n=17). The next
largest proportion was serving sentences that were less than one year. The smallest proportion were serving sentences between 5 and 10 years (n=2).

Fifty-six percent (n=30) had admitted to being in a young offenders institute, 31% (n=22) said they had not, and 13% (n=9) did not answer the question. The time spent in a youth offenders institute ranged from 2-13 years. Less than 12 month was the most frequent (n=19) and 1-5 years was the next largest (n=14); average 31.2 months. Fourteen percent (n=10) have parents with convictions, 73% (n=51) said their parents did not have convictions, 12% (n=9) did not answer this question.

4.2.2. Non-incarcerated respondents

The non-incarcerated sample was recruited using both opportunity and snowball sampling methods. The selection remit was that participants were males and over the age of 18. This was to ensure they were matched to the incarcerated sample. The participants were selected from a public environment which was thought to represent the general population rather than a restrictive sample group such as students; which is prominent in offender – non-offender research. Demographic information was collected for 85 of the participants; information was missing for 6 of the participants.

The age range was 18 to 40 years old. The mean age is 23.9 years. The age distribution of the sample shows 61% (n=57) were between 18 and 24 years. The next largest proportion were between 25 and 30 years 26% (n=22). The older participants had the smallest proportions, 5% (n=4) were between 31 to 35 years, and 2% (n=2) were between 36 to 40 years.

Ethnicity of the non-incarcerated group show the majority were white 93% (n=79). Only a few participants were represented by other ethnicities, 2% (n=2) are black-African, 1% (n=1) Chinese, and 4% (n=3) did not state their ethnicity.

The majority of the sample 41% (n=35) had undertaken further education such as A-Level’s, BTEC or NVQs. One quarter 25% (n=21) was educated to degree level and a further 9% (n=8) are educated to postgraduate level, 12% (n=10) had obtained GCSEs (or
equivalent), a further 5% (n=4) had received practical (on-job) qualifications, and 6% (n=5) had no qualifications.

The largest proportion of the sample were from a student population 37% (n=31). Around one third of the sample 33% (n=28) was in skilled employment and a further 21% (n=18) in unskilled employment, 6% (n=5) were in professional employment, and finally 2% (n=2) were not in employment at the time of taking part in the research.

A large proportion had talked to the police in either a victim or offender capacity 87% (n=74). Only 13% (n=11) said they had never talked to the police. Three quarters 75% (n=64) claimed they had committed a crime. Twenty-three percent (n=20) said they had never committed any crime and one person did not answer this question. Around one quarter of the participants 26% (n=21) admitted to have been convicted of a crime, 74% (n=63) said they had never been convicted of a crime.

4.4. Data Collection Process

The data was collected by a team of twelve researchers. The research team was trained in the use of the interview protocol and conducting interviews prior to carrying out the research. The criteria for selecting which incarcerated offenders to interview were: male, over the age of 18, and who was available at the time, this allowed offenders who had committed a range of crimes to be interviewed. All the interviews took place in the same room within the prison and were supervised by the on-duty psychologist. Up to 6 interviews were conducted in the same room at the same time by 6 different interviewers.

For the non-incarcerated sample the research team recruited males over the age of 18 from the general public. They were selected via opportunity sampling – those who were available at the time or via snowball sample – participants would inform friends or colleagues about the study and those willing to take part would be recruited. Other than age and gender no other criteria for selecting those from the general public was used. The research team worked together to identify participants, which again lead to a number of interviews being conducted at the same time and within the same vicinity. For example, if a group of friends were willing to take part an individual researcher from the research team would interview each person in synchronicity.
In both data collection instances, researchers made audio recordings of the narrative interview questions, with the consent of the respondents, when respondents refused to be recorded they were asked if notes could be made from their responses. All questionnaire and demographic responses were recorded in a questionnaire pack which was read aloud to each respondent at the required intervals throughout the interview.

The data collection is a standard method in terms of the CY-NEOv1 protocol; however there are some points to note with regard to the restrictions of this method of data collection:

Conducting semi-structured interviews requires rapport building between the interviewer and interviewee (Crossley, 2000) this may have proved difficult within a prison setting with a number of interviews being conducted at the same time. It is important to note that different people have different interpersonal qualities and experience of conducting interviews for data collection. To overcome this issue the team was provided with training in interviewing, and given a detailed interview protocol. Training ensured sufficient guidance was provided in the use of the interview protocol and relevant prompts were provided for use in the interviews to obtain the necessary level information retained from the respondents. Additionally, having a large research team raises concerns for the fluctuations in the standard of data collected between the interviewers. The detailed protocol and training were designed to overcome this. However, the likelihood of researcher bias is reduced with a large research team this means the researchers are less likely to impose their views or ideas of potential findings to influence the participants responses.

A further issue is the use of hand written notes rather than recorded interviews. To keep within the ethical guidelines and allowing respondents to feel comfortable, when a person said no to being recorded, the interviewer, with permission, proceeded to take detailed notes of the answers. Some of the questions for the narrative interviews required a lot of detail within the response therefore writing down detailed information whilst listening to a respondent’s free recall is difficult. Some of the information obtained may have been a brief version of what was actually said. This can impact the quality of detail that is obtained in the interview and interpretation of data during the analysis sections.
The setting in which the interviews were conducted may have influenced the quality of data obtained. In both cases, several interviews took place in the same room at the same time. Even though each interviewee was interviewed by only one interviewer, the presences of other inmates and prison staff may have left some interviewees reluctant to give information such as details of the crimes they had been imprisoned for. On contrary, in some cases information may have been distorted or sensationalised. Human memory does not provide an exact account of autobiographical events therefore it is likely that distortion can occur regardless of the environment. McAdams (1993) argues that life-narratives are not concerned with the content of what is being said but the context. The issue of participant truthfulness is relevant to all data-collection that is concerned with self-report measures.

The use of a triangulation of methods that the CY-NEOv1 allows will provide a good means of overcoming any limitations encountered during the data collection. The current data set is large and holds detailed information for 145 participants, to gather data of this size would be time consuming for a single researcher. To gain access to prisons for research purposes is extremely difficult especially when members of staff are required to monitor interviewees during data collection; this can be costly to the organisation, having only one researcher would have taken a lot of time, staff, and effort on the part of the prison service. Therefore, having a team of researchers allowed the data to be collected in a timely manner, with little disruption to the prison service, while still gathering a large amount data necessary for the project.

4.4.1. Ethics

The data source for the current project is IRCIP archive data. Consent was granted by Prof Canter (head of IRCIP archives) to use the data for the purposes of the current project. The use of the data was approved by the University of Huddersfield SREP ethics board. An additional sub-set of interviews was collected by the current author to be incorporated in the main data set. This data collection was also approved by the SREP ethics board at the University of Huddersfield.
The data collected was from non-incarcerated individuals. An information sheet (see appendix 3) and consent form (see appendix 4) was added to the CY-NEOv1. British Psychological Society ethical guidelines were followed throughout the data collection and analysis procedures. Participants were asked to consent to taking part in the research via a signature on the consent form. This included consenting to direct quotes from interviews to be used in the write-up of the research and for their data to be stored in IRCIP archives for future research. In addition, withdrawal procedures were also explained to all respondents.

The issue of confidentiality was addressed before the interviews commenced. Participants were informed that items discussed within the interviews would be kept confidential, and all information being made anonymous. Identification numbers were used for each of the interviews and questionnaire packs completed by respondents. To stop deception and reduce psychological harm, participants were given an information sheet and talked through the procedure and purposes of the data collection and the project. Furthermore a risk assessment was completed by the current researcher which was submitted as part of the ethics application and approved by the SREP panel.
Section introduction (1): Life outside of crime

Life Outside Of Crime (LOOC) is defined as the part of the offender’s life-story that does not directly relate to their crime action. This section is in reference to the significant event and the life as a film aspect of the life-story interviews. This section is classed as a LOOC as it does not ask participants to directly discuss the crimes they are involved in. However, depending on the level of criminality in the lives of the offenders, it is expected that the LOOC sections of the interviews will include some discussion of criminality; the level of criminality within the life story is then able to be assessed.

LOOC has been explored in many ways within academic literature. For example, the examination of environmental and social features that are involved in criminality (Farrington, 1996; Lipsey & Drezon, 1998; Galbry, 2003), developmental and family aspects (Sampson & Laub, 1995; Farrington, 1996), and through life trajectories and life turning points (Sampson & Laub, 1995; Maruna, 2001). However, few have focused on the lives of offenders using their narrative accounts as a method of exploration. The life-story paradigm offers a way of understanding the offender’s reality as it makes sense to them. Furthermore the LAAF framework is a novel method of exploring the life stories of offenders and is incorporated into the analysis. The following chapters (5, 6 and 7) make use of the LAAF method to: 1) draw on comparisons of incarcerated offenders life-stories to life-stories of non-incarcerated individuals, 2) to examine the thematic differences in the life-stories of incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals, and 3) to explore what, if any, dominant narrative themes are present in the LOOC.
Chapter 5

Life-narrative Comparisons of Incarcerated and Non-incarcerated Males

5.1. Introduction

To deconstruct the criminal narrative, a content framework – namely, the LAAF was devised from literature exploring narrative. Although the LAAF is primarily designed for use with life as a film narrative, here it is employed to deconstruct film and Significant Event (SE) narratives. The LAAF explores a range of psychological and complexity components derived from different areas of narrative analysis; it is expected to be compatible over both life-narrative interviews. Content analysis has been successful in exploring themes within narrative accounts for examples see McAdams (2009) and Maurna (2001).

Content analysis has seen much success in exploring different aspects of criminality such as, case linkage analysis (Woodhams & Labuschange, 2011) homicide (Trojan & Salfati, 2011) rape (Canter, Bennell, Alison & Reddy, 2003) and desisting and persisting offenders (Maruna, 2001). Content analysis allows previous knowledge of the topic area to be explored by providing suitable background information to develop a content framework or to extend prior frameworks. However, limitations still occur with this form of analysis. For example, an over-emphasis on existing frameworks may result in contextual aspects of the data being overlooked and important details being omitted (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005; Elo & Kyngas, 2008). Still, content analysis does have strengths over other methods. In particular, when used with qualitative data, content analysis allows the researcher flexibility of how the analysis is conducted. Elo and Kyngas (2008) claim there is no right or wrong way; the method is subjective to the needs of the researcher and available data.

In the present chapter the LAAF content framework is implemented to explore the life-stories of a group of incarcerated offenders. A group of non-incarcerated males are incorporated as a control group to establish what the criminal narrative is in comparison to members of the general public. The study aims to achieve a descriptive framework based on the psychological components that a narrative discloses in a group of offenders. Firstly, to depict what narrative components are available in the life-stories of offenders and secondly to assess the usefulness of the LAAF framework as a content coding method for use with
exploring life-narratives. The research questions are; what kinds of stories do criminals tell about their lives, and how do those stories differ from stories non-incarcerated members of the general public tell about their lives?

Lifestyle features of criminals, such as social, environmental, and developmental aspects have demonstrated that negative life components can impact the onset to criminality. Taking the criminal away from the offences they have committed and exploring their life outside of the crimes is a useful way of identifying criminal aspects of a person’s life-story. Previous research suggests that negative turning points (Sampson & Laub, 1995), negative environmental aspects (Farrington, 1996) and negative life trajectories (Maruna, 2001) contribute to a person’s involvement in criminal activity. The hypothesis here is that differences between the incarcerated and non-incarcerated life-episodes will be present. The incarcerated offenders will include life-episodes with a higher presence of negative items.

The chapter is separated into two sections. The first explores life as a film narrative and the second explores the SE narrative. Both narrated episodes are content analysed using the LAAF framework. Each section is separated into the story content, the psychological content, psychological complexity and psychological components. At each stage narrative verbatim is used to illustrate the findings.

5.2. Method

From the sample, 40% (n=61) of the interviewees were offenders who were incarcerated at the time of interview, 60% (n=90) of the interviewees were from members of the general public non-incarcerated sample.

Life-story interviews asked the participants to discuss a SE and describe their life as a film. Each interview was recorded and transcribed. The transcripts were then subject to content analysis using the LAAF framework and were coded using the same framework by an independent inter-rater. Cohen’s Kappa for inter-rater reliability was conducted for the film and SE narrative for each section of the content framework. Although the content framework offers a host of theoretical definitions to explain the different items for coding, it is still a complex coding framework in terms of the number of individual variables, the
number of cases to be coded, and the subjective nature of the data. Based on definitions of Cohen’s kappa, a kappa value between .40 and .75 represents a fair to good level of agreement (Banerjee, Capozzoli, McSweeney & Sinha, 1999, pg. 6). The established kappa for the film narrative was 0.512 and for the SE 0.441; both are considered adequate for the current data set. (Tables are presented in appendix 5).

Each individual variable of the LAAF was subject to comparative analysis using chi square analysis. The chi square analysis indicated any significant associations to the LAAF variables and to which group this association occurred. A thematic analysis was conducted on the interviews for each of the LAAF items where a significant association was present. The thematic analysis was used to establish, what, if any, subthemes occurred within the narratives for that variable. This is presented separately for the film and SE narrative.

5.2.1. Data analysis strategy

To uncover what stories incarcerated offenders tell about their lives, their life-story narratives are compared to life-story narratives of non-incarcerated individuals from the general public. The LAAF content framework was used to content code the film and significant event narratives from the two narrator groups. The content variables are coded using 1 when an item was present and 0 when an item was not present; this method allows a secondary dataset to be formulated in SPSS which can then be subjected to statistical analyses.

The frequency occurrence of the content variables, from each narrator group, is analysed using Chi Square analysis. Chi Square analysis indicates if a significant association is present for each variable and for what narrator group the association occurred. Although to examine each of the LAAF variables multiple comparisons will be made, it is important to look at the frequency occurrence for each individual variable to uncover which are associated to the stories offenders tell about their lives. By establishing what variables are associated with the offenders’ stories, which variables are not, and which variables are common place in both narrator groups; the analysis is steered towards answering the research questions and predictions which are to establish what stories offenders tell about
their lives and how they differ from the stories non-incarcerated individuals tell about their lives.

One issue with this analysis strategy is that individual differences in the life-stories are not uncovered as the frequencies deals with the narrators at an aggregate level. To overcome this, a thematic analysis is conducted on the interviews for the LAAF items where a significant association is found in the Chi Square analysis. Simply put, if the crime-genre item was significantly associated to the incarcerated group then the interviews where this item is present will be analysed for different themes relating to crimes. For example, if the crime was describe in a positive or a negative way, if a fictional crime account was described or a crime that took place. The thematic analysis is used to establish, what, if any subthemes occur within the narratives.

5.3. Results

The tables presented in this section illustrate the content of the LAAF coding framework disclosed by both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated interviewees. The tables are presented in frequency order of the LAAF items in the offenders’ narrative, starting with the highest frequency. Narrative verbatim is used to illustrate the variables of the LAAF framework, verbatim from the incarcerated group is represented by a ‘P’ and ‘N’ for the non-incarcerated.

In general, the offenders presented both their film and SE narratives in an overall negative tone. The life episodes included contaminated sequences and justification for their actions. Criminal action played a big part in the life-stories of offenders in both film and SE narratives. The non-incarcerated individuals tended to use positive tone through discussions of their achievements and other positive aspects of their life-story in film and SE narrative.
Table 5.1. LAAF variables for life as a film narrative interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>LAAF ITEM</th>
<th>INCARCERATED (N=61)</th>
<th>NON-INCARCERATED (N=90)</th>
<th>Kappa value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STORY GENRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic presentation</td>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>40 (44.4%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=7.311, p&lt;0.05** 0.820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>13 (10.1%)</td>
<td>12 (14.9%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.675, N.S. 0.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=14.808, p&lt;0.05* 0.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tragedy</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=10.848, p&lt;0.05* 0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thriller</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=.063, N.S. 0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=.894, N.S. 0.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal content</td>
<td>Doing crime</td>
<td>33 (54.1%)</td>
<td>12 (26.8%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=28.881, p&lt;0.05* 0.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imprisonment</td>
<td>29 (47.5%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=45.786, p&lt;0.05* 0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship problem</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=4.723, p&lt;0.05*** 0.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>16 (17.8%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=.086, N.S. 0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material success</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=7.252, p&lt;0.05** 0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Victim of crime</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=8.454, p&lt;0.05** 0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship success</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>13 (14.4%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=.003, N.S. 0.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Expected Values</td>
<td>Test Statistic</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=.018$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative tone</td>
<td>35 (57.4%)</td>
<td>20 (22.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=19.404$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive tone</td>
<td>32 (52.5%)</td>
<td>42 (46.7%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=.488$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive tone</td>
<td>26 (42.6%)</td>
<td>64 (71.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=12.255$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive tone</td>
<td>18 (29.5%)</td>
<td>12 (13.3%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=5.975$, p&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy ending</td>
<td>32 (52.5%)</td>
<td>26 (28.9%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=8.538$, p&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad ending</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.157$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-mastery</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=8.390$, p&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=.499$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status – victory</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=.913$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement/ responsibility</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>15 (16.7%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=2.270$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity/ togetherness</td>
<td>18 (29.5%)</td>
<td>20 (22.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.025$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love/ friendship</td>
<td>15 (24.6%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=13.415$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring/ help</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=5.150$, p&lt;0.05***</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.374$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redemptive theme</td>
<td>General redemption</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>10 (11.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=2.930$, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Chi-Square Value</td>
<td>p-Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat negative events transformed to redemptive</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 3.368$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets forth pro-social goals</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 0.825$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of sense of moral steadfastness</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 2.043$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys a special advantage</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 0.239$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffering or injustice in lives of others during</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of sense of moral steadfastness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General contamination</td>
<td>23 (37.7%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 24.879$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimisation</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 17.505$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointment</td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 12.572$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of significant other</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 10.943$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/ psychological illness or injury</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 6.216$, p&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrayal</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 4.516$, p&lt;0.05***</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 2.043$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disillusionment</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 2.990$, N.S.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex guilt, humiliation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragedy theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong done to them/ theirs</td>
<td>20 (32.8%)</td>
<td>8 (8.9%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 13.747$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 1.485$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irony theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impotence/ hopelessness</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X²(1)=4.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion/ misunderstanding</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X²(1)=9.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adventure theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilment/ satisfaction</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness/ skills/ competencies</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>X²(1)=.200, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible rewards/ acquisitions</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X²(1)=14.808, p&lt;0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quest theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming struggles/ obstacles/ mission</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.386, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory/ proving self/ success</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X²(1)=2.764, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity/ bravery</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.069, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychological complexity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive complexity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct psychological ideas</td>
<td>4.67 (2.76)</td>
<td>3.63 (1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t(149)=2.699, p&lt;0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct events cited</td>
<td>2.6 (2.48)</td>
<td>2 (1.64)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t(149)=2.050, p&lt;0.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people</td>
<td>2.2 (1.63)</td>
<td>1.5 (1.56)</td>
<td></td>
<td>t(149)=2.631, p&lt;0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presences of coherent themes</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>37 (60.7%)</td>
<td>51 (56.7%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=.238, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of contingent sequences</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25 (41%)</td>
<td>29 (32.3%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.215, N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Distinct beginning, middle and end components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>X²(1)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roles for characters</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roles for characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>X²(1)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensory gain</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material/ financial gain</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social gain</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power/ status gain</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpersonal style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>X²(1)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confronting of others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidant of others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Locus of control

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>X²(1)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>X²(1)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>χ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial of responsibility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume the role of victim</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion of responsibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distorting the consequence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation of condemners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.05***</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement of responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=3.368, N.S.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count (%)</td>
<td>Count (%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)</td>
<td>p-value</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to higher loyalties</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=2.043, N.S.</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of injury</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X^2(1)=2.990, N.S.</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of the victim</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X^2(1)=2.994, N.S.</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehumanising the victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroused negative</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=10.353, p&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aroused negative</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=3.737, N.S.</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility towards others</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=8.454, p&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroused positive</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=2.658, N.S.</td>
<td>0.581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aroused positive</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>19 (21.1%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=1.583, N.S.</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy for others</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=.196, N.S.</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self ID stronger than others</td>
<td>46 (75.4%)</td>
<td>67 (74.4%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=.018, N.S.</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others as significant</td>
<td>45 (73.8%)</td>
<td>56 (62.2%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=2.189, N.S.</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self ID weaker than others</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=.001, N.S.</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others as non-significant</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=4.784, p&lt;0.05***</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity - protagonist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapist</td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=4.773, p&lt;0.05***</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>7 (11.5%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=3.898, p&lt;0.05***</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrior</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>X^2(1)=4.201, p&lt;0.05***</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Count 1</td>
<td>Count 2</td>
<td>Chi-square</td>
<td>Significance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 4.201, p &lt; 0.05^{***}$</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = .913, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = .324, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>14 (15.6%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 5.785, p &lt; 0.05^{***}$</td>
<td>0.548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = .000, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 2.990, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = .894, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healer</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 1.485, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbiter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 1.374, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = .682, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 1.374, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0.664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritualistic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = .682, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Identity of others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Count 1</th>
<th>Count 2</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>7 (11.5%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = 1.742, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (3.35)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = .000, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = .063, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = .603, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>0.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapist</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1) = .078, \text{N.S.}$</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Count (Percentage)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Chi-Square (df)</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritualistic</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.485$</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.485$</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.374$</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrior</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.374$</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbiter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.001, **p<0.010, ***p<0.05
5.3.1. Film narrative

5.3.1.1. Story content

Highlighted in table 5.1 are the LAAF variables with significant associations to either the offenders or non-incarcerated individuals. In most cases, the narrators stated a specific genre of film which they felt represented their lives. The comedy genre was the most common in both incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals, however the chi square analysis shows this was significantly associated with the non-incarcerated group. The items significantly associated with the offenders include: crime and tragedy genres, focal content based around crime, relationship problems and material success, negative tone, passive tone, and a happy ending. In comparison to the film descriptions of the non-incarcerated individuals which included significant association to a comedy genre and a positive tone.

Comedy based movies are a popular aspect of the film culture with a range of different styles of comedy films now available. The psychological manifestation of a comedy theme allows individuals to present themselves and their lives as carefree, ironic and happy. The comments the non-incarcerated interviewees used for representing their life as a comedy ranged in terms of the descriptions they used; not all were accompanied with positive connotations.

N7 – ‘Would probably be a dramatic comedy... strange things happening to me all the time’ pg170, 43-5

N43- ‘The film would be a comedy... many random events, usually involving the emergency services’ pg227, 38-9

Despite the comedy genre being described negatively, in the majority of cases the use of a comedy genre description was followed by positive connotations.

N9 – ‘It would be a comedy... you can’t take life too seriously really’ pg173, 29.

N25- ‘It would be a cankerous comedy with all my stupid adventures I get up to’ pg193, 39-40

The comedy description of life was also used in combination with other films genres. There were a number of combinations of comedy style films in both interviewee groups. The use of comedy combination genres was more prevalent among the incarcerated group.
In contrast to the non-incarcerated interviewee film descriptions, the incarcerated interviewees’ film descriptions were significantly associated with what can be considered, negative genres of film, such as tragedy and crime. Both tragedy and crime genres had low representation among the non-incarcerated interviewees life as film descriptions. The use of a tragedy description reflected a negative perception of life trajectories for the incarcerated groups.

However, given the association between lifestyle and depicting their life into an overarching theme (or film genre) it was expected that the frequency of the choice of crime genre, would be higher among the incarcerated group. The high frequency occurrence of relating life to a crime-film, among the incarcerated sample, showed correlations with descriptions of the crime film genre.

Life as a film of crime was represented by two subthemes. The first demonstrates the use of crime descriptions in a positive and light-hearted tone:

- **P1** ‘It would be something like Shameless [UK TV comedy-drama series] and Bread [UK TV comedy-drama series] with Scouse [person from Liverpool] and the Manc [person from Manchester]. There would be convicts and working families with the odd person doing crime on the side’ pg 7, 16-17

- **P21** ‘it would be a comedy like ‘Lock, Stock and Two Smoking Barrels’ [crime based UK film title] or ‘Snatch’ [crime based UK film title], that sort of thing, with everything going wrong, but it would just be funny with me coming to prison’ pg48, 46-8

However, the other subtheme shows crime descriptions within the film genre as negatively portrayed:
P29 ‘it would be a gangster film something like ‘Menace to Society’ [crime based US film]. There would be shootings, murders, robberies, selling drugs and loads of girls’ pg65, 44

P7 ‘it would be about drugs, guns and money. It would be a violent film’ pg20,9

In McAdams (1993) interviews the interviewees were asked to ‘entertain an overall life theme’ (pg. 263). McAdams puts forward the idea of reflecting on life in a story form, this method allows the individual to incorporate characters and episodes as a process of disclosing major life themes and messages. In most cases, for both groups, the narrator started answering this question with the overarching theme of the film genre and discussed a number of events and people that would be included. In some cases the film genre did not match the following events. Though, in the majority of cases, the genre and description of the film did provide a good introduction of the life as a film and was consistent with the psychological ideas presented.

The use of film genres that were not included in the coding-frame were described in a number of the narratives for both groups. The depiction of life as a drama and the use of real-life film projections e.g. documentaries, were found in both groups of narrators. Future versions of the LAAF should include more content categories to the genre section of the framework.

Scenes disclosed represented autobiographical or hypothetical events and were presented in past, present and future events. Descriptions of scenes of doing crimes and imprisonment, by the incarcerated group, were described both positively and negatively. Crimes were described as a part of their lifestyle, which was represented as positive perceptions of crime.

P10- ‘People on our estate could not get new cars or motorbikes without me taking them. I just used to rob them and ride them’ pg26, 21-3
P27- ‘It would be based around robbing a copper mine – it was comical, we made loads of money and it would be the main event of my life’ pg 61, 44-5
However, reflecting on the crimes was also presented in a negative tone. Although there is some debate that criminals choose to commit crimes, at times narrators did not feel like they had another option.

*P7* – ‘I have to rob to keep myself going’ pg20, 20

Hypothetical crime scenes were also included in some of the film narratives. Such events were still centred on the concept of criminal action as a central theme within their life-story. The inclusion of criminal action, as a hypothetical situation, suggests it is a large part of the offender’s self-identity and the events and behaviours that they associate with.

*P29*– ‘There would be shootings, murders, robberies, selling drugs and loads of girls’ pg65, 44-5

*P38*– ‘Doing a heist for millions and then lying on a yacht’ pg87, 28

The narrative scenes describing imprisonment had both positive and negative reflective aspects from the incarcerated group. For example, the positive aspects of imprisonment included prison being a support service that allowed the narrator to access resources necessary to make life changes. Narrator 34 demonstrates how imprisonment had provided him with an opportunity to reflect on past wrong-doings and offered different methods of support.

*P34*– ‘Since I have been in jail this time, I have been thinking that this is no kind of life to lead... I am not taking drugs anymore...I have just finished an art course in here but I plan on doing something within music when I get out pg77, 12-9

However, imprisonment did not create the same positive outlook for all of the offenders.

*P52*– ‘I’ve been in jail all my life. The film would be about coming here’ pg122, 34

*P53*– ‘I regret putting my family through me coming here but I’m not bad’ pg 123, 49-50

There is a connection with crime and imprisonment for an incarcerated offender population. A combination of crime and imprisonment within the scenes are presented as the final subtheme.
Over half of the offenders described a happy ending for their film narrative; two subthemes emerged within the happy endings. The first included a family related event, which the offenders related their happy ending to having children or being reunited with estranged family members.

A further sub-theme of a turning point was also present among the happy endings. The turning point was presented as learning from past events, which gave the offenders a chance to change their lives, as narrator 37 puts it, ‘go straight’.

Negative tone was demonstrated by the discussion of negative events, such as death, wrong done to them, betrayal, and negative emotional expressions, and was coded on the overall tone of the narrative rather than one particular item. Positive tone was also coded in terms of an overall tone. The same applies for the proactive and passive tones. The proactive tone was coded when an interviewee describes behaviours such as taking initiative, whereas the passive tone was coded when behaviours such as accepting what was happening without resistance. Like with the positive and negative, proactive and passive tone is difficult to illustrate with narrative verbatim. Nearly 60% of the incarcerated
offenders used a negative tone when describing their film narrative in contrast to over 70% of the non-incarcerated that used a positive tone.

5.3.1.2. Psychological content

Psychological content focuses on themes of agency and communion, contamination and redemption, and NAS components. Key differences between the incarcerated offenders and non-incarcerated individuals are demonstrated in the psychological content of the film narrative. The offenders’ narratives were significantly associated with agency theme of self-mastery and communion themes of love and caring. The offenders’ narratives were also significantly associated with a number of negative themed items in both the contamination themes and NAS themes. For the agency theme of self mastery, two sub-themes emerged within the offenders narratives: ‘prison’ and ‘self’. In the subtheme of prison, narrators demonstrated being in control of their own destiny. The imprisonment provided a place to reflect, take charge and become a master the environment to achieve positive outcomes.

P24-‘Instead of jail being a bad place, think of it as a college where you can use your time positively’ pg55, 13-14

The subtheme of ‘self’ represented an internalised self mastery. The offenders presented an idealised formation of the self within the environment around them.

P38- ‘Audience would like me because I wasn’t wicked, the way I portrayed myself. I wasn’t devious or sneaky I was a man of my word. Friends would say I was funny... I see myself as others see me, I am what I am’ pg87, 33-36

The non-incarcerated narrators, showed self-mastery as a ‘life turning point’ through mastering their environments which are career or education focused. For example, self-mastery would be described through occupation and desire for chosen their profession. Narrator 5 provides an example of the self-mastery theme as a hypothetical situation of future events that he wishes to occur.

N5- ‘My film would be me completing the course that am currently doing...I have a family, win the lottery, be able to travel and see the world and live in a satisfied life in peace and quiet’ pg168, 39-41
Love and friendship was expressed by both groups through the expression of love and friendship of family, friends and partners. This theme tended to be associated with accounts of how others are significant in their lives, showing a positive element to the narrative.

P2- ‘The significant people would be my family and friends; I have 1 brother, 1 sister and 1 or 2 mates that I really love’ pg9, 41-42
P19- ‘Tom, my partner, he is a brilliant chef and very happy. Without him I’m lost’ pg45, 26

The theme of caring and help was not always presented positively. For narrator 5, the expression of the caring/ helping theme stemmed from a negative event which resulted in the individual taking on the role of the carer for his siblings.

P5- ‘my dad left, I was bullied at school, I started looking after my brothers’ pg16, 28

A general contamination sequence was demonstrated in a large proportion of the offenders’ narratives. The theme of contamination is concerned with movement of positive to negative.

P4- ‘it [life as film] would see me growing up, leaving school, working. I was planning to get married but that went down the drain’ pg13, 45-47
P5- ‘I followed my girlfriend to London and then to Liverpool and got a job, a house and a baby. I ended up in prison’ pg16, 29-31

Disappointment in adulthood formulated a sub-theme within the different forms of contamination sequence. This was centralised on the aspirations of the individual’s sense of self, rather than the disappointment occurring from the actions of another person.

P28- ‘I brought a daughter into the world and I had everything going for me, but then I had a breakdown of my marriage and I ended up in here... I went off the rails and started using crack and heroin and I’m in here now doing a life sentence’ pg64, 9-13
Victimisation was demonstrated when the narrative involved episodes where narrators discussed times of being physically or verbally abused. The theme is demonstrated by childhood and adulthood sub-themes. For narrator 61, his childhood victimisation was through physical violence from outside the family unit.

_‘I had a bad childhood as I was the only black kid living in the area... but when I was at school, I was the only black kid there, there was violence all day, even off teachers sometimes’ pg139, 20-22_

Narrator 49 shows victimisation from the childhood, this is presented on a psychological level ‘everyone loves to hate me’. He also clearly presents himself as a victim.

_‘We have a big family and I am the youngest, I have been spoiled and protected a lot. I am one of those people in the family that everyone loves to hate... What I want the film to portray is me as naïve, I am a victim’ pg116, 48-pg117, 1_

Narrator 31 shows victimisation from adulthood. He describes the violent acts of others ‘3 fellas with bats’. Although not physically hurt by them, he was injured in his escape, this resulted in him not being able to do the job he had been working towards.

_The film would be about getting stitched. When I left school I wanted to be a pilot... broke both my legs and had to finish there... a brick came through the window. There were 3 fellas with bats so the three of us jumped out of the window. I ended up breaking both my legs in the fall’ pg69, 32-40_

The final section of the psychological content explores themes from Canter and Youngs (2009) Narrative Action System (NAS). The NAS represents four narrative themes that have been found in offenders accounts of their crime action. There were a number of significant associations for the NAS themes in the offenders’ narratives. The tragedy item of wrong done to them or theirs, the irony items of impotence and confusion and the adventure item of tangible rewards; were all significantly associated with the offenders’ film narratives.

Narrators 29 and 41 show examples of when wrong was done to theirs. In both cases the ‘theirs’ represented close family members. The wrong that was done related to serious crimes committed against their close family members e.g. murder (narrator 29) and rape (narrator 41).
‘My brothers, they were very scary people, when they got murdered people were happy’ pg65, 45-46

‘My eldest daughter was raped just before I came in here, he has never been caught but if he had I would be doing time for murder’ pg95, 49-50

Wrong done to them or theirs, among the non-incarcerated interviewees, was presented differently. For example, narrator 30 presents a series of situations where he had been wronged, such as teachers not believing in him, getting beat up, both of which contributed to a relationship break-down.

‘Teachers kind of said I’ll never amount to anything or go to university...I eventually did make it to uni. I met someone nice but we broke up cause I was a twat, who got beaten up!’ pg202, 41-44

The theme of Impotence/hopelessness was expressed by subthemes of internal and external. The external subtheme, feelings of hopelessness occurred due to the loss a significant other. For narrator 62, this was from the loss of his child.

‘I lost my job right after my kid died. Me and my wife never came back to the place where we lived with my son. We could not do so – too many memories’ pg141, 8-10

Narrator 60, on the other hand, provides an example of internal hopelessness. In this story, the hopelessness is represented by his incarceration and the feeling of not being in control of his destiny.

‘Being encaged... being controlled all the time. Not having the strength and knowledge of having your own destiny and wanting to escape ...Sick of having people in control of my life. Just wanting a normal life’ pg137, 19-23

5.3.1.3. Psychological complexity

In general, narratives of incarcerated offenders had a more complex structure for the film narrative. The offenders, on average, discussed 4.6 different psychological ideas, including 2.6 different events and 2.2 different people; each showed a significant difference to the non-incarcerated individuals. The non-incarcerated individuals’ film narrative was
centred on fewer psychological ideas, events and people. The offenders tended to present their films as a more structured format using beginning, middle and end sequences and were more likely to give character roles for the people they described in their films. Both the offenders and non-incarcerated individuals used coherent themes and contingent sequences. Finally, the length of the narrative given by the offenders (M=248.53, SD=18.25) was longer than the non-incarcerated individuals (M=189.44, SD=19.96); however a t-test showed no significant difference in the mean number of words. The length of the film narrative for the incarcerated offenders ranged from 29 to 1084 words and from 12 to 1432 words for the non-incarcerated individuals.

5.3.1.4. Psychological components

Chi square analysis showed a significant association to the offender’s narratives for the sensory and material gains, several justifications, hostility and aroused negative emotions, others as non significant, and the caregiver, warrior, escapist and survivor imagoes. Only the friend imago was significantly associated with the non-incarcerated individuals.

The psychological incentives presented in this section are based on Bandura’s (1986; 1999) social-cognitive theory of behaviour. The theory posits that a series of different psychological incentives motivate behaviour. Youngs (2006) demonstrates how monetary, power/status, and sensory incentives are particularly pertinent among criminals self-reports of their offending action. Sensory gain and material gain were significantly associated with the incarcerated offenders’ life stories, supporting part of Youngs (2006) earlier findings.

Sensory gain was presented within the narratives by themes of internal sensations which tended to be linked to the narrators drug use. In the theme of material/financial gain, the offenders associated their financial gains to the crimes they had committed. Narrators 42 and 58 all described material/financial gain from real life events; narrator 38 related his gains to a hypothetical situation.

*P38- ‘Doing a heist for millions and then lying on a yacht... After the heist I’d set off with a gorgeous woman and go fishing, go away with the money and lady’ pg87, 28-31*
P42- ‘I have been able to do things that I would never have been able to do if I hadn’t sold drugs’ pg99, 38-39
P58- ‘Making money and having fun.... I steal and I have a posh life’ pg132, 50 – 133, 6

The material and financial gain relates to Bandura’s monetary incentive, whereby a person is able to acquire whatever they desire. Youngs (2006) further extends this in terms of criminal action suggesting that monetary incentive may also be represented as material gain which may offer a symbolic, emotional or physical sense. Each of the quotes demonstrates both monetary and material gain which demonstrates a sense of entitlement for each of the narrators.

The results presented in table 5.1 show a number of the justification and neutralisation themes are significantly associated with the life-stories from the incarcerated offenders. The justifications section measures two key theories: Bandura’s (1999) moral disengagement and Sykes and Matza’s (1957) neutralisation theory. The variables in this section are not mutually exclusive therefore narrators may have had more than one justification.

The presentation of the self as a victim allows the individual to attribute the blame for things that have happened to influence from the environment or others. Narrator 1 discusses a number of instances of being a victim in his life-story. He attributes the blame for being ‘nicked’ to his friend and because of this he is unable to make new friends, his self-harming behaviours are as a result of his father’s mistreatment and during incarceration he places the responsibility of him controlling his drug problem on the lack of help given to him.

P1- ‘I had a good friend before 1998 but since then I’ve been by myself as our friendship got chucked back in my face. I was nicked on charges that I wouldn’t have been and since then I find it hard to trust people and now I only have acquaintances...When my family broke up when I was 3-7 years old then 7-13 my family was back together but there were lots of drinkers and it was always disrupted. My step-father would send me out to play and would sexually abuse my sisters. He was always having a crack at me too. I was always trying to get my family back together but I ended up in care... I ended up cutting my wrists and every relationship
since has been chaotic...I’ve asked for some help with drugs but I haven’t heard anything yet and I’m out in 4 weeks’ pg 7, 18-30

Narrator 35, however, is a victim of ‘the system’. He implies that he was not cared for during his incarceration because he was an offender. His story is centred on a time that he was mistreated by members of the prison system.

P35- ‘my nose started leaking in the morning time. I told the nurse and she dismissed it – that went on for 2 weeks. One night I got really bad headaches and was vomiting with it, I was nearly crying with the pain...I told him I thought I was dying and felt really bad. He said I probably just had a cold. I got worse and threw the chair at the door again – he just threw 2 paracetamol at me and said to wait until morning. I came around in hospital 4 days later... They left me unconscious in my cell for over 18 hours. I got £2000 compensation for that’ pg81, 3-14

Denial of responsibility is demonstrated by the offenders by attributing the responsibility of their action to others. For narrator 33 this attribution of blame is towards his previous partner. Narrator 33 suggests that his previous partner liked the idea of him standing up for her and would intentionally create situations to provoke him into a fight and thus he was forced into a violent situation.

P33 –‘I needed some space and would tell her to go out with her mates. But if I went out with her I’d get into fights with guys looking at her. If she was out with her mates she’d phone me and tell me some guy had pawed her and I would race over to her and fight the guys. I think she liked the idea of me fighting for her. Like in the movies...The audience would think I was lucky to get rid of her. I don’t have problems, I get on with everyone’ pg74, 35-41

Narrator 49 denies responsibility for his actions, claiming the environment he was exposed to during his up-bringing was to blame. He describes his life story as a sad tale. His story begins with the narrator setting the scene of how he didn’t know how to cope with his independence which resulted in him being misled by others.

P49- ‘Not knowing how to deal with independence. For me, the recognition from people was very important. I realise now that it was the wrong type of respect. Being misled what is right and wrong by people around me, like gang leaders’ pg116, 42-45

Diffusion responsibility is based on the principle that responsibility of the action is taken by a group or it is divided up into different components showing that the overall responsibility cannot be given to one particular person or action. This was displayed in two
ways. The first was from the influences of others (group responsibility) and the second was a division of labour (not being responsible for the whole thing). Narrator 34 demonstrates the division of labour in the sense that he was arrested for selling false goods but diffuses the responsibility by stating that it was not his stall. So, although he was responsible for selling the merchandise, he was not responsible for the place where it was sold.

_P34-_ ‘I left school at 15 and had an ok job at the market until I was arrested for selling false labels – it was false labels on clothes in 1997. It wasn’t even my stall, it was someone else’s’ pg76, 48-50

In general, the incarcerated offenders described more negative emotional content than the non-incarcerated individuals. Negative emotional content was coded for aroused and non-aroused emotions and hostility. Narrator 19 demonstrates negative aroused emotions.

_P19-_ ‘when I was hit over the head with a metal bar, I lost some of my memory. This has caused me a lot of anxiety, that’s where a lot of my problems come from’ pg45, 20-22

Hostility, in all cases, was always geared towards others or another person.

_P33-_ ‘I’ve gotta be out there. I was going around fighting and getting into trouble. This must have been fate (ending up in prison) because I was getting into trouble a lot with my mates’ pg74, 29-31

Narrator 43 likens his life to an extremely violent film. This film has similar qualities to the hostility he showed towards the person his wife had an affair with.

_P43-_ ‘It would be like ‘Kill Bill’, everyone running around with swords and stuff’ pg101, 36. P43 also states ‘I went round to where the bloke [man ex-partner had an affair with] works to try and chop his head off but he wouldn’t stay still’ p100, 19-20

For the identity components, others as non-significant were significantly associated with the incarcerated offenders. Narrator 34 shows how drinking and drugs are the significant aspect in his life and others are a by-product of this through high violent acts against those that are closest to him such as ‘domestic violence’ and fighting with his brother.
Then I got into drugs – I was using cocaine and drinking heavily. That led me to having domestics, and I got done for domestic violence and ended up going to prison because of that. I was always fighting, I have had my throat cut twice. I was getting into fights through drinking and it was my brother who cut my throat (he showed his scar – covered approximately two thirds of the width of neck). While we were fighting I cut him as well’ pg77, 6-11

For the self-imagoes, a significant association was found for the caregiver, warrior, escapist and survivor for the incarcerated group. For the non-incarcerated group, a significant association was found for the friend imago. The self-imago of a caregiver was from the birth of their children in most cases, however in some of the interviews, the role of the caregiver it was due to changes in circumstance, such as looking after younger siblings.

‘I grew up on an airbase, my dad left, I got bullied at school, I started looking after my brother’ pg16, 27-8

The warrior represents a self-imago that is dominant and in some cases intimidating over others. For the offenders, this imago materialised as a means of control and hostility towards others.

‘standing up for what I believe in. I would be dishing out my own punishment for wrongdoings’ pg10, 35-6
‘I’ve gotta be out there. I was going around fighting and getting into trouble’ pg74, 29-32

The escapist is a person that lives for a diversion. They may go out drinking, holiday, take drugs, party to escape their day-to-day lives. With the offenders’, the escapist imago was regularly presented through the use of drugs.

‘Crazy weekends, cocaine, good though. Going out and getting off your head with the lads and a few girls, good times’ pg87, 25-28
‘Family and partying on weekends’ pg132, 50

The final imago is the survivor. The survivor, contrary to the warrior imago who takes charge, is a victim of circumstance; however, they are able to survive the hardships that life throws at them. The survivor in the offender life-story is a protagonist that has overcome a particular challenge in life providing a turning point.
P25 – ‘would be me when I was focused, then me on drugs and me coming into prison... although I’d done bad things; I’ve sorted my life out’. pg56, 2-24

P34 - ‘I have been thinking that this is no kind of life to lead, I have got 3 kids to look after. I am not taking drugs anymore – I had a heart attack at 24 through taking coke and decided to stop. I didn’t get any help stopping, I just did it. Pg77, 6-17

The friend imago was significantly associated with the non-incarcerated group. The friend imago is a person who has life-long friendships. Maintaining and stabilising those friendships are particularly important to those with an idealised self as a friend.

N27 – ‘relationships and friendships are an integral part of life. That’s what I want – to have good friends and be in a good relationship’ pg196, 39-40

N85 – ‘My life was pretty much about my friends’ pg306, 24-5

5.3.2. Significant event

The SE narrative differed to the film narrative; some of the variables within the LAAF framework were not applicable to the significant event narrative and were removed during the content coding stage. The significant event is a real-life event whereas the film narrative may contain hypothetical situations and future events. Table 5.2 presents the frequency and chi square analysis of the LAAF components for the significant event. Again, narrative verbatim is used to provide examples.
Table 5.2. LAAF variables for significant event narrative interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>LAAF item</th>
<th>INCARCERATED (N=61)</th>
<th>NON-INCARCERATED (N=90)</th>
<th>Kappa Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STORY GENRE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment</td>
<td>28 (45.9%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=43.571, p&lt;0.05^*$</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing crime</td>
<td>23 (37.7%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=33.134, p&lt;0.05^*$</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship problem</td>
<td>23 (37.7%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=22.573, p&lt;0.05^*$</td>
<td>0.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>18 (29.5%)</td>
<td>8 (8.9%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=10.845, p&lt;0.05^*$</td>
<td>0.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship success</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=0.001, N.S.</td>
<td>0.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>15 (24.6%)</td>
<td>16 (17.8%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.304, N.S.</td>
<td>0.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material success</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.284, N.S.</td>
<td>0.412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of crime</td>
<td>4 (6.5%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=0.65, N.S.</td>
<td>0.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative tone</td>
<td>42 (68.9%)</td>
<td>28 (31.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=20.826, p&lt;0.05^*$</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive tone</td>
<td>26 (42.6%)</td>
<td>61 (67.8%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=9.421, p&lt;0.05^{**}$</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive tone</td>
<td>23 (37.7%)</td>
<td>46 (51.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=2.633, N.S.</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive tone</td>
<td>22 (36.1%)</td>
<td>37 (41.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=0.389, N.S.</td>
<td>0.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-mastery</td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td>8 (8.9%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.950, N.S.</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Frequency 1</td>
<td>Frequency 2</td>
<td>$X^2(1)$</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Empowerment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement/ responsibility</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>19 (21.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=0.973$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status – victory</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=0.029$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communion</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity/ togetherness</td>
<td>26 (42.6%)</td>
<td>24 (26.7%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=4.179$, p&lt;0.05***</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring/ help</td>
<td>17 (27.9%)</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=10.978$, p&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love/ friendship</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=3.642$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.461$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redemptive theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General redemption</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=2.841$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys a special advantage</td>
<td>4 (6.5%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=0.129$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets forth pro-social goals</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=2.043$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of sense of moral steadfastness</td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=0.877$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffering or injustice in lives of others during childhood</td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=0.877$, N.S.</td>
<td>0.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat negative events transformed to redemptive sequence</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=4.516$, p&lt;0.05***</td>
<td>0.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contamination theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General contamination</td>
<td>32 (52.5%)</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=37.889$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointment</td>
<td>18 (29.5%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=20.804$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of significant other</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=11.860$, p&lt;0.05*</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/ psychological illness or injury</td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=7.882$, p&lt;0.05**</td>
<td>0.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Count (%)</td>
<td>Count (%)</td>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Victimisation</strong></td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=8.454, \ p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td><strong>0.466</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Betrayal</strong></td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=14.120, \ p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td><em>0.572</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Failure</strong></td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=12.464, \ p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td><em>0.513</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disillusionment</td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=2.990, \ N.S.)</td>
<td>0.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex guilt, humiliation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tragedy theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong done to them/ theirs</td>
<td>24 (39.3%)</td>
<td>12 (13.3%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=13.548, \ p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td><em>0.551</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=4.516, \ p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>**<em>0.487</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsion</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=4.516, \ p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>**<em>0.495</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irony theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impotence/ hopelessness</td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=6.171, \ p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>**<em>0.832</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion/ misunderstanding</td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=4.773, \ p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td>**<em>0.580</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=1.485, \ N.S.)</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adventure theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilment/ satisfaction</td>
<td>17 (27.9%)</td>
<td>21 (23.3%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=0.397, \ N.S.)</td>
<td>0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness/ skills/ competencies</strong></td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>29 (32.2%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=7.175, \ p&lt;0.05)</td>
<td><strong>0.356</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible rewards/ acquisitions</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=2.043, \ N.S.)</td>
<td>0.886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quest theme</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overcoming struggles/ obstacles/ mission</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>23 (25.6%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=0.707, \ N.S.)</td>
<td>0.402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory/ proving self/ success</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>14 (15.6%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=1.035, \ N.S.)</td>
<td>0.397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity/ bravery</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>(X^2(1)=0.499, \ N.S.)</td>
<td>0.413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSYCHOLOGICAL COMPLEXITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Substantive complexity</th>
<th>Formal complexity</th>
<th>Psychological Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinct psychological ideas</td>
<td>4.15 (SD 2.0) 3.18 (SD 1.56)</td>
<td>t(149)=3.3332, p&lt;0.05* 0.514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distinct events cited</td>
<td>2.13 (SD 1.28) 1.42 (SD .56)</td>
<td>t(149)=4.058, p&lt;0.05* 0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people</td>
<td>1.61 (SD1.14) .64 (SD .95)</td>
<td>t(149)=5.613, p&lt;0.05* -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presence of contingent sequences</td>
<td>42 (68.9%) 26 (28.9%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=23.485, p&lt;0.05* 0.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presences of coherent themes</td>
<td>41 (67.2%) 63 (70%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.132, N.S. 0.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roles for characters</td>
<td>4 (6.6%) 4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.324, N.S. 0.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sensory gain</td>
<td>16 (26.2%) 22 (24.4%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.062, N.S. 0.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material/ financial gain</td>
<td>10 (16.4%) 5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=4.773, p&lt;0.05*** 0.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social gain</td>
<td>10 (16.4%) 5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=4.773, p&lt;0.05*** 0.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Power/ status gain</td>
<td>6 (9.8%) -</td>
<td>X²(1)=9.129, p&lt;0.05** 0.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confronting of others</td>
<td>11 (18%) 3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=9.339, p&lt;0.05** 0.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Avoidant of others</td>
<td>9 (14.8%) 7 (7.8%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.868, N.S. 0.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reactive</td>
<td>24 (39.3%) 23 (25.6%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=3.225, N.S. 0.517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>21 (34.4%) 49 (54.4%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=5.859, p&lt;0.05*** 0.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assume the role of victim</td>
<td>16 (26.2%) 1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=22.960, p&lt;0.05* 0.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denial of responsibility</td>
<td>14 (23%) 2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=16.491, p&lt;0.05* 0.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distorting the consequence</td>
<td>12 (19.7%) 1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=19.233, p&lt;0.05* 0.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reported (N%)</td>
<td>Expected (N%)</td>
<td>Chi-Square (df=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Displacement of responsibility</strong></td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=17.505, p&lt;0.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diffusion of responsibility</strong></td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=9.346, p&lt;0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appeal to higher loyalties</strong></td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=6.062, p&lt;0.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denial of injury</strong></td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=6.062, p&lt;0.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condemnation of condemners</strong></td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=6.062, p&lt;0.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Denial of the victim</strong></td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=4.516, p&lt;0.05***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dehumanising the victim</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aroused negative</td>
<td>17 (27.9%)</td>
<td>18 (20%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.264, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility towards others</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=16.491, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroused positive</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>22 (24.4%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.200, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroused negative</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>12 (13.3%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.622, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aroused positive</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>17 (18.9%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.877, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy for others</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.001, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self ID stronger than others</td>
<td>43 (73.8%)</td>
<td>73 (81.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.147, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others as significant</td>
<td>43 (70.5%)</td>
<td>51 (56.7%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=2.957, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self ID weaker than others</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>10 (11.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=2.930, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others as non-significant</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=9.346, p&lt;0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity - protagonist</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=7.252, p&lt;0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Number (%)</td>
<td>Expected Number (%)</td>
<td>X² (df)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapist</td>
<td>9 (14.9%)</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.868, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warrior</strong></td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=6.062, p&lt;0.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>7 (11.5%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.742, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=2.043, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.029, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.000, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=2.079, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=2.785, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=2.075, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healer</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.078, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbiter</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.078, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.374, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.682, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ritualistic</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiver</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.126, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.682, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=1.461, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapist</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>X²(1)=0.078, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Count 1 (%)</td>
<td>Count 2 (%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)$ N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=1.485$, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>$X^2(1)=0.063$, N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritualistic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrior</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbiter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.001, **p<0.10, ***p<0.05
5.3.2.1. Story genre

The story content was presented differently in the SE to the film narrative. Details of film content and resolution were not discussed in this narrative interview. However, a number of similar scenes of focal content were described in the SE as the film. Those scenes included imprisonment, doing crime and relationship problems; each was significantly associated with the offenders narrative. An additional scene of birth was also significantly associated with the offenders’ narratives.

Imprisonment was the most commonly discussed scene from the SE of the offenders. Often the discussion of the imprisonment was of the sentence they were currently serving. The narrators regularly portrayed the imprisonment as a negative event and talked about how it had a negative impact on their lives.

P8- ‘Being sent here, it is totally devastating and has really devastated me by taking me away from my family and taking away my freedom’ pg21, 17-18

However, like with the film narrative imprisonment was also discussed in a positive light. For example, narrator 3 discussed positive elements of his imprisonment – being able to get off drugs and finding a hobby.

P3- ‘Well it was when I was in jail. I had a bad drugs problem when I came into jail but I got into the gym and became a bodybuilder’ pg11, 18-19

Doing crime was regularly discussed in conjunction with imprisonment. In most cases doing crime represented a negative turning point in the life of the offenders which usually stemmed from the breakdown of stability factors. For narrator 18, his family broke up, he went through the care system and when he was old enough to look after himself, he started committing crimes. Narrator 25, on the other hand, turned to crime as a way of supporting his family.

P18- ‘At 16 I was put in my own flat, and then I got into crime and drugs’ pg42, 19-20

P25- ‘I was on top of the world but I couldn’t support him financially because I’d lost my job so I turned to crime’ pg56, 18-19
Relationship problems tended to be presented in the form of a relationship break-up from a partner. There were a number of reasons in which the break-ups occurred. Generally the offenders discussed their ex-partners in a negative manner.

P38- ‘After having two kids with my ex, she changed. It was like she had bad PMT all the time. We broke up – she went a bit strange and the relationship ended. She started picking at things and arguing and drinking wine’ pg84, 24-26

P43- ‘It’s my ex’s fault why I’m in here now, she had an affair’ pg99, 18-19

The inclusion of a more positive aspect to the life-narratives resided around scenes describing the birth of their children. The offenders generally saw this as both a positive experience and significant life event.

P22- ‘the birth of my kids. I have 3 kids all boys’ pg50, 17

P34- ‘The most significant event was the birth of my first born’ pg76, 16

The prevalence of this communion based theme – the birth of their children demonstrates a level of intimacy and belongingness (McAdams, 1993) within the offender group. Due the circumstance of being incarcerated at time of interview, it is likely that the offenders’ themselves miss their family and children; which explains why the birth of their children may be a significant life event. Baumeister and Wilson (1996) state an aspect of persons’ basic needs is to add value and justification to their life. Through descriptions of good parenting the offenders are able to achieve a sense of value, satisfying this basic need.

Differences in the tone of the SE were present between the two narrator groups. The incarcerated offenders showed a significant association with a negative tone with over 60% of the offenders using a negative tone to describe their SE compared to only 30% of the non-incarcerated individuals. The non-incarcerated individuals SE narratives were significantly associated with a positive tone with nearly 70% of the non-incarcerated showing a positive tone for their narratives compared to on 36% of the offenders.
5.3.2.2. Psychological content

Key differences can be seen between the narratives of the offenders and non-incarcerated individuals. Similar to the film narrative, the communion theme of caring, a range of contamination sequences, and the tragedy theme - wrong done to theirs, irony theme - impotence and confusion were significantly associated with the offenders’ SE narrative. Additional themes of unity, tragedy theme - revenge and compulsion were also significantly associated with the offenders’ narrative. The agency theme of achievement and the adventure theme of effectiveness were both significantly associated with the non-incarcerated individuals.

The agency theme of achievement/responsibility was significantly associated with the narratives from the non-incarcerated interviewees. However, for both the interviewee groups, achievement was demonstrated by two separate subthemes: ‘physical’ and ‘educational’. For the physical subtheme, the achievement was demonstrated by the successes of physical elements. For narrator 11, achievement was demonstrated through learning to play a musical instrument. For narrator 3, this was demonstrated by climbing a mountain.

P11- ‘My guitar teacher had ‘Wonderwall’ playing on CD one day and I just learned how to play it. When I got out I started a band up again with me playing guitar this time’ pg27, 19-21
N3- ‘While I was on holiday there I climbed a mountain which was pretty significant to me’ pg166, 20-21

For narrator 1, the educational achievements came in the form of overcoming a difficult point in the educational course.

N1- ‘When I first started part of my role was to give presentations. I remember having to do my first presentation without any preparation. I was really anxious about it, it all went ok though’ pg164, 23-26

The unity and togetherness theme had both positive and negative subthemes. For the offenders, this theme was centred on the breakdown of the family unit demonstrating a negative turning point in their life-story. For narrator 18, a number of negative connotations
are associated with the concept of unity, for example ‘put in to care’, ‘confused’, ‘sad’, and ‘death’.

*P18- ‘I was put into care at 4 years old because my mum and dad split up... I remember my mum and dad splitting up though, I felt confused and sad’ pg42, 17-21*

The expression of the caring/helping theme tended to stem from a negative event such as the loss of a parent which resulted in the narrator taking on the role of the lost parent.

*P27- ‘After he [father] died I was the head of the family, I was the one out working and that. I had to bring my brothers up, my mother took it badly so I looked after her as well’ pg61, 21-23*

The caring role was also expressed from positive events in which narrators experienced a positive turning point through the care and nurturing of another.

*N26- ‘I’m already a God father. The birth changed my life- looking after her and having a young person around was the most life changing experience I’ve gone through’ pg195, 17-19*

General contamination was demonstrated by the movement of positive to negative within the narrative. Like with the film narrative this was significantly associated with the offenders. Contamination sequences were concerned with changes in the narrators’ lives.

*P2- ‘I have always been taught right from wrong and had never been in trouble before I moved there, the people around me there influenced me towards violence’ pg8, 21-23*

The theme of disappointment was presented by childhood scenes. Childhood disappointment tended to stem from a parental aspect. For example narrator 15 demonstrates parental disappointment from not being encouraged to achieve his childhood aspirations. However, narrator 65 demonstrates his parental disappointment by his parent’s separation and the inability of his mother to provide substantial care for him.
P15- ‘Well I was fostered at 6 and I got trials for Everton school boys but my foster parents wouldn’t let me go and I think that’s affected me. Sport was my life and who knows what could’ve happened. Instead of encouraging me they didn’t let me go’ pg36, 17-19

P65- ‘My mum and dad got divorced and my two brothers and my two sisters went with my dad and I went with my mom. I was four years old and I was left by myself – my mother could not be bothered with me. Sometimes she forgot to pick me up’ pg148, 17-22

The contamination theme of victimisation was also described using scenes from childhood. For narrator 1, his childhood victimisation was through physical violence from those within the family unit.

P1- ‘My step-father was very abusive. There was sexual abuse to my two sisters and he was violent towards me’ pg6, 22-25

The loss of a significant other, again, included scenes from adult and childhood episodes. For the childhood scenes (narrator 5 and 18) the significant other was represented by a parental figure. However, in the adult scenes (narrator 23) the significant other was represented by a companion – best friend. In each case the narrator highlighted how the loss of the ‘significant-other’ resulted in a negative turn of events.

P5- ‘My father leaving us at 7 years old. I remember dad went away working for 6 weeks and came back 6 months later. There were a lot of arguments but I didn’t understand what was happening. Then he left for the second time. I remember mum put us in a room and told us that dad was leaving, I remember I was sitting on a stool and I felt broken. Dad kept in touch with us for a few weeks then broke contact and moved in with another woman’ pg15, 17-22

P18- ‘I was put into care at 4 years old because my mum and dad split up. I went to about 60 different homes and they were all pretty horrendous; you had to sleep with one eye open’ pg42, 17—19

P23- ‘When my best mate died in my arms, since then it’s just been downhill’ pg17
The contamination theme of betrayal was also described from childhood scenes, regularly concerned with a parental figure. The narrators discussed scenes of abandonment drawing a picture of a broken family unit. The betrayal, in some cases, was described as the onset of negative events that followed in the narrator’s life-story, such as, ‘I went off the rails’ and ‘state of mind’.

P14- ‘my dad got posted back to England but he ended up having an affair and it all went Pete Tong [Cockney rhyming slang for wrong] after that. Me mum was gutted, it nearly killed her like. I just know that’s sort of the time I went off the rails’ pg34, 17-20

P33- ‘When I was three years old my mother left me in the park. I have trust issues and hatred towards my mum. She left my dad for another man. She phoned her brother and said she didn’t want me. I blame her for my being in here and the way that I am. I am educated but my state of mind, I blame her’ Pg73, 21-24

The final contamination theme relates to physical or psychological illness or injury. Although scenes of childhood and adulthood are present in this part of the narrative, the most suitable sub-themes, in this case, are personal injury and illness of other. The sub-theme of personal injury residing in the discussion of physical injuries that occurred during childhood episodes is dominant in this theme.

P6- ‘I got run over by a car at the age of 2. I have a lot of scars on my head. I don’t know if it changed me at all because I don’t know what I was like before the accident. People are always stopping me and asking me about the scars and stare at me because of them’ pg17, 17-20

Narrator 38 demonstrates the theme of illness of another. In his narrative, the individual presents his contamination script in terms of the mental illness incurred by his ex-partner. The result of which ended with him being incarcerated.

P38- ‘After having two kids with my ex, she changed. It was like she had bad PMT all the time. We broke up – she went a bit strange and the relationship ended. She started picking at things and arguing and drinking wine. I was stupid though as I would buy her the wine. She stabbed me, all over my arms. I hit her once too in defence, and got 2 years in prison for that even though I had a witness that saw what really happened’ pg86, 24-28
Finally, NAS themes showed differences in the psychological content expressed by the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. For the incarcerated offenders negative NAS content was significantly associated with their narratives. For example, wrong done to them or theirs was expressed by wrong being done to people close to them. Narrator 1 describes a childhood memory, whereas narrator 7 describes a memory from adulthood.

P1- ‘My step-father was very abusive’ pg6, 22

P7- ‘I got conspiracy to rob and murder so I’m in for 25 years. I’m pissed off because the paper said a kid only got 21 years for killing his wife and cutting her up. They just slammed me for 25 years. There is no justice; it’s all nonsense out there’ pg19, 25-28

The theme of revenge was discussed by a small number of the offenders. This was expressed as a violent act. For narrator 43, his revenge attack was directed at a person who had wronged him; whereas for narrator 44 his revenge attack was directed at the person who had wronged his sister.

P43- ‘It’s my ex’s fault why I’m in here now, she had an affair and I went round to where the bloke works to try and chop his head off but he wouldn’t stay still and they both decided to press charges and that’s why I’m here’ pg100, 18-21

P44- ‘I killed me sister’s boyfriend because he was beating her up’ pg102, 18-19

Confusion tended to be centred on childhood scenes in most cases this was disruption of stability factors. For narrator 5 the separation of his parents led to a number of negative emotions stemming around feelings of confusion and impotence.

P5- ‘I remember dad went away working for 6 weeks and came back 6 months later. There were a lot of arguments but I didn’t understand what was happening’ pg15, 17-19

P18- ‘I remember my mum and dad splitting up though, I felt confused and sad’ pg42, 20-21

The feeling of impotence or hopelessness occurred as a result of the loss a person close to the narrators. For narrator 5, this was losing his father to a marital break-up.

P5- ‘I remember mum put us in a room and told us that dad was leaving, I remember I was sitting on a stool and I felt broken’ pg15, 19-21
Effectiveness was significantly associated with the non-incarcerated individuals; this was mainly displayed through discussion of work or educational events when the narrator had demonstrated effectiveness in achieving goals. However, a few occasions were presented when effectiveness was displayed in terms of sporting achievements through the skill of the narrator.

*N15*  ‘I won the national rowing event in Liverpool. I had only started rowing a year before and I was surprised at how quickly I had got the hang of it and reached where I was’ *pg*181, 17-18

*N23*  ‘I suppose getting my Law Degree. It was the first time I actually put any effort into something- I’d wasted four years of university previously. First time I actually took my adulthood seriously- and proved I’m a clever bastard!’ *pg*190, 17-19

5.3.2.3. Psychological complexity

Like the film narrative, the incarcerated offenders’ SE narrative was also more complex than the narratives from the non-incarcerated individuals. The SE narrative from the incarcerated offenders, on average, included the discussion of 4.1 different psychological ideas, including 2.1 different events and 1.6 different people; each showed a significant difference to the non-incarcerated individuals. In general, the non-incarcerated individuals’ SE narrative tended to be centred on fewer psychological ideas, events and people. The offenders were more likely to use contingent sequences when discussing their SE. The length of the SE narrative for the incarcerated offenders ranged from 59 to 687 words and from 21 to 868 words for the non-incarcerated individuals.

5.3.2.4. Psychological components

Chi square analysis showed a number of significant associations to the offenders for material, confronting behaviours, power and social gains, several justifications, others as non-significant and warrior and caregiver imagos. Proactive behaviours were significantly associated with the non-incarcerated group. Comparing the SE with the film narrative a number of similarities have emerged. For example, material gains, a range of justifications, others as non-significant, and warrior and caregiver imagos were also significantly associated with the offenders film narrative.
The material and financial gains discussed by the narrators tended to be linked with the criminal action they had been involved in. Both narrators express ‘making a lot of money’ in each case the money came from crimes they had committed, although narrator 42 makes attempts to justify his criminal action by likening it to a job.

**P33**- ‘I went to jail when she was born as well. I was making lots of money then got caught. I gave the money to their mother’ pg73, 30-31.

**P42**- ‘I’m in here for drugs. I basically used ‘cos it was free. People in here commit crimes to get drugs but I didn’t – I didn’t go robbing houses or mugging people. Whatever I wanted I could get myself. My crime was conspiracy to supply. I was dealing in kilos not bags in pubs – big amounts. Only cocaine as well... She knew that I had loads of money but as long she got what she wanted she was happy. The other girl I was seeing just thought I had my own business. Well, I did have my own business as well but... I think there are two types of criminal. I wouldn’t rob houses... I know what I did was illegal but... I’ve never committed any other crimes’ pg97, 41-98,5.

Power gains were also expressed by criminal action; in this case it was violent action against another person. In both cases the power gain is in the form of overpowering another gang. Narrator 2 explains how he was looking after the ‘older people’, whereas narrator 29 talks about how his brothers overpowered another gang.

**P2**- ‘One night I went around there and threw all these kids out, battered them all. Before I moved there I would probably have just asked them to stop. I hung around with these older people and they had had a lot of trouble with these gangs. I just wasn’t having it’ pg8, 31-34.

**P29**- ‘They were selling drugs and another gang wanted their turf so my brother shot one of them’ pg65, 17-18

Social gain was also displayed in terms of power over others. This represents the gang sub-theme. This occurred when wrong was done to the narrator or others that were significant to them. This was strongly influenced in dealing with opposing gangs. Again, narrator 2 talks about social gain in the form of the people who he was hanging around with and that he had to take care of them.

**P2**- ‘I hung around with these older people and they had had a lot of trouble with these gangs. I just wasn’t having it’ pg8, 33-4
However, social gain was not always expressed as violent. Narrator 11 discusses how he learned to play guitar which resulted in him improving his social life and helping him gain confidence.

P11- ‘It had an impact on me because I went from being quite a shy person to quite confident. I went around with them a lot to open mic nights and stuff – it led me to be playing in front of large groups of people’ pg27, 24-26.

Due to the discussion of more power gain behaviours in the SE than in the film, relates to the inclusion of more confronting behaviours in the SE than in the film. The confrontational behaviours occurred as a result of an emotionally charged event which usually included a third party person, such as standing up for another person; this person was usually a significant other to the offenders.

P2- ‘I went around there and threw all these kids out, battered them all...I just wasn’t having it’ pg8, 31-4

Confrontational behaviours also occurred at times when the offenders felt their honour had been attacked. Such scenes also included highly emotionally events involving a significant other.

P43-[response to ex-wife having an affair] ‘I went round to where the bloke works to try and chop his head off but he wouldn’t stay still’ pg100, 19-20

For the non-incarcerated individuals over 50% described proactive behaviours within their SE narrative. The behaviours tended to be focused around making positive changes in their life through work or study. The proactive behaviours were mainly centred on the narrators as agents of their actions rather than discussing influences from others.

P75- ‘I suppose the decision to switch careers – from leisure to public health. It was a significant change. When? In my late thirties. There was no way forward in the leisure industry. It doesn’t impact on others’ lives and I wanted to make a difference. My part-time study is to improve my knowledge of the field’ pg288, 18-21

P80- ‘Leaving home, leaving my country and coming to a country where I do not know anyone. Getting used to a different country...Well I have got to know myself better, now I can plan what I want to do, make plans, I wasn’t a planner before, now I understand myself better’ pg296, 17-21
Like the film narrative, the offenders used a number of justifications when describing their SE. The justifications they used were the same as in the film narrative and occurred very little within the SE of the non-incarcerated individuals. Like with the film narrative, more than one justification may have been used by the offenders during the SE narrative. In the SE the justifications were regularly used when discussing their criminal actions.

Denial of responsibility was used when the narrators attributed the blame for their actions to another source. Narrator 38 for example, denies his responsibility of going to jail by claiming he pleaded guilty because of his love for his ex-partner. In doing so, he is morally relieving of his violent actions against her which preceded his arrest.

P38- ‘I pleaded guilty thought because I still loved her and did not want to drag it out. After doing 2 years, we ended up getting together when we had to decide on custody of the kids. But then I ended up back in jail for driving without a licence’ pg86, 29-31

For narrator 60, he denies responsibility for his actions, claiming the environment he was in, as a child, was to blame.

P60- ‘Got into committing crimes and street life. Social exclusion. Fell into it. Did what peers did to be accepted. Just to feel wanted and be part of it’ pg136, 26-27

Distorting the consequences of their actions allows the individuals to feel more detached and further removed from the end result (Bandura, 1999). This form of justification is demonstrated by narrator 42, the seemingly ‘victimless’ element to selling drugs allowed the narrator to be further removed from the consequence of his actions and was able to compare his crime to other crimes he considered as more serious. Narrator 42 compares drug dealing to robbing houses. He also presents his own interpretation of criminal action suggesting there are ‘two types of criminals’ and that he is not the same as other criminals.

P42- ‘I think there are two types of criminal. I wouldn’t rob houses... I wouldn’t dream of doing that. I know what I did was illegal but... I’ve never committed any other crimes...I’ve only snorted not taken heroin or anything... I know it’s illegal what I’ve done but I don’t see myself as the same as most people in here [prison] – I wouldn’t dream of robbing a house’ pg98, 2-11
Displacement of responsibility allows the individual to make someone else accountable for their actions. Narrator 4 displaces responsibility for his crimes to others. He denies involvement with the drugs crimes that he was convicted for, claiming he was ‘only hanging around’ with the people who committed the offence.

_P4-_ ‘I was not even involved in the offence, but I was hanging around with them – I didn’t do anything.’ pg13, 18-20_

Narrator 25 demonstrates displacement by the lack of employment opportunities resulting in him having to commits crimes to get by.

_P25-_ ‘It would be the birth of my son. I’d just lost my job so I felt a lot of pressure...I was on top of the world but I couldn’t support him financially because I’d lost my job so I turned to crime. So it went from the best day of my life to the worst. I went bankrupt and found it hard to find another job so I turned to crime’ pg56, 17-21

The original idea for the denial of injury is that ‘offenders can excuse their behaviour if no one is really harmed’ (Maruna & Corpes, 2005, pg. 12). Narrator 7 describes the injury he caused as a result of defending himself. He does not talk about why he was holding the knife just that he was holding one; this also strengthens the denial of the injury element as he is distancing himself away from the knife. This form of cognitive dissonance is also presented by the narrator by explaining that he handed himself in. The options of doing the right thing ‘handing self in’ was based on the assault rather than the murder – again denying the injury.

_P7-_ ‘I was holding a knife and stabbed him as he turned around and tried to hit me... I thought I’d stabbed him in the shoulder but I’d killed him... I handed myself in and there were loads of statements, I was released on remand but handed myself back in but I got conspiracy to rob and murder so I’m in for 25 years’ pg19, 26-26

Appeal to higher loyalties is presented by narrator 49 who uses his gang to neutralise his behaviours. The motivation for the murder is justified by it being an action of his gang which was a response to a wrong that was done to him.

_P49-_ ‘I got involved with someone else, there was an alleged blackmail and some conflict with me being assaulted. My gang decided to kill this other group who were linked to another group of triad. I was assaulted and as a result, my gang decided to kill a member of the other gang. We did and I was convicted of murder and sentenced to life’ pg115, 30-34
Narrator 60 uses the influence of another person as a method of minimising his cognitive dissonance about the criminal behaviour he was part of. He suggests it was a method of acceptance into peer groups.

\[ P60 \] ‘Did what peers did to be accepted. Just to feel wanted and be part of it. Stealing cars and doing ram raids’ pg136, 26-28

Condemnation of condemners was significantly associated with the incarcerated sample. For narrator 7, this form of justification comes in the form of condemning the justice system. He compares the sentence he was given to a sentence received by another person who had committed, in his eyes, a much worse crime. The narrator demonstrates how he was wronged and as a result shifts the attention from his crime to the crime committed against him.

\[ P7 \] ‘I’m pissed off because the paper said a kid only got 21 years for killing his wife and cutting her up. They just slammed me for 25 years. There is no justice; it’s all nonsense out there. The law’s a load of bullshit, I feel nothing for justice now’ pg19, 26-28

A similar story is presented by narrator 59 who blames the social system for failing him as a child. Narrator 59 draws attention away from the acts that he committed and claims he could have been saved by the social system.

\[ P59 \] ‘I was always getting into fights older and bigger boys. I could have been helped though. It’s sad. It could have been avoided. I made some bad choices and so did they – the social system. I could have sued them. Mum was abusing me. I was put in an assessment centre and then I was abused by the staff. I just ran away when I was 9 or 10 years old. I slept out on my own’ pg134, 26-30

The self-imago of a caregiver was regularly projected by the offenders from the discussion of the birth of their children. In some of the interviews, the role of the caregiver was due to changes in circumstance, such as looking after younger siblings.

\[ P27 \] ‘After he [father] died I was the head of the family, I was the one out working and that. I had to bring my brothers up, my mother took it badly so I looked after her as well as my brothers were quite young’ pg61, 21-3

For those whose caregiver-imago stems from the birth of their own children, it created a clear turning point within their life-story narratives.
Like with the film narrative, the warrior imago was represented by a dominant self-image that was intimidating over others. The imago was projected through self-focus and from violent action.

5.4. Chapter Summary and Conclusion: Uncovering the criminal narrative

The aim was to explore the differences in life-stories of incarcerated offenders and non-incarcerated members of the general public. The results of the content analysis demonstrated that life-stories of incarcerated offenders differ in terms of the three areas of narrative that were explored: the story content, the narrative complexity, and the psychological content. For each area, the offenders discussed more negatively related items than their non-incarcerated peers, thus supporting the hypothesis that criminals’ narratives would include a more negative expression of the episodes they describe. This finding of a negative overview of the criminals’ life-stories can be related to Maruna’s (2001) research where he found similar negative connotations for the narratives of persistent offenders. The variability and thematic structure of the negative aspects among criminals’ life-stories needs to be further explored.

The story content of the offenders’ life-narratives demonstrates that criminal activity plays an important role in how the offenders describe their life. The offenders’ narratives included a higher number of criminal related story-plots and scenes. The idea of a person carrying out a dominant narrative role has been widely cited e.g. Canter (1994) and Bamberg (2009). In particular, White and Epston (1990) discuss this concept in a therapeutic sense. Establishing the level of criminality that is related to the dominant narrative role is
particularly important for treatment practices, especially when the aim is to help the offenders formulate new identities as reformed characters.

A further interesting point to note is the inclusion of ‘gain’ behaviours such as the material / financial, sensory, and social gains described in the scenes discussed by the offenders. The gains stem from Bandura’s (1986) socio-cognitive theory where he describes the gains as incentives. The significant association of the three gains to the offenders’ narratives adds support to Youngs (2006) previous work, which suggested that such gains have particular relevance to criminal action.

The complexity of the narratives also demonstrated differences between the incarcerated offenders and the non-incarcerated members of the general public. Overall the offenders’ narratives are more complex in terms of number of people, events and ideas they described within their life episodes. Presser (2010) suggests incarcerated offenders are in an environment where they regularly reflect and talk about their life events; suggesting why the offenders had more complex narrative structure. However, McAdams (2005) argues that the point of the narrative is to make sense and provide meaning. Therefore, the complex nature of the offenders’ narratives may be due to a disorganised sense of self and meaning.

A further interesting finding resided in the overall tone used by the offenders in their narrative expression. A negative tone of expression was used in the offenders’ life-stories in contrast to a positive expression that was used in the life-stories from the non-incarcerated group. This suggests that the offenders are more likely to express their life stories through negative language to describe the events. A cautionary point to note is that some offenders displayed both positive and negative tone of expression depending on the event they were discussing. For example, the life story narratives consisted of a SE and describing their life as a film. Therefore, the SE may have been positive and the film negative or vice versa. However, it does not detract from the offenders, overall, using a larger number of negative descriptions than the non-incarcerated within their narrative accounts.

The final theme within the LAAF framework is the psychological content within the life-stories. The offenders discussed more communion based themes. The most significant finding in relation to the psychological content was the use of a contaminated script within
the offenders’ narratives and the number of justifications they incorporated which had little availability in the narratives from the non-incarcerated group. The use of contaminated themes within the offenders’ narrative supports Maruna’s (1999, 2001) earlier work which demonstrates a similar contaminated script to that found among persistent offenders and Farmer, et al. (2012) who found similar findings among persisting sex offenders. Also, the use of justifications within the offenders’ narratives supports Linde (1993) and Bandura’s (1999) notion of those who engage in immoral acts provide excuses and justifications to disengage themselves from the acts. One reason for the use of justifications in the offender sample could be due to their incarceration and the need to justify their behaviours to themselves and others. Nonetheless, the contamination scripts and justifications offenders incorporate into their life-stories demonstrate key areas of psychological differentiation to the life-stories of those of the general public, confirming the usefulness of a narrative approach to exploring crime and criminals. However, the extent of how the contamination and justifications are used from one offender to the next needs to be further explored.

As argued in the introductory sections of this thesis, narrative psychology provides a tool for understanding a number of psychological components as they make sense to the individuals. The LAAF content framework has been developed from a detailed analysis of the research pertaining to the narrative perspective and encompasses items that are relevant to the narratives of offenders. The present chapter has demonstrated that this method is an appropriate tool for exploring the life-stories of those who are classed as criminal. It has also been successful in demonstrating aspects of narrative identity that are considered to formulate ‘the criminal narrative’. The LAAF was implemented to two different life-episodes, each demonstrated clear findings in relation to the research aims; adding to the validity of the LAAF as a research tool.

In summation, the study was successful in demonstrating how the life stories of incarcerated criminals differ to those who are considered as non-incarcerated and non-criminal. This primary study has shown that the stories criminals tell are tainted by the crimes they have committed. Furthermore, the life-stories told by the criminals are plagued with contamination scenes, the need to morally assert ones action through the use of justifications and neutralisations, and negative associations to the scenes, behaviours and
emotions. The life stories of criminals demonstrate the level of overlap their criminal action has on their life stories. This overlap suggests that part of the dominant narrative role criminals assign to their identity is that of a criminal. Uncovering these important psychological components in the life-stories of male criminals highlights a number of issues for treatment where the focus is on adjusting the cognitive processors that formulate the dominant narrative such as CBT, emotive therapy, and schema therapy which are widely used in prisons. In addition to recidivism once released, for instance if a person perceives himself as a criminal it may impact how chances of finding stability and reducing his own opportunities for crime. It is important to explore the structure of the narratives to further assess differences in the life-stories within criminal samples and between the criminal and general public samples; this is examined in the following chapters.
Chapter 6

Offenders’ Contaminated Script

6.1. Introduction

The aim is to uncover the thematic structure of the narrative differences in LAAF variables of the incarcerated and non-incarcerated narratives for film and Significant Event (SE) narratives. It is hypothesised that the LAAF variables will present a themed structure from the co-occurrence of the items and structural differences will be found between the incarcerated and non-incarcerated LAAF variables. From the narrative differences found in the previous chapter, it is expected that a theme within the incarcerated LAAF variables will depict a contaminated script; this script will not be as readily associated with the non-incarcerated group. Smallest Space Analysis (SSA-I) is used to explore the thematic structure.

The contaminated narrative extends from the work of McAdams et al. (1997) and Maruna (2001). Maruna presented the idea of a contamination script among the life-narratives of persistent offenders; whereas McAdams, et al. (1997) found contaminated sequences to be used more often among less generative individuals. A contamination script includes the influence of negative turning points and ideals which the narrator may centre on themes of no hope of change within their lives. Negative turning points have been identified as indicators of the onset of criminal action (Sampson & Laub, 1995; Harris, 2011). Therefore, when comparing the life-scripts of those who are incarcerated for crimes and those who are not, it is likely that this idea of a contamination script will be represented in the life-stories told by the incarcerated group. However, variances in the level of contamination within the life-stories are expected.

Baumeister (1991) describes self-contamination as a method of self-protection for those who are open to a vulnerable sense of self. For example, through self sabotage a person can avoid disappointment when their expectations are not met. Fluctuations in the proposed contaminated script, within the offender sample, may be due to the personal attributes of those offenders. Those who are one-time only offenders would be expected to have less of a contaminated script as their offence is likely to be a crime of circumstance.
rather than a lifestyle choice. In addition, those who are likely to desist from crime, once their incarceration period has ended, would also show less of a contaminated script based on the ideas presented by Maruna (2001). Those who are persistent offenders may show a greater level of contamination within their life-stories based on the previous hypothesis.

It is widely cited that offending starts at a young age and decreases with age (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1983; Farrington, 1986; Lauritsen, 1998). Farrington (1995) further claims that the majority of young offenders will grow out of crime by the time they reach 32 years of age. This idea is echoed by Maruna (1999) stating that ‘street crimes’ usually end at the age of 30 or 40 years old. Therefore, the idea that the contamination script may be related to age is explored. Research suggested that older offenders grow out of crime, it is expected that if the contamination script is related to age it would be more prevalent among younger offenders.

Finally, two different life-story sequences are explored. From the frequency occurrence of LAAF variables in the previous chapter it is expected that the offenders would contain themed regions of the contaminated script for the film and SE narratives. A number of differences when describing one’s life as a film and describing a SE are present. The differences in the narrative topics explored would present natural differences in the co-occurrence of the items between the film and SE SSA structures.

The LAAF framework is a novel method and how the items co-occur with each other is yet to be explored. Further examination of the LAAF items would assess the usefulness of this content framework for use in deconstructing narratives. The following research questions are explored. Will the LAAF items show a thematic structure? Will there be differences in the thematic structure of the LAAF items for the incarcerated and non-incarcerated groups? It is predicted that differences will be found and that the thematic structure for the incarcerated group will be consistent with a contaminated theme.

6.2. Method

Life-story narratives from 61 incarcerated offenders and 90 non-incarcerated males were content analysed using the LAAF framework. The items with frequency less than 3
were excluded from the Smallest Space Analysis (SSA-I). SSA-I was applied, separately, to both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated LAAF items for SE and film narratives.

SSA-I is a Multi-Dimensional Scaling (MDS) method of analysis. This method allows for the co-occurrence of each of the LAAF items to be measured against each of the other items which are presented by a graphical representation of the variables. The distance between each of the variables represents the relationship of every variable with each of the other variables. For example, a smaller distance between the spacing of the variables in the graph shows a greater relationship and a larger distance shows a weak relationship. The SSA-I analysis works on similar principles to factor analysis; it is a data reduction method. However with SSA-I, items are not confined to a linear space and fewer assumptions are made about the underlying structure of the variables. Instead this method allows the relationship of every variable to every other variable to be represented in a three-dimensional space. The more often each variable co-occurs across each of the cases the closer the variables will be placed in the plot. The final configuration plot will provide thematic regions in relation to the items that are placed together. Furthermore, SSA-I provides a visual representation of the co-occurrence of the variables which is displayed in a geometric space. MDS methods such as SSA-I are regularly used in research exploring criminal behaviours (for examples please see, Canter & Heritage, 1990; Alison et al., 2000; Salfati, 2003; Canter & Ioannou, 2004; Youngs, Canter & Cooper, 2004).

The level of fit for the spatial representation of the variables within the data matrix is established by the Coefficient Of Alienation (COA) (Borg & Lingoes, 1987). This measurement works on the premise that a smaller value represents a closer fit between the plot and the matrix. A COA of 0 would represent a perfect fit and a COA of 1 would represent a poor fit. The number of variables and the amount of error in the data can influence the level of fit in the data. As the LAAF framework has a large number of variables (125), it is expected that the level of fit between the plot and the matrix would be around 0.2-0.3, showing an acceptable level of fit.
6.2.1. Data analysis strategy

Following from chapter 5, LAAF items are examined for thematic structure using SSA-I analysis in the HUDAP software. This is applied separately to the film and SE LAAF items for both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals to established differences between the thematic structures of the two narrator groups; in order to answer the research questions. To tackle this, low frequencies items (<3) will be removed from the analysis, for both groups. Although it is not necessary to remove low frequency items for SSA-I, the interpretation of the differences in the thematic structure between the two narrator groups and the configuration of the co-occurrence of the variables in the plot, is made easier with fewer items. To tackle the research questions – whether LAAF variables would display thematic structure and if differences would be present between the two narrator groups - the analysis strategy is set out in different stages. Once the SSA-I structure is obtained, the first stage of the analysis is to assess the frequency distribution of the items in the four SSA-I plots. This is to determine: a) if the placement of the items within the plots is created by frequency contours, and b) predict what variables may be included in the contaminated script. Though the frequency occurrence of the items was examined in the previous chapter, the frequency analysis here is to examine the structure of the SSA-I configuration. Due to the different number of variables in the SSA-I configurations for the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals the next stage of the analysis is to demonstrate which items in the incarcerated SSA-I do not appear in the non-incarcerated SSA-I. This will further help to verify the thematic difference between the two narrator groups. It is predicted that differences in the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals will resemble a contaminated script. Variations in the contaminated script, among the offenders, will be assessed using background characteristics that previous literature has found to be associated with offenders (as discussed in the introduction section). Kruskal-Wallis tests will be used to assess such variations using SPSS software.

6.3. Results

A monotonicity co-efficient was used to establish the SSA-I structure for the film and SE LAAF variables. Figure 6.1 represents the variable configuration for the incarcerated offenders’ LAAF items for the life as a film component of the interview. The COA was 0.335
for the 74 variables in the configuration. LAAF items from the non-incarcerated life as a film interviews are displayed in figure 6.2. The figure represents the configuration for 55 variables identified in the non-incarcerated offenders’ life narrative episodes, the COA was 0.306. In figure 6.3 the configuration of the LAAF items are displayed for the incarcerated offenders SE narrative. The COA was 0.307 for 69 variables. Figure 6.4 shows the LAAF variables for the SE of the non-incarcerated individuals is displayed. The COA is 0.281 for 55 variables.

To examine thematic differences between LAAF variables for the incarcerated and non-incarcerated interviews, the variables that appeared in the non-incarcerated SSA-I plot were identified in the SSA-I plot for the incarcerated offenders.

6.3.1. Thematic structure and frequency analysis of LAAF variables

Although the frequency occurrence of the variables was assessed in the previous chapter, this was conducted in the manner of frequency comparisons between the two participant groups in relation to whether an item was present or not. The frequency analysis within the current chapter was to examine if the placement of the variables within the geometric space of the SSA-I plot was structured in accordance to the frequency occurrence of the available items. The frequency occurrence of the items is displayed in three modalities: high - items that occurred in more than 40% of the sample groups; medium - items that occurred in 20-39% of the sample; and, low -items that occurred in 5-19% of the sample. The results are displayed in table 6.1.

6.3.1.1. Frequency analysis

The frequency occurrence of the variables did not account for any themed region within the geometric space for either the incarcerated or non-incarcerated SSA-I configuration. Frequency occurrence of the items is presented in table 6.1; the table is in frequency order of the LAAF items for the incarcerated offenders’ film narrative.

*High frequency* items ‘negative tone’ and ‘contingent sequences’ were high in the SE of the incarcerated offenders, for the film narrative both items occurred in the medium frequency range. The high frequency item for the non-incarcerated group was ‘comedy’ –
this was low frequency for the offenders. Items ‘positive’ and ‘proactive (tone)’ were high frequency in the non-incarcerated group for both the film and the SE; both items were a medium frequency for the offenders. ‘Proactive’ behaviours were high frequency in the non-incarcerated SE and were medium frequency for the offenders. Finally ‘coherent themes’, ‘self-identity stronger than others’ and ‘others as significant’ was high frequency for both the offenders and non-offenders.

A number of medium frequency items for the offenders had a frequency of less than 5% within the non-incarcerated group, such items include ‘crime’, ‘tragedy’, ‘others non-significant’, ‘hostility’, ‘disappointment’, ‘confusion’ ‘distorting the consequences’ ‘displacement of responsibility’ and ‘victimisation’.

Low frequency items, for both of the participant groups, included the highest number of items overall. A number of low frequency items for the incarcerated narratives occur in fewer than 5 within the non-incarcerated narratives. The items include: ‘survivor’, ‘denial of injury’, ‘higher loyalties’, ‘condemnation’, and ‘betrayal’.

To summarise, additional review of the of the frequency occurrence of the LAAF variables highlight a number of items that have little occurrence within the non-incarcerated life-stories. Therefore, the items expected to demonstrate a contaminated offender script include: ‘doing crime’, ‘imprisonment’, ‘relationship problems’, ‘others non-significant’, ‘hostility’, ‘disappointment’, ‘victimisation’, ‘survivor’, ‘denial of injury’, ‘higher loyalties’, ‘condemnation’, and ‘betrayal’. It is predicted the aforementioned items will form a distinct region within the SSA-I for the incarcerated offenders which is not present within the non-incarcerated SSA-I; such regions are likely to occur for both the film and SE narratives.
Table 6.1. Frequency of LAAF items for the film and significant event narrative interviews for both incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>INCARCERATED LIFE AS FILM</th>
<th>INCARCERATED SIGNIFICANT EVENT</th>
<th>NON-INCARCERATED LIFE AS FILM</th>
<th>NON-INCARCERATED SIGNIFICANT EVENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>STORY GENRE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic presentation</td>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40 (44.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>13 (10.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12 (14.9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tragedy</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thriller</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romance</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focal content</td>
<td>Doing crime</td>
<td>33 (54.1%)</td>
<td>23 (37.7%)</td>
<td>12 (26.8%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imprisonment</td>
<td>29 (47.5%)</td>
<td>28 (45.9%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationship problem</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>23 (37.7%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Death</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>15 (24.6%)</td>
<td>16 (17.8%)</td>
<td>16 (17.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material success</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>1st Group</td>
<td>2nd Group</td>
<td>3rd Group</td>
<td>4th Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim of crime</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>4 (6.5%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship success</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>13 (14.4%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>18 (29.5%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>8 (8.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative tone</td>
<td>35 (57.4%)</td>
<td>38 (62.2%)</td>
<td>20 (22.2%)</td>
<td>28 (31.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive tone</td>
<td>32 (52.5%)</td>
<td>23 (37.7%)</td>
<td>42 (46.7%)</td>
<td>46 (51.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive tone</td>
<td>26 (42.6%)</td>
<td>22 (36%)</td>
<td>64 (71.1%)</td>
<td>61 (67.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive tone</td>
<td>18 (29.5%)</td>
<td>22 (36.1%)</td>
<td>12 (13.3%)</td>
<td>37 (41.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy ending</td>
<td>32 (52.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 (28.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sad ending</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCHOLOGICAL CONTENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-mastery</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>8 (8.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>19 (21.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status – victory</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement/ responsibility</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>15 (16.7%)</td>
<td>24 (26.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity/ togetherness</td>
<td>18 (29.5%)</td>
<td>26 (42.6%)</td>
<td>20 (22.2%)</td>
<td>24 (26.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love/ friendship</td>
<td>15 (24.6%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring/help</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>17 (27.9%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redemptive theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General redemption</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>10 (11.1%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat negative events transformed to redemptive sequence</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sets forth pro-social goals</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of sense of moral steadfastness</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoys a special advantage</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>4 (6.5%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffering or injustice in lives of others during childhood</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination theme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General contamination</td>
<td>23 (37.7%)</td>
<td>32 (52.5%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victimisation</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disappointment</td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td>18 (29.5%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of significant other</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical/psychological illness or injury</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrayal</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disillusionment</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (3.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex guilt, humiliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tragedy</td>
<td>Wrong done to them/ theirs</td>
<td>20 (32.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24 (39.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (8.9%)</td>
<td>12 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsion</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irony</td>
<td>Impotence/ hopelessness</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion/ misunderstanding</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>Fulfilment/ satisfaction</td>
<td>20 (32.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>17 (27.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 (33.3%)</td>
<td>21 (23.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness/ skills/ competencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 (24.4%)</td>
<td>29 (32.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible rewards/ acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quest</td>
<td>Overcoming struggles/ obstacles/ mission</td>
<td>18 (29.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (32.2%)</td>
<td>23 (25.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victory/ proving self/ success</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (8.9%)</td>
<td>14 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity/ bravery</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 (11.5%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSYCHOLOGICAL COMPLEXITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substantive</th>
<th>Psychological ideas</th>
<th>4.67 (2.76)</th>
<th>4.15 (SD 2.0)</th>
<th>3.63 (1.96)</th>
<th>3.18 (SD 1.56)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Events cited</td>
<td>2.6 (2.48)</td>
<td>2.13 (SD 1.28)</td>
<td>2 (1.64)</td>
<td>1.42 (SD .56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people</td>
<td>2.2 (1.63)</td>
<td>1.61 (SD 1.14)</td>
<td>1.5 (1.56)</td>
<td>.64 (SD .95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent themes</td>
<td>37 (60.7%)</td>
<td>41 (67.2%)</td>
<td>51 (56.7%)</td>
<td>63 (70%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent sequences</td>
<td>25 (41%)</td>
<td>42 (68.9%)</td>
<td>29 (32.3%)</td>
<td>26 (28.9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning, middle and end components</td>
<td>22 (36.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13 (14.4%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles for characters</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Formal                                  |                      |             |             |             |             |
| PSYCHOLOGICAL COMPONENTS                |                      |             |             |             |             |
| Incentive                               |                      |             |             |             |             |
| Sensory gain                            | 20 (32.8%)           | 16 (26.2%) | 12 (13.3%) | 22 (24.4%) |
| Material/ financial gain                 | 16 (26.2%)           | 10 (16.4%) | 10 (11.1%) | 5 (5.6%)   |
| Social gain                             | 8 (13.1%)            | 10 (16.4%) | 6 (6.7%)   | 5 (5.6%)   |
| Power/ status gain                      | 4 (6.6%)             | 6 (9.8%)   | 1 (1.1%)   | -          |
| Interpersonal style                     |                      |             |             |             |             |
| Confronting                             | 9 (14.8%)            | 11 (18%)   | 9 (10%)    | 3 (3.3%)   |
| Avoidant                                | 3 (4.9%)             | 9 (14.8%)  | 5 (5.6%)   | 7 (7.8%)   |
| Locus of control                        |                      |             |             |             |             |
| Proactive                               | 29 (47.5%)           | 21 (34.4%) | 38 (42.2%) | 49 (54.4%) |
| Reactive                                | 20 (32.8%)           | 24 (39.3%) | 19 (21.1%) | 23 (25.6%) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justifications</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Denial of responsibility</th>
<th>Assume the role of victim</th>
<th>Diffusion of responsibility</th>
<th>Distorting the consequence</th>
<th>Condemnation of condemners</th>
<th>Displacement of responsibility</th>
<th>Appeal to higher loyalties</th>
<th>Denial of injury</th>
<th>Denial of the victim</th>
<th>Dehumanising the victim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial of responsibility</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20 (32.8%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assume the role of victim</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15 (24.6%)</td>
<td>16 (26.2%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion of responsibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distorting the consequence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation of condemners</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement of responsibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appeal to higher loyalties</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of injury</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denial of the victim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehumanising the victim</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emotions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroused negative</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>11 (18%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>12 (13.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aroused negative</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>17 (27.9%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>18 (20%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility towards others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>14 (23%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aroused positive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9 (14.8%)</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>22 (24.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-aroused positive</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>19 (21.1%)</td>
<td>17 (18.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy for others</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>Self-ID stronger than others</td>
<td>Others as significant</td>
<td>Self-ID weaker than others</td>
<td>Others as non-significant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46 (75.4%)</td>
<td>43 (73.8%)</td>
<td>67 (74.4%)</td>
<td>73 (81.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others as significant</td>
<td>45 (73.8%)</td>
<td>43 (70.5%)</td>
<td>56 (62.2%)</td>
<td>51 (56.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-ID weaker than others</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>13 (21.3%)</td>
<td>9 (10%)</td>
<td>10 (11.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others as non-significant</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>8 (13.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity - protagonist</th>
<th>Escapist</th>
<th>Caregiver</th>
<th>Warrior</th>
<th>Survivor</th>
<th>Traveller</th>
<th>Maker</th>
<th>Friend</th>
<th>Sage</th>
<th>Counsellor</th>
<th>Lover</th>
<th>Healer</th>
<th>Arbiter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 (16.4%)</td>
<td>7 (11.5%)</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>6 (9.8%)</td>
<td>5 (8.2%)</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (14.9%)</td>
<td>12 (19.7%)</td>
<td>4 (6.6%)</td>
<td>7 (11.5%)</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>3 (4.9%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>14 (15.6%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (7.8%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>3 (3.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of others</th>
<th>Caregiver</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Humanist</th>
<th>Ritualistic</th>
<th>Maker</th>
<th>Warrior</th>
<th>Sage</th>
<th>Healer</th>
<th>Humanist</th>
<th>Arbiter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (11.5%)</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2 (3.3%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counsellor</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>5 (5.6%)</td>
<td>6 (6.7%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escapist</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritualistic</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveller</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrior</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1 (1.1%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanist</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbiter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1.6%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 (2.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3.1.2. Thematic structure

Film narrative

For the non-incarcerated group (figure 6.2), the crime items were located with ‘escapist (imago)’ and ‘redemption’ items. The location of the items suggests that part of the narrative that involves criminal action also includes ‘redemption’ for the non-incarcerated individuals. For the incarcerated configuration (figure 6.1), crime related variables are closely situated near ‘masculine’, ‘victory’, ‘financial gain’ ‘action’ and ‘crime’ as a film genre. This suggests an element of power (masculine, victory) and psychological incentives for crime action (financial gain) in the incarcerated group.

Positive variables such as ‘achievements’, ‘rewards’, ‘proactive voice’ and positive emotions are located in a similar region of the plot to the crime variables, for the incarcerated group. The concept of crime is embedded in the sense of reward for the incarcerated group, suggesting that criminal action has a strong overlap in how their life is perceived. In contrast, the same positive variables, for the non-incarcerated group, are located on the opposite side of the plot from the crime variables. For the non-incarcerated, achievements and rewards co-occur with effective and proactive behaviours. For both groups the ‘achievements’ and ‘rewards’ are located near the ‘prove self’ variables.

The configurations of emotion-related variables show differences for the incarcerated and non-incarcerated groups. Variables resembling positive emotions are located near the crime variables for the offenders. However, negative emotional items are located near the crime variables for the non-incarcerated; the positive emotions are located on the opposite side of the plot. For the offenders, negative emotional items are located with items such as, ‘impotence’ and ‘weak self-identity’. For both groups the negative emotion items are also located near items such as ‘victim’, ‘wrong done’ and ‘death’.
Figure 6.1. Thematic structure of LAAF variables for film narrative for incarcerated offenders

74 variables from 61 cases of INCARCERATED OFFENDERS Life as a film narrative
Vector 1x2, CoA 0.335, transformation13, iterations 24
Figure 6.2. Thematic structure of LAAF variables for film narrative for non-incarcerated.
Figure 6.3. Thematic structure of LAAF variables for significant event narrative for incarcerated offenders
Figure 6.4. Thematic structure of LAAF variables for the significant narrative for non-incarcerated

The SSA-I for the offenders shows the ‘doing crime’ and ‘imprisonment’ variables are located in the same region as a range of justifications such as ‘denial responsibility’, ‘distorting the consequence’ and ‘denial of injury’. In this region, negative emotions are also located e.g. ‘hostility’ and ‘aroused negative’. In contrast to the film narrative, the crime variables within the SE tend to be presented as a negative theme. For the non-incarcerated individuals, crime variables are not present in the SSA-I structure. The ‘negative aroused emotions’ are located near ‘confronting’ and ‘loss of other’. For both groups negative emotions such as ‘non-aroused
negative’ and ‘impotence’ are located near items such as ‘death’, ‘passive’ and ‘weak self-
identity’.

Positive emotions ‘positive’ and ‘aroused positive’ are located near items ‘effective’,
‘self mastery’ and ‘achievements’. This theme is found in both the incarcerated and non-
incarcerated SSA-I structures. For both SSA-I configurations ‘redemption’, ‘empowerment’ and
‘overcoming’ are located in similar regions. Although, the SE discussed by the incarcerated and
non-incarcerated individuals was different, they do show a number of similarities suggesting
the narrative of the events is underpinned by similar psychological processes.

6.3.1.3. The contaminated script

In both cases (SE and film) the non-incarcerated SSA-I had fewer variables on the plot, the items were mapped on to the incarcerated SSA-I. This was achieved by indicating which of
the non-incarcerated narrative items appeared in the offenders SSA-I’s.

As predicted, a themed region emerged within the incarcerated narrative items in both
the film and SE narratives; this is indicated in figures 6.5 and 6.6. In both SSA-I configurations,
the themed region is presented in the left-hand side of the plot. This region represents
variables that were present within the narratives from the incarcerated sample but did not
appear in the non-incarcerated sample or had very low frequencies in this group and therefore
was removed from the analysis.

Altogether, 22 items were identified in figure 6.5 as the contaminated script for the film
narrative. A Chronbach’s alpha co-efficient identified the internal consistency of the items was
0.677. For Figure 6.6, 18 items were identified as part of the contaminated script for the
significant event, a Chronbach’s alpha co-efficient identified the internal consistency of 0.808.
Over 50% of the items in the contaminated script were the same in both the film and SE; these
‘warrior’, ‘condemns condemners’, ‘others non-significant’, ‘victim’, ‘disappointment’ and
‘illness injury’.
A secondary data matrix was formulated for the items in the contaminated script. The matrix allowed further analysis of the level of contamination presented by the incarcerated offenders within their life-narratives. The contamination script occurred in 84% (n=51) of the offenders film narrative and 80% (n=49) of the offenders SE narrative. All offenders showed levels of contamination for either the SE or film narrative. The range of this contamination was calculated, creating a percentage from the number of contaminated items displayed in the narrative accounts against the total number of contaminated items in the SSA-I configuration (e.g. number of contaminated items displayed in each individual script / total number of contaminated items x 100). The level of contamination in the film narrative ranged from 0% to 45% and 0% to 67% for the SE.

As the low frequency items (<3) were removed for the SSA-I the contamination script was also present in the non-incarcerated narratives. For the non-incarcerated, 22% (n=20) had contamination items in their film narrative and 12% (n=11) in their SE narrative. However, the level of contamination was much lower. For the film narrative, the level of contamination ranged from 0% to 18% and 0% to 22% for the SE. Mann Whitney U tests of difference were conducted to assess if a significant difference in the level of contamination was present for the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. The level of contamination in the film narrative differed significantly between the incarcerated offenders and the non-incarcerated individuals U=827.50, Z=-7.939, p<0.001. The level of contamination in the SE narrative differed significantly between the incarcerated offenders and the non-incarcerated individuals U=743.50, Z=-8.605, p<0.001.
Figure 6.5. Thematic structure of LAAF items for Film narrative for incarcerated offenders with non-incarcerated LAAF items mapped on
Going to jail was a regular topic disclosed as a SE for the offenders therefore the placement of items ‘imprisonment’ and ‘doing crime’ in this region is not surprising. The contaminated script in the SE includes negative self image ‘failure’ and a number of justification methods ‘loyalties’ and ‘denial injury’. In the film contaminated script, there are a number of negative items which would depict a negative film such as ‘tragedy – genre’, ‘repeat negative events’ and low self identity variables ‘confusion’ and ‘impotence’. The general theme of the contaminated script is negative for both the SE and film narratives.
A large proportion of the items relate to themes that have previously been identified as part of an offender’s life story. For example, the theme of contamination is represented by negative turning points within the life story. Negative turning points have been strongly correlated with criminality (Harris, 2011; Sampson & Laub, 1995). Each of the subsequent contaminated items from the original coding framework is incorporated into the contaminated script. In addition to the items from the contamination sequence are items relating to neutralisations (Sykes & Matza, 1957) and justifications (Bandura, 1999). Other items included in the contaminated script include victimisation aspects. The warrior imago is part of the contaminated script for both the SE and film narrative. The warrior is a person who is confrontational and exerts dominance over others this is presented in the contamination script by behaviours such as hostility and other people considered as non-significant are common among offenders.

6.3.2. Case studies: Level of contamination within the life narratives

Four case studies representing a high level of contamination within the offenders’ narratives are presented. The case studies demonstrate different life-stories which are classified into two scripts of contamination: a victim of circumstance (narrators 1 and 38) and a quest for honour (narrators 7 and 33). Further exploration into how the scripts are presented as archetypal themes are presented in the following chapter.

At no point in this section of the narrative interviews were the interviewees asked to provide details of crimes they had committed. All four of the case studies included descriptions of crimes the offenders had been involved in or criminal activity in general. Each narrator makes use of a number of neutralisation methods when discussing their actions. Narrators 1 and 7 show high levels of contamination in both the film and SE narratives. Narrator 38 is an example of high contamination for the SE and narrator 33 shows high contamination for the film.
Narrator 1 (high contaminated both)

(Significant event)...going into care at the age of 13. It was because of a family breakdown. My ma had a nervous breakdown and my sister went into care...my step father was very abusive. There was sexual abuse towards my two sisters and he was violent towards me...I turned to drugs, mostly cannabis and amphetamines and I started doing burglaries to make money. By 21 I was on crack...It really hurt me it was the first time my family was back together and it all went wrong...(Film)... There would be convicts and working families with the odd person doing crime on the side. I had a good friend before 1998 but since then I’ve been by myself as our friendship got chucked back in my face. I was nicked on charges that I wouldn’t have been and since then I find it hard to trust people and now I only have acquaintances... My step-father would send me out to play and would sexually abuse my sisters. He was always having a crack at me too. I was always trying to get my family back together but I ended up in care. I got back in touch with my dad at 16 but he died in 1997 and my ma died in 1998. I ended up cutting my wrists and every relationship since has been chaotic. ... At home I stay with friends but they are all drug users so it’s back to stage 1, I’ve asked for some help with drugs but I haven’t heard anything yet and I’m out in 4 weeks. ... I am an honest person, but if someone did something to me I would retaliate but not violently...

Narrator 1 starts his life as a film narrative by providing examples of TV shows that would represent his life. Both the TV shows he suggests are light-hearted tongue-in-cheek crime related shows. From the beginning of the narrative, narrator 1 associates crime with his life-story. Different forms of victimisation are represented by occurrences of betrayal from others and through the loss of parents. The way he presents himself within the narrative would suggest weak self-identity through the use of examples of times when he has been victimised and the attribution of blame to others. His emotional state is hostile towards others.

Interview 38 (high contamination in significant event)

(Significant event)...after having kids with my ex, she changed. It was like she had had PMT all the time... she went a bit strange and the relationship ended. She started picking at things and arguing and drinking wine. I was stupid though as I would buy her the wine. She stabbed me, all over my arms. I hit her once too in defence, and got 2 years in prison for that even though... I pleaded guilty thought because I still loved her...after doing 2 years we ended up back together...I ended up back in jail for driving without a license...arrested on a restraining order once for wanting to see the kids. She is a bitch...I think having kids make all women go nasty...I suffer for wanting to see the kids... Police always take the woman’s side, so I still
wouldn’t have reported her if I could go back to the time she stabbed me. I’m not like that, I just gave her a slap and I got arrested. I now have an indefinite restraining order against me…

A similar victim-type theme can be seen in life-story presented by narrator 38. The narrator presents a number of examples of when wrong has been done to him. Again, this has demonstrated betrayal by a person close to him and has resulted in a set of emotional states where the narrator has demonstrated hostility and condemnation of condemners. He also uses a set of interpretations where he displaces and denies his responsibility in the violent actions between him and his ex-partner, attributing responsibility for his actions elsewhere.

_Script: Quest for honour_

**Interview 7 (high contaminated both)**

_**(Significant event)**... I smashed the kid in the car and knocked the 3rd person on the floor... I thought I’d stabbed him in the shoulder but I’d killed him [denial injury]. I’m not happy with the sentence because they think I went to rob them on purpose but that was impossible [distorting]... I’m pissed off because the paper said a kid only got 21 years for killing his wife and cutting her up. They just slammed me for 25 years. There is no justice; it’s all nonsense out there. The law’s a load of bullshit, I feel nothing for justice now... *(Film)*... It [film genre] would be about drugs, guns and money. It would be a violent film... I started not going to school and smoking loads of weed... My mum had no control and didn’t give a fuck. She got a new fella, I tried to stab him... I had no stable home from 13-19 years old. I have been in and out of jail, I have to rob to keep myself going... I wouldn’t let my family come to court ...I thought someone might shoot me and I didn’t want them to see it. I didn’t think they could deal with it. I could happily do the rest of my life in jail... It’s easier for me in here as there is nothing to worry about. My family however, are always stressing out.

Narrator 7 uses the warrior imago to present himself. His narrative is full of examples of crimes he has been involved in and this is replicated by the inclusion of description of his life as a violent crime related film. Although he does present a strong sense of self identity within the narrative, he incorporates a number of distortion methods as a way of justifying his behaviour by focusing on his own objectives. Similar to the other narrators, narrator 7 also includes a number of examples within his narrative where he has been victimised by the justice system and possible victimisation from other criminals.

**Interview 33 (high contaminated film)**
(Film) Action – I’m always into something... I was going around fighting and getting into trouble. This must have been fate (ending up in prison) because I was getting into trouble a lot with my mates. I was going to the gym, watching cage fights, working security and neglecting the kids. I wasn’t getting on with my the ex and didn’t get on with her mother and father. I beat up her father once. The ex was constantly nagging, wanting to go on holidays with the family and phoning all the time – she would be wrecking my head. I needed some space and would tell her to go out with her mates. But if I went out with her I’d get into fights with guys looking at her. If she was out with her mates she’d phone me and tell me some guy had pawed her and I would race over to her and fight the guys. I think she liked the idea of me fighting for her. Like in the movies, typical women spending all the man’s money... I don’t have problems, I get on with everyone...

Narrator 33 also presents himself in a way that also fits the warrior imago theme. He also shows a strong sense of self identity within the narrative. He uses a number of justification methods and provides his own interpretations for his imprisonment. He does not include any overly emotional words to describe his actions which would suggest his emotional state is calm, but he does demonstrate hostility towards others through the continued use of violence.

The victimisation that narrator 7 experiences stems from his own interpretations of the events and the miscarriage of justice that he feels has happened to him. Whereas narrators 1 and 26 were victims of violent sexual assaults and the further victimisation steamed from the attacks being conducted by a person that was close to them. This use of victimisation within the narrative is a good example of how the contamination script varies from offender to offender. On the other hand, narrators 7 and 33 both presented themselves as warriors using violence as a form of dominance over others with a strong sense of self-perception. This again demonstrates how the contamination script can differ from offender to offender.

6.3.3. Background characteristics and level of contamination

To assess if background features of the offenders were associated with the level of contamination within their narratives, a total score of contamination was calculated using the frequency occurrence of contamination items presented by each offender. Using this score, a Kruskal-Wallis test was applied for each of the 4 background features of: age, offence history,
tone of significant event and type of offence, and was calculated for the level of contamination in both the SE and film narratives.

Age was divided into three categories: 20-29, 30-39, 40+. Kruskal-Wallis test showed contamination script in the film ($H(2)=.085$, N.S) and SE ($H(2)=3.124$, N.S) narrative was not significantly affected by age.

Offence history was assessed in four categories: one-time only offenders, 2-5 convictions, persistent offenders (6-99 offences), and high level offending (100+ offences). Contamination script in the film narrative ($H(3)=2.192$, N.S) and SE narrative ($H(3)=3.193$, N.S) was not significantly affected by offending history.

To assess the tone of the SE, offenders were separated into positive and negative tone. Contamination script in the film narrative ($H(1)=.029$, N.S) was not significantly affected by tone of significant event. Contamination script in the SE narrative was significantly affected by tone of significant event $H(1)=10.042,p<0.05$, in this case more negative significant events were discussed.

Offenders were differentiated in reference to the crimes they had disclosed. Property, person, and sensory classifications were applied. Contamination script in the film ($H(2)=.662$, N.S) and SE narrative ($H(2)=.149$, N.S) was not significantly affected by type of offending.

6.4. Chapter Summary and Conclusion: The contaminated script

The aim was to uncover the thematic structure of the LAAF items in the film and SE narratives. A theme of LAAF items that exists in the narratives from the incarcerated offenders but is not present in the narratives of the non-incarcerated males was identified. This theme of items was termed the ‘contamination script’. It includes a number of items that relate to the contaminated themes presented by McAdams, et al. (1997), neutralisations techniques by Sykes and Matza (1957), justifications by Bandura (1999), and negative emotional items. The presence of a contaminated script was found in all of the offender’s narratives for either the SE, film narrative, or both. The level of contamination varied between the offenders. Background
characteristics of the offenders were investigated to see if they were associated with the items from the contaminated script; the findings did not suggest any of the background features were related to the contaminated script.

Although the analysis of the background characteristics did not show characteristics of an offender which support a contaminated script, they do suggest that level of contamination in life e.g. negative life trajectories (through examination of positive and negative SE) was the most likely predictor of the contaminated offenders’ script for a SE narrative. This finding was expected. However, what this analysis of the background characteristics does suggest is that the contaminated script does exist among a varied group of offenders. This finding is supported by the analysis of the case-studies which provided examples of how a different version of the contaminated script is presented within the narrated accounts. The offender group consists of offenders who have committed a range of crimes. Future research exploring the contaminated script should consider how the script may be presented in the narratives among offenders of different offences. It is likely that themes based on background characteristics of the offenders in relation to the contaminated script would be better identified if the offenders represented one type of crime.

The case-study review presented examples from 4 offenders with a high level of the contamination script within their life-story. Interestingly, this review demonstrated variation within the contamination script and highlighted two key themes. The first theme was that of a victim of circumstance and the second a quest for honour. Both themes suggest different story plots that the offenders use to describe their lives and the roles they assign themselves as the protagonist. Further exploration of archetypal themes is presented in the following chapter.

The general structure of the LAAF items within the SSA-I plots showed that crime, within the incarcerated offenders narratives, was related to achievements and various forms of gains. This is in contrast to the crime within the non-incarcerated narratives which was related to negative emotions. Although the non-incarcerated group had admitted to committing crimes, crime does not appear to be a large part of their life-story, unlike the life-stories of
incarcerated offenders. The contamination script presented in the narratives of the incarcerated offenders shows their life-stories are strongly influenced by justifying their behaviours and sequences of good things turning bad; whether it is through someone disrespecting their honour or through victimisation. This presents a number of psychological antecedent factors to criminality and the level of overlap criminal action has in the life-stories of offenders. Two different life-narrative interviews were examined. Each identified the contamination script in a broadly similar fashion; supporting the validity of the contamination script within the life-stories of offenders.
Chapter 7

Archetypal Themes in Life-Episodes

7.1. Introduction

Further deconstruction of the offender narrative is used to examine the archetypal structure of the LAAF variables for film and SE narratives to see if different narrative themes can be differentiated within the life-stories of offenders. The central premise is that stories people tell about their lives will have some cultural significance to the archetypes of stories told in fictional literature. Brooker (2004) argues that all fictional stories have a limited number of basic themes. When asked to talk about an event, behaviour, or memory, people do not discuss what happened in reference to behavioural and personality traits; they describe what happened in the form of a story (Agnew, 2006). The story will have a beginning, middle and end and will see the narrator as the protagonist, presenting a sequence of situational, interactional, emotional features all based on the narrators perception of the event that took place. A sensible inference is that the stories people tell about their lives would have some reference to the structure of general plots found in fictional accounts.

Canter and his colleagues have published a number of outputs demonstrating how criminals’ accounts of their crime action can be classified into four key thematic constructs. Based on the dominant narrative themes of professional, revenger, victim and hero; the themes have been consistently found in thematic explorations of crime scene actions form a range of crimes (see Canter & Youngs, 2009), from self report measures focusing on the offenders experience of the crime (see Canter, Kaouri & Ioannou, 2003; Youngs and Canter, 2012), and in a case study review of offenders narrated accounts of their crime action. Each study is based on different samples of offenders, presenting a triangulation of methods showing consistent findings of the NAS themes. However, the research focuses on crime actions and therefore the broader life-story narratives of offenders have yet to be explored. The life-stories in the present study are deconstructed using the LAAF framework. This method has been successful in demonstrating differences in the life-narratives of incarcerated offenders and non-incarcerated
individuals (highlighted in the previous chapter), but is yet to be explored for an archetypal structure.

The dominant narrative roles of professional, revenger, victim and hero are developed from Frye’s (1957) archetypal themes of fictional mythoi. Frye states “…archetypal analysis of the meaning or significance of such work [symbols as archetypes] would deal with it in terms of the generic, recurring, or conventional actions/ shapes indicated by mood and resolution…” (pg. 105). He argues that there are a number of learned associations which are generic and reoccurring themes and symbols within large cultures. Certain themes and symbols will be recognised across cultures and others will only be recognised within cultures.

Frye’s archetypal themes include: the mythos of summer – romance adventure, the mythos of autumn – tragedy, the mythos of winter – irony, and the mythos of spring – comedy. Each has its own formulation of symbolic rituals that reoccur in the story plot and in the protagonist. Stories are a method for people to communicate ideas and experiences about their lives; therefore the hypothesis is life-stories will have a similar narrative structure to archetypal themes found fictional stories. In particular, Youngs and Canter (2012) have demonstrated how dominant narrative roles in criminal action follow the structure of Frye’s themes. For example, the mythos of summer – romance is the professional adventure, the mythos of autumn – tragedy is the revenger tragedy, the mythos of winter – irony is the victim irony, and the mythos of spring – comedy is the hero quest.

The aim is to determine what archetypal themes emerge in the life-story narrative content of offenders and if such themes relate to archetypal themes found in criminal action. The following research questions are explored: What archetypal themes are present in life-story narratives of offenders? Are the same archetypal themes found in criminal action also present in the offenders’ life events?
7.2. Method

The LAAF variables from 61 incarcerated offenders narrated accounts of a SE and film were subject to SSA-I. A full description of SSA-I is provided in chapter 6.

7.2.1. Data analysis strategy

To examine if the thematic structure of the LAAF variables demonstrates archetypal themes the SSA-I plots from the incarcerated offenders’ film and SE narratives, from chapter 6, are also examined in the current chapter. Re-running of the SSA-I analysis was not necessary to deal with the research questions of this study. Previous ideas of four archetypal themes derived from Fryes (1957) fictional mythoi are used to differentiate the SSA-I configuration into an archetypal structure to see if archetypal themes do occur and if the same themes that are found in criminal action (e.g. Canter & Youngs, 2009; Youngs and Canter, 2011; 2012) are present in the narratives of broader life-events. Excerpts from Frye’s original book and Youngs and Canters (2012) paper will be used to demonstrate how the different themes are identified in the SSA-I structures making use of case studies to show how the themes are presented within the narratives of the current set of incarcerated offenders. Chronbachs alpha is used to determine the internal consistency of the items in each of the archetypal themes. Finally, to establish if the archetypal themes are consistent over different life-episodes (e.g. film and SE) sub-scales will be formulated in SPSS for each of the hero, victim, revenger and professional themes. Spearman Rho correlations will be ran on each sub-scale for the film and SE to establish if the archetypal themes show significant correlations over the different life-episodes.

7.3. Results

7.3.1. Archetypal structure of LAAF items

The SSA-I configuration of LAAF variables for the incarcerated offenders life-story narratives, from chapter 6, is displayed in figures 7.1 and 7.2. Four regions of dominant narrative themes are indicated on both the plots. The internal consistency for the items in each region is displayed in table 7.3. Chronbach’s alpha co-efficient analysis demonstrates each
region has a good level of internal consistency for the incarcerated offenders LAAF items presented in that section of the plot; for both the SE and film narratives.

The structure of the narrative themes, in figures 7.1 and 7.2 is similar in its configuration to the SSA-I presented in Youngs and Canter (2012). For example, the low intimacy roles (revenger and professional) are placed on the opposite side of the plot to the high intimacy roles (victim and hero). The high potency items (professional and hero) are placed on the opposite side of the plot to the low potency items (victim and revenger). A summary of the structure is displayed in figure 7.3. The structure of themes within the LAAF items adds support to Youngs and Canter’s potency and intimacy items in the dominant narrative roles. The agency items ‘victory’ (not in SE), ‘achievement’, ‘self mastery’ and ‘empowerment’ are presented on the high potency side of the plot in both the film and SE SSA-I configurations. However, the intimacy items from the LAAF framework are placed in three of the four quadrants. In the film narrative, ‘caring’ and ‘unity’ are placed in the high intimacy region of the plot; whereas, ‘love’ is placed in the low intimacy region. For the SE ‘love’ and ‘unity’ are placed in the high intimacy region; whereas ‘caring’ is located in the low intimacy region.
Figure 7.1. Thematic regions of LAAF variables for film narrative for incarcerated offenders
A further point to note is the location of the imago items within structure of the plot. For the film narrative six of McAdams (1993) imago themes were included in the SSA-I and four in the SE. Each narrative theme hosts a different set of imagoes. The imagoes represent a dominant narrative theme found in non-criminal populations; each is located with a different region of the plot. Using McAdams’ definitions, the escapist is a person who is fun-loving and lives for diversion and amusement; this imago is located in the professional region of the plot for the SE narrative and the hero region for the film narrative. The warrior is a person who forcefully engages and attains power over others; this imago is located in the revenger of the plot for both the SE and film narratives. The survivor is a person who makes it possible for others to perform and may come from a harsh environment; this imago is located in the victim region of the plot for both the film and SE narratives. The traveller is a person who is fast paced,
and moves over terrain and is located in the revenger region for the film narrative. The caregiver is a person who cares and sacrifices self for others and is located in the professional region for the SE and the hero region for the film narrative. The maker is a person who is more concerned with achievement than power; this imago is located in the professional region for the film narrative. The location of the imagoes, with the different narrative roles, supports McAdams idea of different life-stories presenting different self images.

Table 7.1. Chronbach’s alpha for thematic regions of LAAF variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>REVENGER</th>
<th>VICTIM</th>
<th>HERO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.827</td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant event narrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.752</td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3.2.1. Archetypal themes and dominant narrative roles in the LAAF items

Outlined below are four dominant narrative themes in fictional mythoi that have been explored by Frye (1957) and later adapted to criminal action. The four themes represent the professional-adventure, the revenger-tragedy, the victim-irony, and the hero-comedy. The themes are discussed in relation to the SSA-I divisions presented in the film and SE LAAF variables. For each, a large number of the same variables were present in the same region of the plots for the film and SE narratives, when this is not the case either film or SE is presented in brackets next to the item to indicate which plot the item is located. Case studies are used to provide examples of the archetypal themes.
**Dominant narrative role: professional, Archetypal theme: romance – adventure**

Frye (1957) states that the central element of the romance plot is adventure, in this story the protagonist goes from one adventure to another, and there is a power of action presented by the protagonist (pg. 186). The SSA-I items for both the SE and film narrative in the professional region of the plot depict a protagonist who is proactive ‘proactive voice’ and ‘proactive behaviours’ (SE) and sees adventure in his life-story ‘action’ (film). This narrative theme is also associated with positive emotions ‘positive tone’, ‘aroused positive’ and ‘non-aroused positive’ (film). The imago in this region is that of an ‘escapist’ (SE) which can be related to moving from one adventure to another, the association of the crime related variables represents the types of adventures the professional associates with his life-story.

In this theme, Frye describes the protagonist, after his adventure, as putting away his ‘beggars rags’ and returning to his princes robe (pg. 188). The theme here sees the protagonist as succeeded in completing his task and can now relinquish in his riches. The professional protagonist is fixated with his task – the crime ‘doing crime’(film), ‘crime’ (film) and as a result is able to receive his riches ‘financial gain’, ‘social gain’, ‘achievements’ and ‘rewards’ (film). This theme can also be projected through the inclusion of the ‘imprisonment’ (SE) variables, it may be that the ‘beggars rags’ is a symbol of imprisonment and ‘relinquishing in his riches’ is success of being released once the term of imprisonment is complete.

Finally, Frye demonstrates how the romance theme is related to dream and rituals. The dreams represent a search for fulfilment and rituals as victory of fertility and obtaining precious objects (pg. 193). Frye suggests that both can have a number of psychological associations. The themes of both victory and fulfilment are demonstrated in the professional narrative by the items ‘victory’ (film), ‘masculinity’, ‘effectiveness’ and ‘self-mastery’. Victory of fertility can be symbolised with the inclusion of the ‘caring’, ‘caregiver’ and ‘birth’ in the significant event and with ‘caregiver-other ‘in the film narrative which each represent a theme of communion. The precious objects are symbolised by ‘social’ and ‘financial gain’ and on a personal level as ‘proving self’ (film) and as a result obtaining a ‘strong self identity’. A second imago of a ‘maker’
is presented in the professional region of the film narrative. The maker is a person who is concerned with achievements rather than power; this concept fits well with the professional narrative and the job-like qualities this narrative role is concerned with in relation to effectiveness and achievements.

The archetypal theme of romance-adventure is symbolically represented by the professional region of the plot. In reference to the dominant narrative roles presented by Youngs and Canter (2012), although they are taken from crime accounts, there are still some strong associations with this dominant narrative theme in an offenders’ life-story. The professional is a person who takes responsibility for his actions which is displayed in the ‘self identity strong’, ‘proactive’ and ‘effective’ variables. This person is less aroused but shows pleasure which is demonstrated in the inclusion of both positive emotional items and the use of positive language throughout this narrative ‘positive tone’. The professional has a strong self identify within the narrative; this is displayed by items of ‘masculine’ and ‘prove self’. Youngs and Canter also put forward the idea of others being non-significant to the professional narrative; however in the life-stories this is demonstrated more by the individual focusing on the self. In the narratives of crime, the professional is represented by the association to ‘job-like’ references to their criminal action, in the life-narratives the professional is represented as a proficient ‘proactive’ and ‘effective’ and competent ‘achievements’ individual.

The professional-adventure theme host a number of similar items in both the film and SE SSA-I. However, due to the differences in the types of narrative episodes that are explored a number of differences can be seen. For the professional in the SE narrative a number of items relate to caring for others which are not part of the film narrative. This concept resides around the identity of the narrator and how they present themselves as having a strong self-identity. The caregiver role is that of a person who sees themselves as caring for others and has a strong sense of self-within that role. The film narrative, on the other hand, is more focused around crime actions and how they relate to achievements and psychological gains for the narrator.
The case study provides an example of how the professional narrative would be projected in a person’s life as a film narrative. Narrator 63 projects a number of Fryes (1957) symbolic archetypes within his narrative. For example, narrator 63 discusses a time of personal struggle when overweight, from which he was able to lose weight and find financial and social gain within, through his new identity as a drug dealer. This concept is similar in symbolic meaning to what Frye discussed as ‘taking off his beggar’s rags’ and relinquishing in his riches. The tone of the narrative is positive and the narrator provides a number of examples of how his financial state improved his social life. He also discusses courses he has achieved and how he will use them to put his life back together now the drug-dealing adventure is over. In the narrative, the self-identity of narrator 63 is strong and he discusses a number of job-like attributes; as suggested by Youngs and Canter (2012).

**Narrator 63 – The professional adventure**

...It would be a gangster film. I have had a very troubled life, I used to be 16 ½ stone when I was 14 years old. I became diabetic through being overweight... I lost a lot of weight from then up until I was 23... I got into selling drugs and then everyone wanted to know me. I was just not normal. Being a dealer gives you some kind of gangster credit... I bought my car for cash, paid £11,500 for it, I lived the life. I started selling drugs while I was still with the kid’s mum. It’s a different lifestyle and people associated with it – stunning girls – they were just following the money but so what? It was easy come, easy go, I used to spend £1000 on a night out, some people go out and spend £120 on a night out and are gutted the next day. I never used to drink pints, it was always bottles of champagne or shorts.... The audience would think I was a good guy who had gone wrong but was getting myself back together. I have passed a computer course while I have been in here and done lots of other courses as well. The audience would think my son was brought up wrong, and they would think it was a shame what happened and what he has been through...(pg144, 6-145,11).

**Dominant narrative role: revenger, Archetypal theme: tragedy**

Chapter 6 presents a contamination script which is present in the life-story narratives of offenders. A number of the items which are incorporated into the contamination script also appear in the revenger region of the plot. One of the themes which occurred within the contamination script was a quest for honour – this is also congruent with the revenger narrative and tragedy theme. From Frye’s description of a tragedy theme the protagonist usually starts
with courage and innocence; this innocence is lost and eventually the protagonist falls (pg. 22). The movement of good to bad within the tragedy description is also consistent with the idea of contamination within the narrative; therefore it is not surprising that the revenger – tragedy theme was located in the same region of the plot as the contaminated script.

In a tragedy, the protagonist typically “...determines shape of the life he has created...with implicit comparison with the uncreated potential life he has forsaken...enters a world in which existence itself tragic...” (Frye, 1957, pg. 212). The description Frye presents of the protagonist’s place within the tragedy have two key symbols, the former sees the protagonist shaping his life and the latter is that of a tragic world. Both represent the two key themes in the revenger region of the plot: contamination and cognitive interpretation. The ‘tragic world’ represents the contamination element of the life story this is represented by ‘death’, ‘victimisation’ (SE) and ‘wrong done’. The protagonist then uses a number of cognitive methods to ‘determine the shape of the life he has created’ such cognitive methods are displayed through the use of neutralisation strategies ‘displacement’ and ‘diffusion of responsibility’ and justifications ‘denial responsibility’, ‘denial injury’(SE) for his actions; which occurred as a result of the tragic world.

A further theme in Frye’s tragic mythos is the situation of hostility which brings on the state of revenge, and the fulfilment of the revenge which completes the tragedy (pg. 209). A similar theme is apparent in the revenger region of the plot. In the life-story of the revenger, the protagonist displays hostility towards others ‘hostility’ and is reactive to hostility towards them which is displayed in items ‘reactive’, ‘confronting’ and ‘wrong done to them’. The theme of a quest of honour presented in the previous chapter can also be found in the tragedy theme. Frye states that “...tragic hero possess hybris, a proud, passionate, obsessed or soaring mind which brings about the downfall...” (pg. 210). Such traits are also expressed in the ‘quest for honour’ presented in the case studies in chapter 6.

A final theme in the tragedy is focused on the device which is creating the revenge; this normally stems from an external fate (pg. 222). In fictional literature this is presented as Gods
or other types of omnipotent beings, however in life-stories this is symbolised as other characters that are part of the life-story. For example, ‘power gain’ (film), ‘loyalties’ (SE) and ‘wrong done to them or theirs’ are all devices that create a situation for revenge and all relate to the influence of others in the life-story. The imago that is presented in this region of the plot is that of a ‘warrior’. The warrior is a person who forcefully engages others; the warrior is a symbol of the overall revenge theme within the tragedy narrative.

The dominant narrative theme of a revenger presented by Youngs and Canter (2012), also shares similar themes to the revenger regions of LAAF items. For example, attribution of responsibility to others is expressed in the number of distortions included in this region, such as ‘displacement’, ‘denial responsibility’ and ‘loyalties’. The protagonist also minimises harm through ‘denial of injury’ and lack of attention to other people ‘others as non-significant’. The revenger’s emotional content includes arousal which is expressed through ‘reactive’, ‘confronting’ and ‘aroused negative’ (SE). Finally, others are expressed as not significant through items ‘others non-significant’ and ‘hostility’.

Although a number of similar items are present in both the SE and film narratives, there are some differences between the two to note. The revenger in the film narrative is more hostile and comes from hostile environment that Fryes describes e.g. ‘sad ending’, ‘death’, and ‘condemnation of condemners’. The SE, however, is more centralised around the revengers justifications for their behaviour or reacting to wrong that has been done to them.

The case study below presents an example of the revenger narrative and how the themes are projected into the narrator’s life as a film. Like with Fryes mythos the narrator describes a number of hostile situations that he has experienced in which he has had to act in a confronting manner. He also discusses the idea that it is fate why he ended up in prison. The larger force that Frye describes as Gods that brings on the situations for revenge are represented as his friends and from his ex-girlfriend – each played a role in his confronting and reactive behaviours; in particular his ex-girlfriend. The narrator uses a number of justifications for his behaviour which are usually directed at others he has mentioned in his story.
**Narrator 33 – The revenger tragedy**

...Action – I’m always into something. I’ve gotta be out there. I was going around fighting and getting into trouble. This must have been fate (ending up in prison) because I was getting into trouble a lot with my mates. I was going to the gym, watching cage fights, working security and neglecting the kids. I wasn’t getting on with my the ex and didn’t get on with her mother and father. I beat up her father once. The ex was constantly nagging, wanting to go on holidays with the family and phoning all the time – she would be wrecking my head. I needed some space and would tell her to go out with her mates. But if I went out with her I’d get into fights with guys looking at her. If she was out with her mates she’d phone me and tell me some guy had pawed her and I would race over to her and fight the guys. I think she liked the idea of me fighting for her. Like in the movies, typical women spending all the man’s money. The audience would think I was lucky to get rid of her.

I don’t have problems, I get on with everyone...Some might feel sorry for me but now I’ve met a new girl. But she’ll stop doing lap dancing. Gone up and down. Can’t wait to go to court with my ex bird on one end who ratted me out and my new bird on the other end...(pg74, 29-48).

**Dominant narrative role: victim, Archetypal theme: Irony**

The victim region of the plot also hosts a number of items found in the contamination script from the previous chapter. The items within the victim region are represented by themes of contamination and victimisation. One of the themes presented within the contamination script is that of a victim of circumstance, Fryes description of an irony theme is that an un-idealised existence is present. This theme corresponds with the contamination theme as both are based on the concept of the protagonist situated, in a place, away from a prefect reality.

Frye’s idea of irony has a series of phases, the first relate to comedy and the second relate to tragedy; it is the tragic irony that is presented within the victim narrative theme. The tragedy element is displayed by the overarching ‘tragedy’ (film) genre that is located in this region of the plot in addition to the ‘negative’, ‘negative non-aroused’ emotional content. Frye describes this as “…irony with little satire is the non-heroic residue of tragedy...”(pg. 224). The
world of irony is a world of chaos; this is represented by the victim protagonist as ‘confusion’, ‘contamination’ and ‘betrayal’ (SE).

The theme of a victim of circumstance is present in the contaminated script. This is replicated in the irony theme. Frye describes the irony theme as a world that is full of injustices and crimes. The victim narrative emulates this with the reference to scenes of victimisation and mistreatment that the protagonist endures ‘victimisation’ (film), ‘self victim’, ‘victim’ and ‘disappointment’. All the attacks against the protagonist represent the movement into a more negative state of mind ‘contamination’, ‘impotent’ and ‘confusion’; hence the resemblance of a theme of a tragic irony for the victim narrative.

In the final phase of the irony theme, Fyre states that eventually all the suffering results in death. This theme is represented in the victim narrative through ‘loss of other’ and ‘death’ (SE). However, Frye states that within the chaos there is the idea of hope of being able to get through it all “...others got through it maybe I can...” (pg. 237). This idea is represented by the ‘survivor’ imago that is present within the victim narrative. The survivor represents a person who comes from a harsh environment.

The victim as a dominant narrative role within the life-story also has a number of similarities in the psychological components presented in Youngs and Canters (2012) victim narrative. The victim narrative attributes blame to others which is displayed in the ‘self victim’, ‘victim’ and ‘confusion’ items. The emotional content expressed by the victim protagonist is displeasure ‘impotence’, ‘negative’, ‘non-aroused negative’ and ‘disappointment’. The level of self identity within the narrative is weak ‘self-ID weak’, ‘passive’ and other people are seen as significant within the context of the narrative ‘others significant’ (SE).

One key difference between the victim role in the film and the victim role in the SE resides around more variables relating to relationships in the SE SSA-I. This is likely due to a large number of significant events discussed by the offenders focusing on relationship failures and the loss of significant others. Although items of ‘unity’ and ‘relationship problems’ are presented in the victim region of both the film and SE, additional items of ‘love’ and ‘other as
significant’ are presented in the SE narrative. This is consistent with the themes that are discussed in the SE.

In the example below, narrator 28 presents his life as a sad film. This sad tale presents a protagonist who has moved from something positive (birth of child) to negative (relationship breakdown and drug addiction) presenting a clear elements of a contaminated script. The negative state of mind presented by the protagonist is shown in his evaluation of drug use ‘a life of lies and deceit’ and how it has destroyed his life. He is disappointed with himself and a victim to the drug addiction. However, Frye suggests an idea of hope and being able to get through it all – the survivor imago; narrator 28 discusses this theme at the end of his film narrative with the thought of a happy ending and overcoming his drug addiction.

**Narrator 28 The victim irony**

...It would be a sad film. I brought a daughter into the world and I had everything going for me, but then I had a breakdown of my marriage and I ended up in here. I was married for the wrong reason; I was under pressure from her father to marry her because she was pregnant. I went off the rails and started using crack and heroin and I’m in here now doing a life sentence... My daughter is closest to me; she has been hidden from my lifestyle although she has seen her father deteriorating. A life with heroin is a life of lies and deceit, it has destroyed my life until now, between people and heroin, heroin will always be the winner...It would be a happy ending. What I did was wrong, but I have the support of my family and people in here. I’ll use my time positively and come out a better person. I’ll never do this again as it has destroyed my life. It has taken 5 years out of my life and I feel guilty for what I have done...(pg64, 9-21)

**Dominant narrative role: hero, Archetypal theme: comedy - quest**

Frye (1957) writes that the central element of the comedy plot is the theme of desire where “...a young man wants a young woman and the desires are restricted by the opposition...” (pg. 163), and in this theme the power of action is obtained by the obstacles restricting the protagonist to gain what he desires (pg. 164). The SSA-I items in the hero region of the plot depict a protagonist who is proactive in his action by overcoming the obstacles that are standing in his way ‘overcoming obstacles’ and ‘empowerment’. One of the central ideals in
This narrative theme is the achievements of romantic relationships ‘relationship success’. An additional imago in this region of the plot is that of an ‘escapist’ – this is a person who likes to escape the mundane day to day life; which relates to the move from one society to another, which Frye describes as part of the comedy theme.

The comedy is central to the hero narrative which is demonstrated by the inclusion of the ‘comedy’ (film) genre as overarching theme to the life-story. Frye also writes that weddings are common occurrences in comedy themes. There is a strong element of relationship success within the hero region of the plot with the inclusion of ‘relationship success’ but also other related aspects such as the communion theme of ‘caring’ (film) and a second imago of a ‘caregiver’ (film). The caregiver imago is a person who is sacrifices self for others. This self image is important in the comedy theme where the protagonist faces a number of obstacles to get what he desires.

In reviewing the stages of comedy, Frye writes “…five stages of comedy may be seen as a sequence of stages in the life of a redeemed society… the final stage is part of a settled order…”(pg. 185). The central aspect of this theme is redemption and resettlement which has direct association with the items that formulate the hero narrative in the life-story events. Here, the protagonist in the hero narrative is a redeemed person ‘redemption’ and ‘empowerment’ that has found resettlement through stability factors ‘relationship success’, ‘fulfilment’ and ‘happy ending’ (film). In relation to the life-stories of offenders, the hero narrative is the offender that is able to find redemption and stability in his life-story.

The archetypal theme of comedy-quest is symbolic of the hero region in figures 7.1 and 7.2. In reference to the dominant narratives roles presented by Youngs and Canter (2012), although they are taken from crime accounts, strong associations with this dominant narrative theme in an offenders’ life outside of crime are present. The hero narrative is a protagonist who takes responsibility for his own actions and focuses on his own objectives ‘overcoming obstacles’. In Youngs and Canters emotional content, the hero role shows low arousal. The lack of emotional items in the hero region of the film plot and inclusion of ‘positive non-aroused’ in
the SE adds support to the low arousal as part of this narrative theme. The hero has a strong self-identity within the narrative and others are significant ‘caregiver’ (SE) and ‘relationship success’.

In the film narrative, the hero role also includes elements of imprisonment; it is likely that this is the reason for the redemption. There are also additional items relating to imagoes, comedy genre and happy ending that are not present in the SE. However, the main theme of redemption, empowerment and stability factors are the main similarities across the two narrative episodes.

For narrator 25 the obstacle restricting him from his desires is drug addiction. He discusses his relationship with his partner, who is his best friend and how this is helping to feel empowered to overcome his addiction; depicting one of Frye’s central comedy themes - the romantic relationship. The ‘redeemed society’ is symbolised through narrator 25 discussing how he would like to help others who are experiencing the same things that he has. It is a way of changing something negative into something positive. The role of stability factors are projected in his film narrative by discussing significant others who are offering him support.

**Narrator 25 The hero comedy**

...It would be like an epic with loads of ups and downs. There would be me when I was focused, then me on drugs and me coming into prison. I’ve had a good upbringing, I wasn’t in trouble, I can’t blame no-one except myself. I lived with my parents until I was 18 then I left, I was a grown man. I have my girlfriend and I know right and wrong. My gran’s played a big part in my life story... I’m not soft, I know when I’m doing right and when I’m doing wrong. I’m trying to better myself and stay off the drugs – as soon as I take drugs I will be bad again. All I can see myself doing now is helping people who have had the same experiences as me. Once I have sorted myself out then I will feel good helping others. I’ve got a chance to make it better. Nothing’s going to hold me back, everyone’s supportive of me. I think this will be my last time. I want to give my kids someone to look up to... My partner is also my best friend, she has always been there for me. I can talk to her about anything and everything. She wants to get it back to how it was before the drugs. It would be a happy film, not a sad film but a comedy. The audience would like me although I’d done bad things, I’ve sorted my life out. It would end on a happy note and they’d have tears in their eyes... (pg57, 2-25)
7.3.3. Correlating dominant narrative roles with narrative contexts

The archetypal theme presented in the SSAs (figures 7.1 and 7.2) shows four distinct narrative roles for the film and SE narratives. The roles are broadly similar for both of the narrative contexts. To examine the consistency of the narrative roles across different contexts, the LAAF items which formulated each role were calculated to make a total score for each role in the incarcerated group for the SE and film narratives; using Spearman’s Rho correlation coefficient the level of consistency of each role in each context is calculated. The hero narrative role in the SE was significantly related to the hero role in the film narrative, r=.50, p<.001. The victim narrative role in the SE was significantly related to the victim role in the film narrative, r=.31, p<.05. The revenger narrative role in the SE was not significantly related to the revenger role in the film, r=.21, N.S; however a positive correlation between the two was present. The professional narrative role in the SE was significantly related to the professional narrative role in the film, r=.54, p<.001.

7.4. Chapter Summary and Conclusion: Archetypal themes and life trajectories

The findings of the present study support the idea that life-story narratives illustrate a number of archetypal themes. LAAF variables from the offenders’ life-story narratives were subject to SSA-I to examine the thematic structure of the items. The configuration of LAAF supported four archetypal narrative themes found in Frye’s (1957) fictional mythoi and Canter and Youngs (2009; 2012) and Youngs and Canter (2011; 2012) action system for crime narratives.

The aim was to determine if archetypal themes emerged in the narrative content of the life-story and if the same archetypal themes found in criminal action where present. The inclusion of the dominant narrative themes and the strong symbolic reference to fictional mythoi suggests the same archetypal structure. The correlation of the archetypal themes found in the offenders life-episodes (film and SE) suggest the narrative themes of professional; revenger, victim, and hero are consistent across different life episodes; adding to the validity as dominant narrative themes in narratives of offenders’.
One reason for consistent themes to occur within life stories could be a result of those story forms being innate features of human communication, or the more likely association to culturally bound dominant narratives. Such stories are popular and have a strong association to how events are depicted and communicated in reality.

In general, the archetypal themes for the LAAF variables of the SE and film narrative tended to be consistent in the dominant narrative roles that emerged in relation to the archetypal themes. However, the LAAF items that made up each theme differed to some extent. A difference in the individual items is expected due to the very different nature of the life-episodes that were discussed. For example, the SE is described from an autobiographical event and the film narrative is a projective technique that requires some form of self-reflection. Based on this, differences between the items that make up the dominant themes is expected.

What the study demonstrates is life-stories of offenders and broader life trajectories of offenders show similar thematic structure to archetypal themes from fiction mythoi. This finding adds support to previous research which has suggested that we present ourselves in the form of a dominant narrative (e.g. White & Epston, 1990; McAdams, 1993) and that certain psychological constructs appear within each dominant narrative (e.g. McAdams, 1993; Youngs & Canter, 2012). The use of this knowledge is particularly beneficial to scenarios when it is important to understand the narrators’ version of events, such as during criminal investigations.

In sum, the finding of consistent archetypal themes in life-story narratives provides a tool for uncovering psychological aspects that occur within the narratives. In criminality, such knowledge is useful for interactive situations with the offenders, understanding how the crimes come about, and how much the crimes are presented in the offenders’ life-story can be beneficial to treatment and rehabilitation programmes. The study of the offenders’ life-stories in comparison to the life-stories of non-incarcerated individuals has presented a number of differences in the stories they tell about their lives. Further exploration is needed to explore what, if any, narrative differences are presented when examining narrated accounts of crimes.
in comparison to deviant behaviours. Such knowledge will demonstrate motivation, incentive and opportunity to commit crime. This is examined further in the following two chapters.
Section introduction: Life inside of crime

Life Inside Of Crime (LIC) is defined as the part of the offenders’ life-story that is directly related to the crimes they have committed. This section is in reference to the crime descriptions of the life-story interviews. For the non-incarcerated males, the LIC section is in reference to the socially unacceptable event they described in their life-story interviews. The NRQ is also incorporated in this section of the analysis.

LIC has been explored in many ways within academic literature. Few authors have utilised criminals’ narrative accounts of their crime actions as a method of exploration. The narrative paradigm offers a way of understanding the offender’s reality as it makes sense to them through the stories they tell about their lives. From the studies presented in the previous chapters it is clear that the crimes the offenders’ commit are a large part of their life-stories. Therefore to drive the life-story approach forward in the exploration of criminality, autobiographical accounts of crime episodes and socially unacceptable events are examined. The following chapters (8 & 9) explore criminal and deviant behaviours by: 1) drawing on comparisons of incarcerated offenders’ dominant narrative themes to deviant acts of the non-incarcerated individuals using the NRQ, 2) to examine the thematic differences in the criminal and deviant behaviours between the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals and across psychological classifications of crimes and deviant acts.
Chapter 8
Uncovering Narrative Roles of Criminal and Deviant Action using the Narrative Roles Questionnaire (NRQ): Comparisons with published research

8.1. Introduction

The NRQ provides a tool for the scripted or learned self to be understood in reference to the dominant narrative role that is being played out in the event described; in this case it is the crime or deviant action. The NRQ provides a basis for interpreting the action that goes beyond the narrated account. For example, the use of a questionnaire provides a method for empirical testing that is subject to less interpretation by the researcher, unlike qualitative methods. The NRQ has been designed with the purpose of uncovering narrative roles in an offender sample; the scale is still in its infancy. Existing research that has implemented the NRQ has been focused on incarcerated offenders. The aim is to further test the robustness of the NRQ across a different sample of respondents. Comparisons are made to Youngs and Canter (2011; 2012) narrative themes of convicted criminals identified using the NRQ, to incarcerated criminals crime accounts in the current study and Socially Unacceptable Behaviours (SUBs) described by non-incarcerated individuals. The hypothesis is dominant narratives are robust and will be present in different sample groups and different contexts.


Following a case study review presenting how the narrative themes of professional, revenger, hero, and victim are identified within narrative accounts of crimes in Youngs and Canter (2011), Youngs and Canter (2012) proposed a data collection tool, NRQ, which is able to capture the same narrative themes. The findings demonstrate interesting applications of the NRQ for understanding the core psychological components of affect state, self-identity and cognitive interpretations which are associated with narrative analysis. Each is presented in a range of modalities based on the NAS themes.
The professional is identified with a high potency and low intimacy narrative role. The role includes taking responsibility for actions, being less aroused and a strong self-identity. The revenger is identified with a low potency, low intimacy narrative. Responsibility is attributed to others and harm is minimised, they disclose elements of arousal and self-identity is weak. The hero is identified as a high potency, high intimacy narrative, and takes responsibility for actions and focuses on own objectives, low arousal, and self identity is strong. Finally, the victim identifies a low potency, high intimacy narrative. Responsibility is attributed to others; there are elements of displeasure and a weak self-identity.

8.1.2. Broader themes of criminal and Socially Unacceptable Behaviour (SUBs)

By exploring criminal action together with SUBs a wider pool of psychological variance in the behaviours is available creating a more enriched dataset for exploring the psychological components that underpin the dominant narrative themes within the NRQ. From this, comparisons can be made to explore if the psychological components that are in Youngs and Canter’s (2012) use of the NRQ are solely a product of a criminal narrative or part of wider forms of narrative construction. This was achieved by comparing the psychological content of the NRQ responses in an incarcerated group of offenders and a group of non-incarcerated individuals (who represent the wider public).

In reviewing criminals narratives Presser (2009) suggests a narrative is made up of core components: cognitive interpretation, emotion, and self-identity. More recently, Youngs and Canter (2012) found each of their dominant narrative themes were underpinned by a range of modalities of the same core narrative components. It is hypothesised that narratives of socially unacceptable behaviour will have similar psychological components to criminal behaviour.

The overall aim is to explore the structural content of the NRQ in relation to the narrative themes and psychological components identified in previous research, by assessing its robustness across different samples and contexts. It is hypothesised that dominant narrative roles, found in Youngs and Canter (2012), will be replicated in criminals’ responses to the NRQ and will show robustness across broader themes of criminal and SUBs. The study aims to
answer the following research questions: Are the four dominant narrative roles dominant in socially unacceptable behaviour? Does socially unacceptable behaviour show the same psychological components as criminal behaviour? When considering the broader themes of criminal and socially unacceptable behaviour is the same psychological structure present?

8.2. Method

NRQ responses from 62 incarcerated offenders and 85 non-incarcerated individuals were explored in the first part of the analysis for narrative themes using the Youngs and Canter (2012) NRQ classifications. Participants completed the NRQ in relation to a socially unacceptable event (for the non-incarcerated individuals) or a crime (for the offenders) they had described during the life-narrative interviews. Combined NRQ responses from the same 85 non-incarcerated individuals and 62 incarcerated offenders were utilised for the second part of the analysis.

8.2.1. Data Analysis strategy

To assess if socially unacceptable NRQ responses show similar narrative components to criminal behaviour a number of analyses will be conducted. First, the NRQ responses from the offender group will be subjected to SSA-I analysis, using Pearsons correlation co-efficient in HUDAP, to establish if a similar item configuration, and subsequent dominant narrative themes, fits with findings from Youngs and Canter (2012). This method allows for the co-occurrence of each of the items to be measured against each other, enabling a graphical representation of the variables to be produced. A full description of SSA-I is given in chapter 6. Sub-scales of the dominant narrative themes will be formulated form the NRQ items and correlated, using Spearman’s Rho correlations in SPSS, to the four narrative themes – hero, victim, revenger and professional - identified in the film and SE narratives, in chapter 7. This is to determine if psychological consistency, in the dominant narrative themes, can be established over different narrative contexts.
The NRQ responses from non-incarcerated SUBs are also subjected to a SSA-I analysis. A Pearson's correlation coefficient is used; this coefficient complies with the likert scale responses of the NRQ. Using the proposed items for each dominant narrative role in the Youngs and Canter (2012) paper comparisons will be drawn from the incarcerated and non-incarcerated SSA-I plots. Chronbachs alpha will be used to assess the internal consistency of the items that make up each of the narrative roles for both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated SSA-I configurations. This will answer the research question: are the four roles – hero, victim, revenger and professional – are dominant in SUBs. Further interpretations of the SSA-I of the SUBs will explore the psychological components that underpin the narrative roles, offering alternative explanations for the configuration of the items; and, assessing if psychological themes that are found in SUBs are similar to those Youngs and Canter suggest are present in criminal behaviour.

Secondly, the incarcerated and non-incarcerated NRQ responses will be combined to explore the broader themes of criminal and deviant behaviours. SSA-I analysis with Pearson's correlation is applied to the combined NRQ responses. The Youngs and Canter (2012) item definitions of the narrative roles is used to interpret the SSA-I structure and Chronbach's alpha is implemented to assess the internal consistency of the items for each of the narrative roles. Principal component analysis with varimax rotation will be applied using SPSS to assess the substructures of the NRQ. As this is an exploratory analysis of the broader themes of criminal and deviant action, no assumptions will be made about the regions that have emerged within the structure of the SSA-I for the dominant narrative roles in the PCA; providing a further testing of the SSA-I structure. One way of doing this is to use an orthogonal (varimax) rotation in the PCA; this is used when the components are expected to be independent. Research that has implement the NRQ has examined its structure using SSA-I; the PCA will act as a further exploratory method of examining the substructures of the scale. One limitation in assuming the components are independent is that information may be lost if the components correlate, an alternative method would be to implement an oblique rotation. However, due to the exploratory nature of the current study an orthogonal rotation was considered sufficient to
further assess the validity of the NRQ as a measure of dominant narrative roles. Nonetheless, for future developments of this research it would be interesting to see how the components would emerge using an oblique rotation.

PCA and Factor Analysis (FA) are both primarily a data reduction methods which condense observed variables into a set of new variables (Velicer & Jackson, 1990). For example, they are used to condense items of a measurement tool into co-existing groups (components or factors), which allows for further interpretation of the underlying psychological constructs which governs that respective aspect of the scale. The reason for interpreting the underlying constructs of scales and questionnaires is because of the difficulties found in measuring behaviours due to the range of psychological processors that are involved. A number of items will be needed to measure the different aspects of the particular behaviour the scale sets out to measure; therefore it is important to consider whether the items are measuring the same underlying construct (Field, 2009).

Although PCA and FA have many similarities, one difference is that in a FA only the variance shared between the variables is described; furthermore Clark-Cater (2004; pg.350) states that a FA makes assumptions based on the variables as indicators of latent factors. PCA, on the other hand, considers all the variance that is unique to a variable (including error variance) and summarises the information into a smaller set of components (or factors) (Clark-Carter, 2004). PCA allows the inter-correlations among all the variables to be explored. In doing so, the pattern of the observed inter-correlations is displayed in the higher-order components that are produced. The PCA method allows the profile among the participants to be tested to see if unity or differences within the pattern of the variables is observed (Clark-Carter, 2004). The main uses of data reduction methods such as, FA or PCA are: 1) to understand the structure of a set or items (or variables); 2) to construct a questionnaire and measure an underlying variable; and 3) to reduce a dataset whilst still retaining the original information (Field, 2009, pg. 628).
To summarise, FA is an extension of PCA and is considered a controversial method due to the subjective nature of the decision making made by the researcher following the analysis (Clark-Cater, 2004; Field, 2009); avoiding confirmation bias made by the researcher (Velicer & Jackson, 1990). PCA, however, provides an output similar to that of a FA but in a more simplistic format which considers all the variance provided by each variable. Furthermore, PCA is a useful exploratory method which can be used to assess the underlying structure of scale items through condensing the items into components. Velicer and Jackson (1990) state that exploratory methods are useful at the initial stages of a theory, the narrative model that Youngs and Canter (2011; 2012) propose is still in the early stages of development and thus the exploratory analyses are deemed more appropriate than confirmatory methods, at this stage. Therefore, to explore the substructures of the NRQ with the broader themes of criminal and deviant action, the PCA with a varimax rotation is considered a suitable method to answer the research questions.

Finally, to demonstrate what themes of components from the PCA underpin the narrative themes, the NRQ items that make up each of the components that emerged in the PCA will be displayed in the SSA-I configuration. Finally, differences in the PCA components between the two participant groups will be explored. Subscales will be formulated for each of the components in SPSS, Mann Whitney U test of difference will be used to assess if any significant differences occur between the two groups for each of the PCA components.

8.3. Results

8.3.1. Comparing NRQ findings to Youngs and Canter (2012)

8.3.1.1. SSA configuration and dominant narrative structure

The NRQ items were inter-correlated using Pearson’s coefficient and subject to SSA-I. Figures 8.1 and 8.2 show the first projection (vector 1v2) of a three-dimensional plot. The plot is labelled with a brief summary of the NRQ item each point represents. The COA are 0.148 (for the offenders, figure 8.1) and 0.144 (for the non-incarcerated, figure 8.2) indicating a good level
of fit for the points within the geometric space. To allow visible comparisons to be made each plot has been given a key which displays the NRQ items that are represented by each of the four dominant narrative themes suggested by Youngs and Canter (2012). Divisions have been included to highlight the geometric region occupied by each cluster of narrative items.

For the crime action of the offenders, the structure of the NRQ items within the SSA-I configuration, show the same thematic structure to SSA-I configuration in Youngs and Canter (2012). The configuration of the items in 8.1 shows four distinct regions of items that relate to the four proposed narrative themes. The structure of the regions is also the same as Youngs and Canter, with the high intimacy items (victim and hero) on the opposite side of the plot to the low intimacy items (revenger and professional). The configuration of the items also shows the narrative themes replicate the same affect states and self identity components as suggested by Youngs and Canter (2012).
Figure 8.1. SSA configuration of NRQ responses for the crime behaviours disclosed by the incarcerated sample

Table 8.1. Internal consistency of NRQ items for each narrative role from the incarcerated offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Role</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>REVENGER</th>
<th>HERO</th>
<th>VICTIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>.915</td>
<td>.825</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No items</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the SUBs disclosed by the non-incarcerated males, the structure of the NRQ items, within the SSA-I configuration, displays similar thematic structure to the criminal events disclosed in Youngs and Canters (2012) sample. The configuration of the items in figure 8.2 shows three distinct regions of item themes that relate to the dominant narrative role from the previous findings. To the left of the plot are the items that relate to a professional narrative. In the centre of the plot are the items that depict a revenger narrative. To the right of the plot is the items relating to a victim narrative. The items that relate to a hero narrative, however, are not all located in the same thematic region of the plot. Each of the hero items are presented in the same thematic region of the plot as the other dominant narrative themes. Therefore, in the case of SUBs the hero narrative is not considered as a dominant narrative theme but rather a combination role.
Figure 8.2. SSA configuration of NRQ responses for the socially unacceptable behaviours disclosed in the non-incarcerated sample

Table 8.2. Internal consistency of NRQ items for each narrative role from the non-incarcerated sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Role</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>REVENGER</th>
<th>HERO</th>
<th>VICTIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \alpha )</td>
<td>.832</td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No items</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In comparison to the NRQ item configuration in the Youngs and Canter paper and the replicated SSA-I for the criminals in figure 8.1, the SUBs show little support for the themed regions for four dominant narrative roles. In the Youngs and Canter SSA-I the item distribution in the plot is situated around two polarising facets of intimacy and potency. The dominant narrative themes are then a combination of high or low levels of intimacy and potency; this is replicated in figure 8.1. However, this structure is not present in the current SSA-I configuration for the SUBs in figure 8.2. The configuration shows that both intimacy and potency is distributed in a linear formation. The linear pattern of intimacy shows low intimacy to the left of the plot with the professional items and high intimacy to the right of the plot with the victim items. The high potency items are to the left of the plot with the professional items and the low potency at the right of the plot with the victim items. One reason for this difference in the potency and intimacy of the narratives is due to the distribution of the hero items. A good level of internal consistency of the NRQ items for the four roles within the socially unacceptable behaviours (see table 8.2) is presented; however the hero role was the lowest.

8.3.1.2. Psychological component interpretations of SSA

Cognitive interpretation is represented by how the event is perceived and then articulated by the individual. Within SSA-I structure in figure 8.2 a cognitive acceptance scale is visible. Within in the scale three different modalities are presented. The first is to the left of the plot, the items in this region support the notion that the individual has taken full responsibility for the cognitive interpretation of the events. This is articulated by statements such as ‘I knew what I was doing’, ‘I was in control’, and ‘it all went to plan’. The centre region indicates a section where cognitive responsibility for the event is minimized. This is indicated by statements such as ‘It was the only thing to do’, ‘I had to do it’, ‘I was getting my own back’, and ‘It was my only choice’. In this section the protagonist is not denying they were part of the action but rather placing the blame on to circumstance ‘It was fate’. The final region, to the right of the plot, represents items where the cognitive responsibility is attributed to others. In this section the protagonist does not feel involved in the activity ‘It was like I wasn’t part of it’, but also that others are to blame for what happened ‘I was a victim’, I was helpless’.
The configuration of the items in the plots also relates to a thematic structure of emotional arousal. This has two modalities: high and low arousal. The low arousal items are located in the upper region of the plot. The protagonist with low arousal sees the SUB as nothing special ‘nothing special’ and something that occurs on a regular basis, ‘usual day’, and ‘it was a routine’. Conversely, in the lower region of the plot are the items that relate to high arousal. The highly aroused protagonist demonstrates enthusiasm of the SUB ‘exciting’, ‘adventure’. The highly aroused protagonist also demonstrates a strong focus on the task ‘I couldn’t stop myself’, ‘nothing else mattered’.
The high level of emotional arousal and the low level of positive emotions in the lower right hand region may be due to cognitive dissonance experienced when taking part in the socially unacceptable behaviour. This would explain why, in this region of the plot, the cognitive responsibility for the behaviour is attributed to others. Therefore being aroused during behaviours that cause displeasure would result in a need to blame others for the things that have occurred. This may have occurred when the individual knew what they were doing was socially unacceptable.

Although the configuration of the items in figure 8.1 and figure 8.2 are differentiated in terms of the location of the hero roles, the figures do show key similarities for dominant narrative themes of victim, revenger and professional, in particular, the psychological components that underpin the narrative roles. For example, the deviant behaviour in figure 8.2 show distinct modalities in the cognitive interpretation and identity within the event, level of arousal and differences in intimacy and potency. Each is similar to the different modalities presented by Youngs and Canter and replicated in figure 8.1; suggesting that the SUBs described by the non-incarcerated individuals are underpinned by the same narrative roles as the crimes described by the incarcerated offenders, with the exception of the hero role.

8.3.1.3. Correlating dominant narrative themes with narrative contexts for incarcerated offenders

Four dominant narrative roles of hero, victim, revenger and professional have been found in the SE and film narratives of offenders. To examine the consistency of the narrative roles across different contexts the narrative roles from the SE and film LAAF items were correlated with the narrative roles from the crime NRQ for the incarcerated offenders. No significant correlations were found. The hero role from the NRQ was not significantly correlated with the hero role in the SE r=-.04, N.S or film narrative r=-.07, N.S. The victim role from the NRQ was not significantly correlated with the victim role in the SE r=-.12, N.S or the film narrative r=.03, N.S. The revenger role from the NRQ was not significantly correlated, the revenger role in the SE r=-.04, N.S, or film narrative r=-.02, N.S. The professional role in the NRQ
was not significantly correlated with the professional role in the SE $r=-.09$, N.S, or film narrative $r=-.01$, N.S.

The low level of the correlation presented between the NRQ with the LAAF items suggests little correlation between the two; the reason for such findings is likely due to the different measures that are used to assess the narrative roles. For example, the NRQ is based on a self report measure which the offenders completed for a crime they had discussed, however the narrative roles presented from the LAAF has a number of complex psychological items that have been coded from the offenders' descriptions of a SE and life as a film. A further way of assessing psychological consistency would be to use elements of the LAAF framework that are relevant to a crime description to code up and assess the roles.

8.3.2. Substructures and regionality in broader themes of criminal and socially unacceptable behaviour

The next section explores dominant narrative roles and the underpinning psychological themes identified in the broader context of criminal and deviant behaviours. This was achieved by combining the NRQ responses for incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals'. PCA components are identified in the SSA-I configuration.

Combined NRQ responses were inter-correlated using Pearson’s coefficient and subject to SSA-I. Figure 8.4 displays the first projection (vector 1v2) of a three-dimensional solution. The COA of 0.136 indicated a good level of fit for the points within the geometric space. Thematic regions have been applied to the plot in relation to the dominant narrative roles presented in Youngs and Canter (2012). Items relating to the four narrative roles have emerged in four distinct regions of the plot. The configuration of the items is similar to those presented in the SSA-I from Youngs and Canter. For example, the high potency items (hero and professional) are on the opposite side of the plot to the low potency items (victim and revenger). The high intimacy items (victim and hero) are on the opposite side of the plot to low intimacy items (professional and revenger).
In figure 8.4, the items depicting a hero narrative role have a clear thematic region in the structure of the items. A clear thematic region for the hero items is displayed in NRQ items for criminal behaviours displayed in the Youngs and Canter paper and in figure 8.1, but no clear thematic structure is present for the hero items when the SUBs were examined alone. The lack of thematic structure for the hero items in figure 8.2 suggests this theme as a dominant narrative role is a characteristic of criminal behaviour and not in low levels of deviancy.

Figure 8.4. SSA of NRQ items for incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals
Table 8.3. Internal consistency of NRQ items for each narrative role from the combined incarcerated offenders and non-incarcerated individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Role</th>
<th>PROFESSIONAL</th>
<th>REVENGER</th>
<th>HERO</th>
<th>VICTIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>.868</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No items</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.3.2.1. Principal component analysis

A principal component analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation was conducted on the 33 items of the NRQ for 147 questionnaire responses. The correlation matrix was observed for individual items to make sure each of the items was correlating with each of the other items. Those items with less than three items correlating at less than 0.3 were removed and the PCA was reapplied to the remaining items. Items that met this criteria included: ‘I was confused about what was happening’ (2 correlations), ‘I just wanted to get it over with’ (2 correlations), ‘It was like I wasn’t part of it’ (1 correlation), and ‘There was nothing special about what happened’ (0 correlations). Therefore those items were removed; according to Field (2009) items with so few correlations have little to no correlation with other items in the analysis.

The analysis was re-run with the remaining 29 items. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure indicated the sample size was adequate, KMO=.772. Bartlett’s test of sphericity $\chi^2(406)=2291.56, p<0.001$, indicated that items were sufficiently large for PCA. Seven components emerged with Eigen values greater than 1 and explained 66% of the variance. Table 8.4 shows the factor loadings for each item in the components after rotation. Thematic examination of the items that cluster on each of the components is displayed in table 8.5.

The PCA analysis does not present components that relate directly to the dominant narrative roles. However, the themes do support the underlying psychological components that each of the narrative roles represent. The PCA emotional components are pleasure, cognitive interpretation components are habit, vengeance and blame, and self-identity components are approval, focus, experience and disapproval. The structure of how each component relates to the dominant narrative themes is presented in figure 8.5.
Table 8.4. NRQ item loadings from PCA analysis using varimax rotation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was interesting</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was like an adventure</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was fun</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.130</td>
<td>-.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was exciting</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>-.137</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was getting my own back</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was trying to get revenge</td>
<td>-.194</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was the only thing to do</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was right</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>-.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to do it</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>-.161</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>-.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was my only choice</td>
<td>-.126</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.247</td>
<td>-.124</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was routine</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was doing a job</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.796</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me, it was like a usual days</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.771</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was like a professional</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I knew what I was doing</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>-.151</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had power</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was helpless</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>-.610</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>-.308</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was a victim</td>
<td>-.268</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.605</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It all went to plan</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was in control</td>
<td>.358</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I couldn’t stop myself</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was a mission</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t care what would happen</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>-.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing else mattered</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.456</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>-.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was looking for recognition</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was a manly thing to do</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was happening was just fate</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I guess I always knew it was going to happen</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I knew I was taking a risk</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalue | 6.696  | 4.300  | 2.607  | 1.712  | 1.548  | 1.345  | 1.089  |
Variance %  | 23     | 15     | 9      | 6      | 5      | 5      | 4      |
α           | .926   | .812   | .817   | .704*  | .669   | .700   | .595   |
**8.3.2.2. PCA and SSA-I**

The configuration of the plot demonstrates how each of the psychological themes underpins the dominant narrative roles. The themes that are presented in the professional narrative are: pleasure, habit, experience and some elements of blame. From the descriptions of the professional role (see Canter & Youngs, 2009; Youngs & Canter, 2011; 2012) is a person that has an overall understanding of what they are doing and their role within the criminal or deviant behaviours (habit). They have a strong awareness of themselves within the event (experience) and enjoy taking part in the action (pleasure).

The components underpinning the hero narrative are focus, approval and disapproval. Youngs and Canter (2012) describe the Hero role as “…its focus on proving oneself and being part of a greater mission…” (pg. 11). The association of self-awareness components of focus and approval support this narrative role. The disapproval element fits into what Youngs and Canter suggest as being part of the bravado that is associated with the hero narrative role.

The majority of items that represent the revenger narrative are also correlated with the items in the vengeance components. Other components that underpin the revenger narrative are focus and blame. The revenger role is a person who sees their actions as being conducted for a particular purpose; this is represented by the self-identity theme of focus. The criminal and deviant action of a revenger is due to being part of some form of victimisation which is represented in the cognitive interpretation theme of blame. Due to the victimisation he is able to provide a level of justification with his responses and actions; this is demonstrated through cognitive interpretation theme of vengeance.

The victim narrative role is represented by one underlying component, which is disapproval. The disapproval component relates to items of self-identity where the individual sees their offending or deviant action as a something they are not part, a false action that was conducted by them due to being confused or helpless.
The dominant narrative themes do not have a single set of psychological components that only underpin that theme. For example, both the professional and the revenger narratives share the component of blame, the revenger and hero narratives share the component of focus and the victim and hero narratives share the component of disproval. This supports the idea of overarching themes which can relate to intimacy (communion based) and potency (agency based) and fluctuating levels of both within the narrative themes.

8.3.2.3. Component differences in participant groups

Mann Whitney U test of difference was carried out to examine differences in the PCA components for the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. The results are displayed in

Figure 8.5. SSA-I configuration from Figure 8.3 with the PCA components identified
Table 8.5. For each component when a significant difference was present the non-incarcerated individuals presented a higher median. The preference for pleasure, experience, and approval by the non-incarcerated group may be a product of the SUB behaviour they discussed. Further exploration of the differences between the two groups for psychological components across crime types, is discussed in the following chapter.

Table 8.5. PCA component themes and central tendency comparisons of participant groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>INCARCERATED Median (SIQR)</th>
<th>NON-INCARCERATED Median (SIQR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em><em>1. PLEASURE</em> (Emotion)</em>*</td>
<td>7 (3.75)</td>
<td>12 (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. VENGEANCE (Interpretation)</td>
<td>10 (4.62)</td>
<td>9.5 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. HABIT (Interpretation)</td>
<td>9 (4.12)</td>
<td>8 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. EXPERIENCE</strong>* (Self-awareness)**</td>
<td>5 (3.0)</td>
<td>7 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. FOCUS (Self-awareness)</td>
<td>8 (3.0)</td>
<td>9 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. APPROVAL</strong>* (Self-awareness)**</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
<td>3 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. BLAME (Interpretation)</td>
<td>7.5 (2.5)</td>
<td>7 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. DISPROVAL (items removed from PCA)</td>
<td>11 (4.0)</td>
<td>11 (4.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.001, ***p<0.05

8.4. Chapter Summary and Conclusion: Dominant narrative roles of deviant and criminal action

The dominant narrative roles provide themes for underlying psychological components exploring how the individual understands the events they discuss, their emotional association with the event, how they place themselves within the event, and interpersonal interactions with their environment and others. For criminal and deviant action, the use of dominant narratives can offer an integrated framework of how the criminal and deviant behaviour is interpreted by those who commit the action. One way of uncovering the dominant narrative roles in criminal action was put forward by Youngs and Canter (2012) and is known as the NRQ. The NRQ is a novel tool; the present findings present a series of analyses in support of the reliability and validity of the NRQ as a method for uncovering of dominant narrative roles.
The thematic structure of the NRQ items, for SUB behaviours, demonstrated three of the four dominant narratives were present in the deviant behaviours. Little evidence was found to support the hero role as a dominant narrative. The configurations of the NRQ items, in relation to the psychological components, were different to the Youngs and Canter item configuration. This is expected when different samples are explored. However, the psychological themes that were present in the narrative roles presented in the SUB NRQ responses matched those presented in criminal responses, with the exception of the hero role. The findings support the hypothesis and suggest that the dominant narrative roles are robust in their psychological classifications of behaviours over different samples.

The second section of the analyses aimed to further explore the dominant narrative roles by combining the NRQ response for the criminal and deviant behaviours. Due to the psychological variance in criminal and deviant behaviours, combining the two provides a more enriched dataset for uncovering the psychological components in narratives. The SSA-I configuration showed support for the four dominant narrative roles. As the hero role was not present in the deviant action but was present in criminal action and the combined criminal and deviant action; it was concluded that the hero role, as a dominant narrative is a product of criminal action. PCA for the combined NRQ responses identified a number of components that linked with the psychological themes of the narrative roles, complementing the SSA-I configuration.

In sum, dominant narratives, in both criminal and deviant behaviour, are governed by the same underlying psychological processors. This suggests criminal and non-criminals show similar narrative styles in terms of precursors to offending and deviant action. Further exploration of the narrative patterns of incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals is explored in the following chapter. The current study demonstrates the NRQ is a reliable and valid measure of dominant narrative roles. The internal consistency for the narrative themes, for both criminal and deviant action and combined criminal and deviant action, show the scale has a good level of internal reliability for measuring dominant narrative roles. The consistent
findings of the psychological components for the NRQ, from the SSA-I and PCA, shows the scale is a valid measure of dominant narratives in criminal action.
Chapter 9

Differentiating Narratives of Criminal and Deviant Acts: What narratives underpin criminality?

9.1. Introduction

The objective is to explore what psychological components differentiate criminal and deviant behaviours. Tarry and Emler (2007) put forward the idea of a delinquency continuum; this relates to a spectrum of behaviours which range in severity. The idea is that deviant actions and crime actions would be at opposing ends of the continuum. To develop a systematic framework for exploring psychological components criminal and deviant acts are classified into similar categories based on the incentive of the act.

The classification system of Property–Person–Sensory (PPS) is based on Bandura’s (1986) human incentives. Youngs (2006) has demonstrated how three of the Bandura’s seven incentives: financial/material gain, power/status gain, and sensory gain are found in criminal action; the three incentives formed the basis of the PPS classification system. In the current classification system property actions are classified as the act of taking something from another. The gain is obtaining the property whether material or financial. Person acts are classified when the act of imposing violence on another person. The violence provides the gain as it relates to power over another person and the violence is not committed as part of the action of gaining property from another. Sensory or internal actions are classified as the act of obtaining something that benefits the individual but is not done by taking something from an unwilling person or imposing power over another.

One problem with classifying crimes is, in some cases, the crime may overlap with other classifications. For example, the primary incentive in an arson crime is the sensory arousal but elements of property will be involved, as with robbery where the primary incentive is the material gain however there will be person aspects involved. The primary aim (or incentive) of the crime was implemented into the classification remit. A similar variation of Property-Person-Sensory as a classification system for crime types has been applied to previous research. For
example, Chen and Howitt (2007) classified the offenders in their research into theft, violence and drugs crimes.

The PPS system is concerned with the primary incentive of the act, therefore acts when a secondary crime was committed as part of the main task are classified by the primary incentive of the act. For example, during a burglary the offender is disturbed and assaults the person who disturbed him the crime would be classified as the primary incentive which was the burglary. Secondly, the offenders in the present sample have committed a range of crimes the PPS system offers a method of psychological differentiation that is based on the offenders’ motives. Thirdly, the PPS system also allows a method for differentiation that was applicable to the deviant acts in addition to the criminal acts. Like criminal actions, the PPS system allows deviant actions to be differentiated in reference to their primary incentive. Clear comparisons can be made between the actions of the incarcerated offenders and the non-incarcerated individuals.

In sum, the acts are classified in the following format:

The property crimes related to those crimes where obtaining property was the primary incentive, such as, acquisitive crimes like burglary, and shoplifting.

The person crimes related to crimes against a person and where there was a clear victim present, such as murder and assault.

The sensory crimes related to drugs, driving and arson are considered to have a sensory or internal representation to the individual; the actions in this group are classed as sensory incentive.

The aims are to examine if dominant narrative roles are present in different crime types, to uncover psychological components that are discussed in narrative descriptions of crime action, and to make comparisons to a sample of narrative descriptions of deviant actions. The research questions are: will different crime types relate to a particular narrative role? The
thematic analysis aims to explore the research question, where does deviancy end and criminality begin?

9.2. Method

9.2.1. Data

Crime and deviant actions were thematically analysed into the PPS categories. Data was removed because a) the participant had not completed the NRQ or b) there were few acts of the same kind.

Narrative Roles Questionnaire (NRQ) responses from 62 incarcerated offenders and 85 non-incarcerated individuals were used in the first section of the analysis.

For the second section, transcripts of the narrated accounts were thematically analysed. A snap-shot selection of crimes and socially unacceptable events were incorporated into the thematic analysis. The crime and deviant action section of the interview provided a substantial amount of data for the qualitative analysis.

9.2.2. Data analysis strategy

A one-way analysis of variance will be applied to each of the individual NRQ items to assess if a significant difference is presented in the items across the three PPS categories for incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals, using SPSS. The mean score for each item will identify the PPS category which is higher for each item, this can be established even when no significant difference is presented. This is a descriptive exercise aimed to address the first research question – whether particular narrative roles underpinned a crime type. The use of multiple comparisons, in this case, is used to examine each of the individual items of the NRQ, rather than the aggregate items representing each of the dominant narrative roles. It is thought this method would identify differences that are presented in each of the individual NRQ items that may have been overlooked when only examining the items as an aggregate for each narrative role; offering a descriptive overview of the NRQ responses, for each crime type, that can be extended by future research.
To answer the final research question – where does deviancy end and criminality begin – a thematic analysis was conducted on the interview transcripts. First of all the interviews are separated into PPS categories, for both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. Secondly, a set of crimes and socially unacceptable events, for each category, will be identified for the thematic analysis. This method will allow similarities and differences in the narratives of the crimes and SUBs to be established using themes that are discussed by the narrators. The behaviors that are involved in many SUBs are the same as those involved in crimes; therefore by drawing on themes described by the narrators underlying psychological differences between the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individual will be identified.

One of the advantages that thematic qualitative analysis offers over methods such as discourse analysis and phenomenological analysis is that it is flexible in terms of how the themes are drawn from the data, and what data it can be used with (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis is a method of analysing and categorising information in the data into similar themes, like all qualitative data it is concerned with exploring the similarities within the dataset.

To generate themes, the transcripts were read and re-read to familiarise with concepts that are visible within the content of the narrative interviews. Themes were then recorded using a theme sheet for each of the PPS action categories. The use of a theme sheet allows sub-themes to be more readily identified. For example, all of the quotes that represent the theme of blame are recorded on the theme sheet, once grouped together similarities and differences in the broader context of the theme of blame can be identified by the quotes, therefore sub-themes can be identified. This method allows the themes that occur within the PPS actions to be identified and also how they are similar or different across each of the action groups to be explored.

9.3. Results Section

9.3.1. NRQ themes and action classifications

In total, 26 different crimes from 70 different offenders and 33 deviant acts from 89 non-incarcerated males were disclosed in during the life narrative interviews. The themes of
property, person and sensory acts are summarised in table 9.1. A high amount of sensory acts are discussed by the non-incarcerated group in comparison to the incarcerated offenders where the sensory related acts are the lowest. In relation to Bandura’s (1986) incentives; sensory actions are associated with new and stimulating experiences that create some form of pleasure for the person committing the act (Youngs, 2006). Sensory gains are different to material and power incentive expressed in by the property and person acts. There is an internal element, for example the behaviours do not have a direct victim; the gain is an internal aspect such as emotional reward for the person committing the act.

Table 9.1. Summary of PPS classifications in criminal and deviant actions discussed by participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INCARCERATED*</th>
<th>NON-INCARCERATED*</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROPERTY</td>
<td>n=27 (39%)</td>
<td>n=24 (27%)</td>
<td>N=51  (32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td>n=26 (37%)</td>
<td>n=24 (27%)</td>
<td>N=50  (31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENSORY</td>
<td>n=17 (24%)</td>
<td>n=41 (46%)</td>
<td>N=58  (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>N=70</td>
<td>N=89</td>
<td>N=159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*% calculated from group total not over all total
Table 9.2. Crime classifications and NRQ items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRQ ITEM</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>PROPERTY</th>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>SENSORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was like a professional*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.71 (1.73)</td>
<td>1.45 (1.05)</td>
<td>2.27 (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was fun*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.21 (1.14)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.63)</td>
<td>1.82 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was interesting</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.21 (1.35)</td>
<td>1.60 (0.82)</td>
<td>2.18 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was like an adventure</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.54 (1.47)</td>
<td>1.60 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.18 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was in control</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.54 (1.44)</td>
<td>2.50 (1.53)</td>
<td>2.27 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was exciting</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.92 (1.69)</td>
<td>1.90 (1.02)</td>
<td>2.36 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It all went to plan*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.42 (1.64)</td>
<td>1.20 (.61)</td>
<td>1.18 (.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had power</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>3.13 (1.42)</td>
<td>2.85 (1.66)</td>
<td>2.64 (1.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just wanted to get it over with</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>2.50 (1.50)</td>
<td>1.80 (1.10)</td>
<td>2.27 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was a mission</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.67 (1.46)</td>
<td>2.40 (1.27)</td>
<td>2.27 (1.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I couldn’t stop myself</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.75 (1.32)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.70)</td>
<td>2.82 (1.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was the only thing to do*</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.54 (1.25)</td>
<td>2.05 (1.60)</td>
<td>1.27 (.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing else mattered</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.50 (1.53)</td>
<td>2.95 (1.63)</td>
<td>2.18 (1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was my only choice</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.04 (1.51)</td>
<td>2.70 (1.45)</td>
<td>2.27 (1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t care what would happen*</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.75 (1.59)</td>
<td>2.90 (1.55)</td>
<td>1.45 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was trying to get revenge*</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.50 (1.02)</td>
<td>2.35 (1.59)</td>
<td>1.0 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was getting my own back*</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.38 (.92)</td>
<td>2.40 (1.63)</td>
<td>1.09 (.30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was a victim</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1.46 (.93)</td>
<td>2.35 (1.56)</td>
<td>1.91 (1.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>2.21 (1.50)</td>
<td>2.55 (1.50)</td>
<td>2.09 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was confused</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.33 (1.65)</td>
<td>1.40 (.99)</td>
<td>2.82 (1.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me, it was like a usual days work*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>4.04 (1.42)</td>
<td>2.70 (1.68)</td>
<td>4.09 (1.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I knew I was taking a risk*</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.0 (1.53)</td>
<td>2.45 (1.57)</td>
<td>3.27 (1.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I guess I always knew it was going to happen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.04 (1.39)</td>
<td>1.65 (1.18)</td>
<td>3.18 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was routine</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.38 (1.61)</td>
<td>1.85 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.73 (1.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was doing a job</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.04 (1.54)</td>
<td>2.85 (1.49)</td>
<td>4.09 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to do it</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.13 (1.45)</td>
<td>2.60 (1.56)</td>
<td>2.64 (1.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was happening was just fate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.38 (.87)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.37)</td>
<td>2.18 (1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was looking for recognition</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.54 (1.10)</td>
<td>1.30 (.92)</td>
<td>1.91 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was like I wasn’t part of it</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.92 (1.38)</td>
<td>1.95 (1.31)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was a manly thing to do</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.33 (.70)</td>
<td>1.70 (1.30)</td>
<td>1.73 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was nothing special about what happened</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.71 (1.19)</td>
<td>1.84 (1.01)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was helpless</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1.83 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.0 (1.52)</td>
<td>2.27 (1.61)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05
To explore if the behaviour styles in the criminal and deviant acts are underpinned by a narrative role the NRQ was separated into four subscales based on the Youngs and Canter (2012) subdivisions of professional, revenger, victim and hero. Means testing was achieved through ANOVA. The results suggest that the PPS classifications for both the criminal and deviant actions are underpinned by a dominant narrative role; results are presented in tables 9.2 and 9.3.

For the criminal actions, the property based crimes showed higher means for 8 out of 11 the professional role items. The person crimes were represented by 7 of the 9 revenger narrative NRQ items. The internal-sensory crimes were represented mainly by the professional narrative items (6) but also a large number of the hero narrative items (4). The NRQ items for the victim role were found to have a high mean across all the PPS crime types. Presented in table 9.2, the professional narrative role is presented in the property and internal crimes, the revenger narrative role is presented in the person crimes, and the professional and hero narrative role in the internal crimes; the victim narrative role was not represented by any crime type.

The results from the mean analysis of the deviant actions presented similarities in the narrative roles which were found in the crime actions. The property crimes showed higher means for 9 of the 11 professional narrative role items. For the person crimes, all of the revenger and victim narrative items showed higher means for this category. Finally the internal acts were represented mainly by the professional narrative role (4/5 items). The items for the hero narrative role showed high means across all the PPS classifications for the deviant acts. In sum, the professional narrative role was represented by the property and internal acts, the revenger and victim narrative roles were represented by the person acts; the hero narrative role was presented across all crime types.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRQ ITEM</th>
<th>ROLE</th>
<th>PROPERTY</th>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>SENSORY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was like a professional</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.67 (1.01)</td>
<td>1.29 (.84)</td>
<td>1.50 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was fun</strong></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>*<strong>3.19 (1.43)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>1.94 (1.43)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>3.19 (1.47)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was interesting</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3.05 (1.32)</td>
<td>2.06 (1.29)</td>
<td>2.86 (1.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was like an adventure</strong></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>*<strong>3.43 (1.36)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>1.94 (1.56)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>3.03 (1.61)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was exciting</strong></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>*<strong>3.62 (1.39)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>2.24 (1.60)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>3.14 (1.41)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was doing a job</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.57 (1.12)</td>
<td>1.41 (1.06)</td>
<td>1.19 (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had power</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.86 (1.38)</td>
<td>2.65 (1.65)</td>
<td>2.14 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It all went to plan</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.48 (1.69)</td>
<td>2.12 (1.61)</td>
<td>2.28 (1.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I knew I was taking a risk</strong></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>*<strong>4.19 (.98)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>2.94 (1.63)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>3.78 (1.19)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was a mission</strong></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.76 (1.54)</td>
<td>1.88 (1.26)</td>
<td>1.69 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I couldn’t stop myself</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3.0 (1.41)</td>
<td>2.82 (1.62)</td>
<td>1.89 (1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to do it</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.10 (1.26)</td>
<td>2.65 (1.65)</td>
<td>1.94 (1.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was right</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.76 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.12 (1.49)</td>
<td>1.78 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was the only thing to do</strong></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>*<strong>2.0 (1.18)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>2.65 (1.65)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>1.64 (1.31)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing else mattered</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.19 (1.28)</td>
<td>2.24 (1.56)</td>
<td>1.72 (1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was my only choice</strong></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>*<strong>1.67 (1.11)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>2.88 (1.72)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>1.67 (1.35)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t care what would happen</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.48 (1.32)</td>
<td>2.82 (1.59)</td>
<td>2.08 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was happening was just fate</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>1.43 (.97)</td>
<td>2.24 (1.52)</td>
<td>1.50 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I was trying to get revenge</strong></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>*<strong>1.76 (1.51)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>2.47 (1.66)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>1.03 (.16)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was getting my own back</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>*<strong>1.76 (1.44)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>2.59 (1.58)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>1.08 (.36)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was helpless</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>1.90 (.99)</td>
<td>2.53 (1.54)</td>
<td>2.03 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was a victim</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>*<strong>1.38 (.86)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>2.59 (1.97)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>1.67 (1.35)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was confused</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>*<strong>2.0 (1.37)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>3.06 (1.63)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>1.69 (1.09)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I just wanted to get it over with</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>2.52 (1.43)</td>
<td>3.29 (1.82)</td>
<td>2.11 (1.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was looking for recognition</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.14 (1.38)</td>
<td>2.35 (1.65)</td>
<td>1.78 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was nothing special about what happened</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.05 (1.28)</td>
<td>2.06 (1.47)</td>
<td>1.94 (1.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>It was like I wasn’t part of it</strong></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>*<strong>1.71 (.95)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>2.47 (1.37)</strong></td>
<td>*<strong>1.64 (.96)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me, it was like a usual days work</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.10 (.30)</td>
<td>1.53 (1.32)</td>
<td>1.50 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was routine</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>1.24 (.53)</td>
<td>1.24 (.66)</td>
<td>1.72 (1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was in control</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.62 (1.43)</td>
<td>2.41 (1.54)</td>
<td>2.72 (1.42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I knew what I was doing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.95 (1.39)</td>
<td>2.47 (1.58)</td>
<td>3.03 (1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I guess I always knew it was going to happen</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.0 (1.34)</td>
<td>2.47 (1.77)</td>
<td>2.69 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was a manly thing to do</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2.14 (1.19)</td>
<td>2.06 (1.51)</td>
<td>2.97 (1.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<0.05
A number of similarities between the crime actions and the deviant actions are presented in reference to the dominant narrative roles they represented. Overall, 19 of the original 33 NRQ items (58%) fell into the same category in the PPS system for both the deviant and criminal acts.

For the criminal acts, ‘I was like a professional’, ‘It was fun’, and ‘It all went to plan’ demonstrated a significant difference across the crimes groups with a high mean preference for the property crimes. ‘It was the only thing to do’, ‘I didn’t care what would happen’, ‘I was trying to get revenge’, and ‘I was getting my own back’ showed a significant difference between the crime groups with a higher mean for the person crimes. ‘For me, it was like a usual days work’, ‘I knew I was taking a risk’ and ‘I knew what I was doing’ showed a significant difference across crime group with higher means presented for the internal crimes.

For the deviant acts, ‘It was fun’, ‘It was like an adventure’, ‘It was exciting’, ‘I knew I was taking a risk’, ‘It was a mission’ and ‘I couldn’t stop myself’ showed a significant difference across the deviant classifications with higher means for the property acts. ‘It was the only thing to do’, ‘It was my only choice’, ‘I was trying to get revenge’, ‘I was getting my own back’, ‘I was a victim’, ‘I was confused’ and ‘It was like I wasn’t part of it’ were significantly different across the deviant acts and showed a higher mean for the person acts. None of the items for the internal acts showed a significant difference across PPS classifications for the deviant acts.

Through the analysis of the high mean scores for the items of the NRQ, a number of psychological differences between the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals are established. For the property related acts, the high preference items show the property offenders demonstrate some level of planning for their crimes (‘it all went to plan’ and ‘I was like a professional’) with positive emotional content. For the non-incarcerated, the NRQ items for the property crimes show a greater level of emotional arousal (‘it was fun’, ‘it was an adventure’, ‘it was exciting’). Although, there was knowledge of the risk involved (‘I knew I was taking a risk’) the action seems to have little planning and are more expressive in nature (‘I couldn’t stop myself’).
For the person crimes, both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated suggest that crimes against the person are revenge related attack (‘it was the only thing to do’, ‘I was getting revenge’, ‘I was getting my own back’). However, they differ due to the person crimes the offenders tended to be focused on their own objectives (‘I didn’t care what would happen’). For the deviant actions, there is an element of victimisation presented in the person acts (‘I was a victim, I wasn’t part of it’). The interpretations presented by the NRQ items would suggest that the person actions, show expressive content (‘I was confused’, ‘it was my only choice’) it is possible they may stem from being attacked first.

Finally, the NRQ items for the internal crimes suggest that such actions are a regular occurrence for the offenders (‘for me, it was like a usual days work’, ‘I knew I was taking a risk’, ‘I knew what I was doing’). The findings presented in this section of the analysis demonstrate that the NRQ items not only provide a method of differentiating narrative themes, but also provide a method for differentiating criminal and deviant acts based on the psychological content within the narrative context. Further exploration of psychological components expressed in the criminal and deviant acts across PPS classifications is sought through qualitative thematic analysis in the following section.

9.3.2. Deconstructing narratives of crime types in comparison to deviant acts

Summarised in table 9.4 are the themes identified across the PPS classifications for the incarcerated and non-incarcerated interviews. The analysis is separated into three sections: property acts, person acts, and sensory acts. Narrative verbatim is used to illustrate the themes.
Table 9.4. Thematic analysis theme summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>PROPERTY</th>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>INTERNAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Blame</td>
<td>Drugs/alcohol</td>
<td>Other person</td>
<td>Other person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Another person</td>
<td>Other person – honour</td>
<td>Circumstance Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Influence/intoxication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instrumentality</td>
<td>Monetary gain</td>
<td>Monetary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Material gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Preparedness</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Unplanned</td>
<td>Routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect planning</td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Emotion</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Control</td>
<td>Weapon</td>
<td>Loss of control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No weapon/high control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Remorseful</td>
<td>Remorse</td>
<td>Remorse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Minimisation</td>
<td>Circumstance Justification of actions</td>
<td>Down playing involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.3.2.1. Property acts

From the offenders’ 12 robberies were reported, three were removed from the analysis as they were street robberies, the 9 remaining cases the offenders had to enter a property to commit the offence. To draw a more direct comparison of the psychological processes involved in the criminal and deviant acts a sample of stealing actions from the non-incarcerated individuals were also thematically analysed.
Theme 1: external blame

A common theme that emerged within the narrated accounts of the property acts was the theme was blame. The attribution of blame allows the offender to express his own interpretation of the precursor to the crimes. The theme of blame, among the offender group, was expressed by two subthemes of: drugs and alcohol and another person; offenders used both to justify why the crimes occurred. In contrast, the non-incarcerated individuals’ subthemes of blame were expressed as another person and no blame.

For the offenders, the subtheme of drugs and alcohol occurred frequently within their narrative. The offenders tended to attribute their state of mind to a state of intoxication and therefore considered this as the reason the crime occurred. A further attribution to drugs was presented by narrator 77, who used his drug debt to justify why he was involved in the crime.

P3 - “I was on drugs then” pg 11, 40 “It’s not something I’d actually do. Alcohol had a big effect on this” pg12, 9-10

P15 – “Normally I wouldn’t go for a shop privately owned...at the time I was using drugs” pg36, 41-42

P77- “I had a drugs debt and the opportunity came around to drive for a robbery to get rid of my debt” pg163, 29-30

The role of another person was displayed when the narrator had stated the involvement of the other person in the commencement of the act.

P25- “I had an argument with my girlfriend on the Valentine’s day so I ended up robbing a local street shop. All I was thinking about was drugs” pg56, 22-34

P51- “Supposed to drive son to scrap yard but he wanted to stop at the bet shop...waited in the car...running out with bat and money bags, he’d done an armed robbery. I drove away” pg 120, 26-28

As with the robbery crimes, a common theme that emerged among the non-incarcerated interviewees was the attribution of blame towards others for their action; this fitted with the same sub-theme of another person.

N71- “my friends were egging me on, we were all really bored” pg281, 40
“all of my friends were stealing stuff and it was a lot to do with peer pressure”
pg246, 29

The subtheme of another person, among the non-incarcerated narrators was the role of ‘peer pressure’ and influence from others. For example, the narrator expressed that he and his friends committed the action together; which is considered as slightly different to peer-pressure due to the mutual agreement to commit the deviant act.

“me and some of the other reps poured it [stolen alcohol] all into the bucket” pg169, 27-28

“so I went outside to the other side of the hole in the wall...they were passing me the creates [of stolen alcohol]” pg263, 41-42

The subtheme of no blame was demonstrated by the non-incarcerated individuals. This was present when narrators took full responsibility for their actions.

“I remember just stuffing it in my pocket” pg 231, 39
“I stole it” pg 308, 25
“I was stealing” pg291, 25

The theme of blame links into the level of cognitive interpretation that is used to explain the commissioning of the offence. For both the interviewee groups the demonstration of external locus of control through the use of an external blaming system; in both cases the antecedent to action was formulated from the influence of another person. However, where this theme differed was the offender’s additional external blaming system that related to intoxication, in which case the offenders had offered justifications of the crimes they had committed that were due to drugs and alcohol. The use of drugs and alcohol as a justification to stealing, among the non-incarcerated individuals, did not create a subtheme of blame. Although not all offenders are drug addicts and not all offences are committed to fund a drug habit, there is a strong correlation with drug use and offending (Towl, 2006). The role of drug use and alcohol intoxication is a clear precursor to the crime action in the current sample of property offenders.
**Theme 2: level of instrumentality**

This theme occurred when the offence was committed for a secondary reason. Although most property crimes are for the reason of gaining something e.g. money or material items, such crimes can still demonstrate expressive qualities. When the act of robbery is carried out, in the moment, without planning, could be considered as an expressive gain. For example, robbery for money is for an expressive gain but a robbery for money to buy drugs or pay off debt is for an instrumental gain. Within the theme of instrumentality two subthemes emerged for the offenders: monetary gain and secondary gain. For the non-incarcerated individuals was the subtheme of material gain; one individual expressed monetary gain.

The purpose of the offences was for *monetary gain*; this was expressed in 8 of the 9 interviews from the incarcerated offenders and was expressed by only one of the non-incarcerated individuals.

*P3-* “the main purpose of the offences was to get the money out of the shop” pg12, 3-4

*P29-* “I was told there was 30k in someone’s house. So we went to the house and got what we needed” pg65, 26-7

*P15-* “my main purpose was gaining access to the money” pg36, 38-9

A further sub-theme of secondary gain was also expressed in the narratives. For example, the offence was committed to obtain money; the money was method of obtaining drugs. It is safe to assume that in all cases where the money was obtained it would be used for a secondary purpose, however only 5 of the narrators specified the purpose.

*P60-* “took money...taxi to take me to house to score more drugs” pg136, 11-5

*P55-* “needed money for drugs”pg127, 34

*P25-* “I got about 300 and I got a taxi and want and spent all the money on drugs” pg56, 34-8

The main subtheme for the non-incarcerated group was *material gain*. None of the interviewees, in this group, mentioned their act of stealing was for a secondary purpose. The
gain was expressive for the primary aim of obtaining the material goods for personal use or benefit.

*N45- “this pack of stickers...I remembered stuffing it in my pocket” pg231, 38-9*  
*N53- “it was just little trinkets and stuff” pg246, 43-44*

Overall, instrumentality was expressed differently by both the offenders and non-incarcerated individuals. The main difference was due to secondary gain of the action – to obtain drugs for the offenders. The theme of instrumentality that was similar for both the interviewee groups was the demonstration of some form of gain whether it is monetary (offenders) or material for the non-incarcerated individuals.

**Theme 3: preparedness**

The theme of preparedness uncovers the level of planning expressed by the individuals before the commencement of the crime or deviant act. A number of similarities were demonstrated in the narratives of the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. Two subthemes of planning and no planning emerged; both subthemes were expressed by both the interviewee groups.

For the robberies the subtheme of *planning* was expressed in 2 of the 9 interviews, demonstrated by narrator 15 and 29 below.

*P15- “I made sure it was busy. I always dropped a pound...excuse if anyone comes – I was looking for my money” pg36, 36-38*  
*P29- “all blacked out [referring to clothes they were wearing] with guns. We waited until 3am...used gloves and masks to disguise ourselves” pg65, 27-36*

However, indirect planning was expressed by a further 3 interviewees. For example, in one case, the narrator claimed that there was no planning involved in the robbery but continues to discuss how he and a friend planned what they were going to do before entering the shop.
A further 2 narrators stated their role in the robbery was the driver; there was high externalisation of the blame in both cases. During the interviews neither of the narrators discussed planning of the crime; however due to the nature of the robbery and the pivotal role of a driver, it does suggest that some element of planning was involved.

For the non-incarcerated individuals, 2 of the 9 narrators also expressed some level of planning before the stealing commenced. This planning was presented by the individual as the sole person involved in the action (narrator36) and also as part of a group who were involved in the action (narrator 71).

The sub-theme of no planning was presented in 4 of the 9 incarcerated interviewees.

The theme of preparedness presents differences between the two interviewee groups. In both cases only a few interviewees had discussed elements of planning; however the offenders indirect planning of the crimes was present and when no planning took place the offenders clearly stated that was the case. For the non-incarcerated individuals the role of planning for the action occurred in only two of the 9 interviewees. This suggests the deviant action of stealing could be more of an expressive act, from the non-incarcerated group, that occurred from the attribution of blame to others, as a result of the people who they were with when they committed the act.
Theme 4: emotion

For the offenders, no positive emotional content was discussed during the narrative interviews in relation to the robberies. This is a direct contrast to the non-incarcerated interviewees who discussed both positive and mixed emotions during the course of the action.

One narrator clearly stated that he did not experience any emotion during the robbery he committed.

P55 – “I didn’t not feel anything. I did not care at the moment...I felt nothing when the arrested me either”pg127, line 37-39

A further narrator said he felt ashamed at the level of violence he had used in the robbery rather than being ashamed for the actual robbery he had committed.

P37 – “[after the crime] I was ashamed and gutted about what I did, it was just a girl on her own in the shop... I was embarrassed when I seen my mum in court, knowing what I had done”pg84, 48-50

In some cases the negative emotion was not expressed during the crime, but was discussed as part of the build up to the crime or after the crime had occurred.

P60 – “[prior to the crime due to drug use] I started to feel paranoid. Guilt and worry. I had been one year clean...[argued with girlfriend prior to crime] She attacked me emotionally and jumped out of the car... felt guilty and thought to buy wine to give to my girlfriend...[during crime] I said it aggressively” pg137,4-13

Unlike the offender group, the non-incarcerated individuals demonstrated a range of emotions in reference to the acts they had committed. The emotional content discussed included emotions they had felt before, during and after the deviant actions were committed. Negative emotions tended to be feeling scared and feelings of guilt for the actions they had committed which are demonstrated by narrator 45 and 86.

N45 – “[After stealing stickers from a shop as a child] ‘I was afraid to go back to that particular shop” pg231,43
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Positive emotions such as thrill and exhilarated were expressed by the non-incarcerated individuals.

In both cases, the narrators described aroused and positive emotions that were present during the deviant action however both also described negative emotions that occurred after the event.

Emotional content discussed by the offenders supports previous findings from Canter and Ioannou (2004). They found robbery offenders’ emotions during crime were negative and concluded the negative emotional content maybe due to the interpersonal content of the crime. The inclusion of positive emotions found among the non-incarcerated individuals supports this idea. For example, the property crimes were cases of robbery for the offenders and cases of stealing for the non-incarcerated group; therefore there was little interpersonal contact for involved in the deviant actions.

Theme 5: control

Level of control that was expressed with 6 out of 9 of the offenders incorporating the use of physical or verbal aggression or weapons to control their victims; from this, two subthemes emerged: high control and high control no weapon. A further subtheme of low control was added. The non-incarcerated group did not express any form of control of others.
during their accounts of property gain. The lack of control in the incarcerated group is due to the lack of interpersonal violence presented in the actions.

High control was expressed by the offenders through the use of a weapon which was used to control the victims during the crimes.

P29- “with guns...tied her up he told her to shut up or we’d kill her boyfriend...started to burn him...knocked him out” pg65, 28-35

P51- “[accomplice] had a bat up his sleeve” pg120, 36

High control with no weapon was expressed in cases where either verbal or physical aggression was used to control the victims during the robbery. Narrator 25 showed high control by pretending to conceal a weapon as a method of making the shop assistant to comply with his requests.

P3- “I put my arms around the woman’s neck and pulled her back” pg11, 49

P25- “I didn’t actually have a weapon but I had my hand in my pocket giving the impression I was concealing something” pg56, 43

A final sub-theme of low control was demonstrated when the offenders expressed that no weapon was used and did not provide examples of other forms of violence, whether verbal or physical to control people during their robberies.

P15- “I did not use a weapon” pg36, 35

P77- “they were not armed” pg163, 31

Theme 6: remorse

This theme was created separate to the previous emotional themes as it represents a reflective overview of the crime or deviant action rather than emotions they felt whilst carrying out the action. The remorse, in this case, may be related to the offenders’ incarceration providing time to reflect on their actions.

P25- “looking back I wouldn’t have done it as I’ve missed 2 years of my life” pg56, 40-1
The same level of remorseful reflection was demonstrated by 5 of the 9 non-incarcerated interviewees.

N53- “I learned my lesson and I have not stolen since. I don’t think we would have stopped unless we had been caught” pg246, 33-34

N86- “I have never done anything like that since...I do not do anything illegal” pg308, 31-32

Theme 7: minimisation

For the offenders, there was a level of minimising the role they played in the crime; this was displayed by narrator 77. For narrator 15, the minimisation technique he used was to reduce the consequences of his actions which he described as not taking personal belongings from the people he encountered during his robberies.

P15- “ill usually leave personal things somewhere so they can get back to people, like photos and things ‘cause it means something. I only want the money” pg36, 47-9

P77- “three got out to do the robbery at the bookmaker, they weren’t armed. I didn’t go in, I just sat in the car” pg163, 31-2

Similar methods of minimisation were presented by the non-incarcerated individuals. Narrator 36 minimises the consequences of his actions through suggesting that the ticket he used to steal money would by unclaimed otherwise and the books (from the betting shop he worked in) remained balanced. Narrator 53, on the other hand, minimises his actions by downplaying the items that he had stolen.

N36 – “[after claiming winnings from an unclaimed ticket] that £20 went in my back pocket ...the books are balanced...it would have been down as an unclaimed ticket” pg213,37-9

N53 – “I did not want to be the only one who had not taken anything, it was just little trinkets and stuff” pg246,30
Summary of themes for property acts

Although the gain for the property crimes and deviant actions is similar, the methods of obtaining the items are constructed differently. The crimes demonstrated a level of instrumentality of secondary gain which was not present in the deviant actions. A higher use of control was expressed by different forms of violence such as verbal threats, physical violence and the use of weapons. The level of instrumental aggression, which is displayed by the use of aggressive acts to obtain a primary non-aggressive goal (Feshbach, 1964); was described in only the offenders’ narratives. The non-incarcerated individuals discussed a range of emotions they experienced during the commission of their crimes; however the offenders only associated negative emotions with their offences. The feeling of remorse was mostly prevalent among the non-incarcerated individuals. Themes of blame (with the exception of drugs and alcohol), level of planning and minimisations showed similar qualities in the commissioning and execution of the actions for both the incarcerated offenders and non-incarcerated individuals.

9.3.2.2. Person acts

Person crimes for the offender group included those who demonstrated high violence therefore murder, attempted murder and manslaughter cases were selected. A total of 9 narrated accounts of person crimes were selected for the offending group (5 murders, 2 manslaughter, 2 attempted murder). For the non-incarcerated group the most highly violent acts against a person were selected; they included fighting and assault (6 fighting and 2 assaults). The narrative interviews for the offenders’ crime accounts ranged from 127-1392 words with a mean of 620 words, for the non-incarcerated individuals the interviews ranged from 50 – 336 words with a mean of 141 words.

Theme 1: blame

The theme of blame was demonstrated by a range of modalities. The sub-themes for the offenders include: other person, other person -honour, and intoxication. The same subthemes were presented for the non-incarcerated individuals.
The subtheme of other person was present in the narratives from 4 out of 9 offenders’ crime accounts and in 3 out of 8 the non-incarcerated individuals accounts of deviant actions. The narrators explained that their violent action was the result of standing up for another person who they felt had been wronged. In each case, the narrator was standing up for a close friend or loved one. The same reactive behavioural pattern is present in the narratives of both groups; however the severity of the attack expressed by the offenders in comparison to the non-offenders was the main difference.

P2- “the lad whose girlfriend it was there, I said ‘You better say something to him’. He didn’t so I got up and just started laying into him in the chair” pg 8, 47-9

P44- “she was black and blue and she had bald patches on her head where he’d pulled her hair out” pg 102, 45-6

N50- “someone threw a punch at one of my mates for no reason at all. We all started fighting” pg 241, 33-4

N30- “I thought someone offended my girlfriend after a night out. So I got into a fight” pg202, 31-2

A second subtheme of other person – honour was present in 4 of the 9 offenders’ accounts and in 5 of the 8 non-incarcerated individuals’ accounts. This theme was expressed when the onset of the violent action was due to an attack against the narrators. The examples below demonstrate that the narrators felt they had been wronged and therefore committed the action due to standing up for their own honour. The key difference was the role of revenge. For the offenders revenge was the key motive for the violent action; however for the non-incarcerated individuals self-defence was the key motive of the action.

P45- “he bottle me so I pushed him and bottled him back... I found a knife.... I’ve put it into his chest and arm” pg105, 29-3

P49-“the other group assaulted me...we decided to seek revenge, initially not to kill anyone but to severely beat him” pg116, 6-9

N17- “got attacked –self defence” pg183, 23-4
A further subtheme of intoxication was a prevalent feature in 7 of the 9 crime narratives from the offenders and in 4 of the 8 narratives of the non-incarcerated individuals. Intoxication from either drugs or alcohol was a background feature for the offenders who tended to specify their level of intoxication at the time the violence action occurred (narrator 30) whereas the level of intoxication was only discussed by one of the non-incarcerated individuals; however each did specify that the violence occurred in or near a public house or nightclub.

P24- “I was drinking a lot – 5/6 a day” pg54, 28

P13- “I’d had about 8 pints by now, was pretty drunk” pg 32, 29

P26- “I was still drinking and still taking drugs. I was on 36 litres of cider a day” pg58, 48-9

N30- “I got really drunk one night” pg202, 31

N50- “in a nightclub” pg241, 31

N5- “outside a pub” pg163, 29

Key differences reside in the level of violence that was expressed and the motive for the action. For example, the offenders had a demonstrated a high level of violence through the involvement of weapons and a revenge motive whereas the non-incarcerated individuals expressed lesser level of violence with a self-defence motive.

Theme 2: instrumentality

Unlike the property crimes, the level of Instrumentality within the person crimes was difficult to establish. Person-centred actions for the offenders and non-offenders showed high levels of reactive behaviours. Although crimes of violence seem expressive in their nature, the primary aim of the attack was to stand up for themselves or someone else and the after effect, for the offenders, was to kill or the attempted killing of the victim. Therefore it is suggested that the theme of expressive-instrumental action is more relevant to the offenders’ crime accounts within the current sample. A difference to the non-incarcerated individuals is that they did not
seriously hurt their victims; the act was deemed as more internally expressive to the individual. For the non-incarcerated individuals, the violent acts showed more expressive qualities by the individual through defending themselves or another; there was no secondary element to the actions committed by this group.

**Theme 3: preparedness**

The level of preparedness was expressed in two subthemes for the offenders: *planning* and *unplanned*. However, there was little level of preparedness expressed by the non-incarcerated individuals.

In the subtheme of *unplanned* attacks the offenders’ clearly stated that their violent actions were not planned. The interviews were conducted in the prison setting and therefore the offenders may have felt they needed to express that the attack was unplanned.

*P26-* “there was no premeditation...no weapons” pg 59, 15-6

*P24-* “it wasn’t premeditated; when it all happened I still could not really believe it” pg 54, 31-2

For 3 of the 9 incarcerated offenders and 1 of the 8 non-incarcerated individuals there was some element of *planning*. In one case, the violent action was fully planned (narrator 49), and in the other 2 cases the weapon was taken to the crime by the offender demonstrates some level of planning and premeditated behaviour (narrator 50). Narrator 48, from the non-incarcerated group expressed some level of planning of the violent action he was involved in through directing others what to do in anticipation of violent action.

*P49-* “our initial plan was to beat or stab the person” pg 116, 15-6

*P50-* “came out with a knife” pg 118, 31-2

*N48-* “he didn’t know which one had ripped his jacket so he wanted them all doing in...told the other doorman to get the others outside the club” pg 237, 43-6
Theme 4: emotion

The emotional content expressed by the narrators, for both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals were negative. In no cases were positive emotions expressed. The lack of positive emotions, associated with the person-centred actions, is consistent with the findings of Canter and Ioannou (2004), who found negative emotions were expressed with person-centred crimes.

P49– “[reaction to a rival gang who had attacked him] I was not just angry at the person who beat me, I was angry at the whole group and I wanted to make an example of these 2 members” pg116, 17-8

P26– “[referring to killing his friends] you’ll find it very confusing ‘cause I do still now. (pg58, line46) There is no reason I can see for doing what I’ve done. The only thing I can think is my anger problems through alcohol” pg59,16-8

P24– “[prior to the crime] I was in a depression. It might seem as though you know I am responsible for my actions...[during] I hit him out of rage...[after] I never expected it... It’s not a good feeling or a good thing” pg54-5,26-51

N80 – “[after beating his friend up] I regretted it afterwards...I felt bad, it was childish behaviour” pg296, 29-32

N30 – “[talking about a fight he got in to sticking up for a girl] because I was drunk, I felt confident so I may have got the wrong impression of what the guy was doing” pg202, 33-4

Theme 5: control

The control theme, in the violent actions, represented a loss of control that was expressed by the individuals. This loss of control was expressed by 5 of the 9 offenders but only one of the non-incarcerated individuals. For the offenders, one did not say he had lost control, but the duration and severity of his attack suggested otherwise.

P2- “I had two knives then but I don’t know where they came from...I was stabbing him for an hour or so” pg9, 1-3

P24- “It was my son [victim] and it was at home. I hit him out of rage and he died in hospital” pg54, 34-5
Theme 6: remorse

There was no element of remorse through reflection, among the offender group, for the crimes they had committed. This may be due to the expressive nature of the crime and the underpinning narrative that it was a revenge attack or they were, in fact, a victim of the circumstances they were in. However, two of the offenders’ mentioned doing the crime in an alternative way, if they had the chance to do it again.

P44- “I stood up in court and said ‘I’m so sorry’ to his family and my family for what I have done” pg103, 28-9

P13- “I didn’t mean to seriously hurt him, I punched him...he went home [the victim] and didn’t wake up the next day...if I had done things differently I wouldn’t have hit him” pg3235-42

Theme 7: minimisation

For the person action minimisation for the violence they had committed was presented by the majority of the offenders. Minimisation showed two subthemes: bad people and circumstance. The subtheme of bad people was expressed by the offenders through minimisation techniques of justifying the violent actions they expressed towards their victims; the victim ‘deserving what they had got’. Other minimisations were formed by justifying the level of violence used due to the circumstances which the violence occurred; this was present in 4 of the 8 offenders and by two of the non-incarcerated individuals.

P44 – “I pleaded guilty for manslaughter...It was unanimous not guilty, not murder. I think they put themselves in my shoes – ‘what would I have done if it had been my sister or daughter?’“pg103,22-5

P24 – “[killing his son] I didn’t seek help when I needed it... I wanted to appear manly so I never talked about my problems, I was just drinking to cover it up and then it happened” pg54, 27-47
Summary of themes for person acts

The acts against a person show the same categories of blame and circumstances in which they occur such as, defending someone else or own honour and the inclusion of drugs and alcohol for both groups. There are clear psychological distinctions between the incarcerated offenders and non-incarcerated individuals. For the offenders, the motive for the violent acts tended to be focused around revenge; this is consistent with the NRQ results in the first analysis section, which show the revenger narrative is associated with person crimes. For the non-incarcerated individuals the motive for the violent acts tended to be in reference to self-defence. This is consistent with the NRQ results which suggest the revenger and victim narratives are associated with person acts in the non-incarcerated group. The level of violence described by the offenders, along with the underpinnings of the revenger narrative, provides a good example of the expressive-aggression and hostile-aggression described by Fesbach (1964) as the difference in aggressive drive. For example, expressive-aggression is the drive to hit someone which is demonstrated by the non-incarcerated individuals whereas hostile-aggression is the desire to hurt someone which is displayed by the offenders. Finally, both groups only discussed negative emotions for the person acts, supporting Canter and Ioannou (2004) who found negative emotions in person crimes.

9.3.2.3. Sensory acts

The sensory actions for the offenders and non-incarcerated individuals are drug related. The non-incarcerated group tended to discuss recreational drug use rather than selling drugs whereas the offenders tended to discuss selling drugs. For the offenders, 11 cases of sensory
acts were included in the analysis. The word count for the crimes ranged between 195 and 565 words, with a mean of 320 words. For the non-incarcerated individuals, 16 cases of sensory acts were included in the analysis, the description of the acts ranged between 27 and 748 words with a mean of 216 words.

**Theme 1: blame**

The theme of blame is consistently presented across each of the PPS classifications; each demonstrating a similar function of blaming methods for why the actions occurred. Such blaming methods are similar across the criminal and deviant actions. The theme of *blame* within the sensory actions also has a number of modalities in which it was discussed by the narrators. The subthemes that emerged are *other person, circumstance* and *full responsibility*. Each theme was expressed by both groups of interviewees.

The subtheme of *other person* was expressed when the individuals attributed the responsibility of their actions to another person. For the both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals the other person was represented by a friend or a known acquaintance. Three of the offenders (narrator 75, 73 and 21) include a concept of money in their discussion of the sensory actions.

*P75-* “it started when one of my mates offered me a job, I had no money so I started driving for him” pg161, 27-8

*P73-* “they had said ‘move this, get a few quid see a few people’... I want my set up, it was his set up – I was carrying out his duties but getting money” pg158, 38-41

*P21-* “I got into it because my friends were selling it and I put some money in” pg48, 30-1

The non-incarcerated individuals mainly described being pressured to commit the act through the influence of others. In each case below, the individual attributes the precursor of the behaviour to being influenced by others. Whereas the offenders all attributed the behaviour to some form of gain.
The second subtheme to emerge was related to the *circumstance* in which the act occurred. For the offenders, the subtheme of circumstance related to a negative change in their life circumstances which is presented as the antecedent factor to the drug dealing. For example, narrators 20 and 30 state that the loss of a loved one was the onset to restarting a drug habit; the drug dealing then becomes a way of paying for the habit. For narrator 68, however, drug dealing is a way of making money due to the lack of employment opportunities; this same concept is expressed by narrator 41.

*P20-* “I split up with my girlfriend and reverted back to my old ways and I started using again. To pay off my debt I began to sell crack & heroin for the guy I owed money too” pg46, 33-35

*P30-* “released from last sentence...mum died. I didn’t care anymore and I started using...couldn’t pay for my habit...and started selling again” pg66,27-30

*P68-* “I was trying to get jobs. I couldn’t get one and then started selling drugs” pg152, 28-29

*N41-* “only way to make good dosh aint it” og223, 28

The subtheme of circumstance, for the deviant acts, however, tended to be focused on the circumstances that they were in before the onset of the drug use. For example, narrators 65 and 75 both describe how their drug use was a positive aspect derived from the circumstance they were in.

*N65-* “probably the environment im in encourages me to take it, just to enjoy myself better” pg269, 49

*N75-* “I think it was a necessary part of getting to where I am” pg288, 37

A final subtheme of full *responsibility* emerged in 8 of the 16 non-incarcerated narratives and in 3 of the 11 offenders’ narratives. The theme of full responsibility was
presented when the individual did not use any external attributions of blame for their actions. Although, in the responsibility category there was an undercurrent of others involved in the circumstance such as friends, nights out, relationships; the difference here is that the narrators did not make a point of blaming another person. For the offenders, responsibility was clearly stated in their narratives. This was mirrored by the non-incarcerated individuals. Although the context of the statement was different e.g. offenders related to drug dealing and non-incarcerated individuals related to drug taking; their responsibility for the actions was presented in a clear statement.

P63- “I dealt [sold drugs] on my own” pg143,15

P32- “I was a drug dealer” pg71, 34

N91- “I bought a load of pills once...with the views to sell them to my friends” pg320, 49-50

N40- “I wanted to see for myself and make up my own mind” pg221, 35-6

The similarities between the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals, presented in the blame theme show similar psychological antecedent factors to the commencement of the acts. However, when the precursors to drug taking were discussed, the offenders’ tended to turn to drugs after negative life events whereas the deviants turned to drugs to enhance positive events.

Theme 2: instrumentality

The level of instrumentality expressed by the offenders’, in relation to the incentive of the acts, was expressed as monetary gain. This theme was present in 6 of the 11 offenders and only 1 of the non-incarcerated individuals. This theme related to accounts of selling drugs to obtain money as the primary purpose but the money was for a secondary purpose. The secondary aim was to support a wealthier lifestyle (narrators 73 and 53) or to support a drug habit (narrators 21 and 30).

P73- “get a few quid...carrying out his duties but getting money from it” pg158, 39-41
For the non-incarcerated the majority of the interviewees expressed taking drugs and did not discuss any secondary gains.

**Theme 3: preparedness**

The theme of Preparedness is represented by the level of routine discussed by 6 of the 11 incarcerated offenders and 6 of the 16 non-incarcerated individuals. The items relating to routine, being in control, knew what was doing, and it was a manly were presented in both groups NRQ responses, with the additional items relating to job and had to do it present in the offenders’ responses.

**P22**- “Id wake up and get ready, then I’d have a full English breakfast. The drugs would be sorted from the night before – I was always prepared” pg50, 28-9

**P53**- “A lot of is was planned” pg123, 42

**P21**- “it was an everyday thing. I would start at 7am, get me drivers and drop it off to them and ...top them up through the day” pg48, 26-8

**N91**- “it was something that me and my friends did, on a smaller scale, on a semi-regular basis” pg321, 1-2

**N42**- “then I did it often, every weekend” pg225, 39

The level of routine expressed by both interviewee groups demonstrates how the commissioning of the actions for the deviant and criminal acts is part of a regular routine. The difference is demonstrated in the offenders’ narratives with the discussion of the commissioning of the criminal action the same way one would discuss a day at the office.
Theme 4: emotion

The theme of Emotion was expressed by two subthemes: negative and positive. For the offenders’ negative emotions were discussed by 4 of the 11 interviewees and positive emotions by only one interviewee. For the non-incarcerated interviewees, negative emotions were discussed by 3 of the 16 interviewees whereas the majority of the emotions, discussed by this group, were positive which were expressed by 8 of the 16 interviewees.

The positive emotions are expressed by enjoyment, having a laugh and fun with friends. For one narrator (41) his positive emotions were expressed through gaining respect from others through selling drugs.

P32 – “I did it for financial gain and to have a laugh” pg71, 48

N41 – “started selling poppers when I was 14 and just got to know more people, you get tons of respect, everyone loves ya” pg223,29-30

N75 – “I suppose I use drugs to enhance my enjoyment of things” pg288,36-7

However, the negative emotions presented by both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals tended to relate to feelings of remorse and guilt for their actions.

P22 – “I am ashamed of my past but I really needed the money” pg50, 40

P63 – “[after apprehension] I called my sister...and just broke down in tears...I was glad it was over but was frightened about how long I would get” pg143, 39-46

N26 – “During taking them I am not bothered, but afterwards I’d feel a bit guilty” pg195,31-2

N35 – “[regarding smoking cannabis] I remember I felt really pressured, and afterwards I felt like I had let my mum and dad down. I never even got the ‘desired effect’ because I was feeling so bad” pg211,26-8

The lack of positive emotions expressed by the offenders maybe due to the level of routine involved in their crimes. For example, the offenders referred to their drug dealing as a job and a routine; such expressions are void of emotional stimulation. This finding is supported by the lack of NRQ items that relate to positive emotions represented by the sensory crimes
disclosed by the offenders. The discussion of negative emotions by the offenders tends to be related to feelings of remorse for their actions.

Theme 5: control

There was no theme of control discussed in the narrated accounts for the sensory actions for either the offenders or non-incarcerated individuals. Due to the nature of the actions there was a lack of events when control over another person was necessary. However, what control was expressed by the individual was the control of their actions in the form of the routine they used to either sell drugs (criminal) or take drugs (deviant).

Theme 6: Remorse

Few narrators discussed feelings of remorse for their actions. This could be due to the ‘red-herring’ issue of the victim in drug crimes. However, narrators 22, 26 and 35 displayed regret for their actions; the quotes are presented in the negative emotions subtheme of theme 4 – emotions.

Theme 7: minimisations

The theme of minimisation presented differences in the techniques used by the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. For the offenders, minimisation methods were implemented by 3 of the 11 interviewees. The techniques they employed were represented by a theme of circumstance and in most cases related to the attribution of blame theme, discussed previously. Narrator 4 minimises his involvement in the crime by suggesting he was just in the wrong place at the wrong time. Whereas narrators 73 and 75 minimise their crimes by saying how they were working for another person, it is a way of making money.

P4 – “I knew about their dealing but never got involved...They were never doing any dealings when I was with them, what they do when I’m not there is their business” pg13, 30-39

P73 – “There was sort of no work coming in...I was brought up with morals – right and wrong – but the had said, ‘move this, get a few quid, see a few people” pg158,37-9
For the non-incarcerated interviewees the minimisation strategies employed tended to be focused on down-playing their drug usage; this was present in 8 of the 16 interviews. Narrator 26 compares his drug use to some of his friends whereas narrators 27 and 51 suggest it is not much of a big deal because ‘everyone does it’.

N26 – “I don’t take them as regularly as some of my friends“ pg195, 26

N27 – “I smoke weed quite a lot and take coke, but nothing else” pg196,29

N51 – “I’m not sure it’s something new. Everyone has done drugs“pg243,30

Summary of themes for sensory acts

The thematic analysis of the sensory acts presented a number of similarities in the commissioning of the acts between the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. Although the majority of acts described by the offenders were selling drugs and the majority of acts discussed by the deviants were taking drugs; both presented influences from others as strong antecedent factors to the commencement of the actions. The level of routine displayed by the preparedness theme also showed similarities between the two groups based on their NRQ responses. The main differences in the two groups related to the level of instrumentality expressed by the offenders; their crimes were committed for a secondary gain. Further differences were in the emotional content. For example, the non-incarcerated individuals discussed more positive emotions that were associated with their actions. However, both groups demonstrated remorse and guilt for their actions.

9.4. Chapter Summary and Conclusions: Where does criminality begin?

The aim of the chapter was three-fold 1) to explore what dominant narrative roles are present in different crime types, 2) to uncover the psychological components discussed in narratives of crime, and 3) draw comparisons of crimes to deviant acts. The findings point to a
level of instrumentality that differentiates the criminal actions of incarcerated offenders to the deviant actions of the general public. Instrumentality is present in the narratives of the offenders across all three of the crime classifications. Instrumentality, emotions and modes of control are the key differences between the incarcerated criminal and non-incarcerated deviant acts discussed.

A number of similarities were displayed in the dominant narrative roles presented across the PPS classifications of criminal and deviant actions. For the offenders, the professional narrative role is present in the property and sensory crimes, the revenger narrative role is presented in the person crimes, and the hero narrative role in the sensory crimes; the victim narrative role was not represented by any crime type. For the non-incarcerated, individuals the professional narrative role was represented by the property and internal acts, the revenger and victim narrative roles were represented by the person acts; and the hero narrative role was presented across all crime types. The findings demonstrate different narrative roles underpin different types of crimes.

The professional narrative was represented across the property and sensory actions for both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. In both cases, high arousal items such as interesting, fun, adventure were presented in the property crimes and routine based items such as routine, knew what doing was presented in the sensory crimes. The possibility of two modalities to the professional narrative is displayed in the use of this narrative role in criminal action. The first relates to a heightened arousal found in the property crimes and the second relates to a lower arousal, job-like state found in the sensory crimes.

Consistent representation of the revenger narrative in the person crimes and deviant action offers a strong association of this narrative role. The revenger narrative role provides a good representation of hostile-aggression described by Fesbach (1964). This form of aggression was displayed by the offenders in the property crimes by the use of violent methods of controlling the victim in the property crimes, loss of control in the person crimes, and negative emotions across all crimes. The level of hostile-aggression formulates a level of instrumentality
that is expressed by the only the offenders. Although the revenger narrative was also presented in the person acts for the non-incarcerated group, this was also alongside the victim narrative role. Thematic analysis demonstrated that the action, in the person group, was a result of standing up for themselves or others, as a form of self-defence, rather than revenge.

Important psychological differences in the criminal and deviants acts were uncovered in the thematic analysis; this was presented in the motive for the action. For example, the offenders’ motive for the property crimes was for monetary gain whereas for the non-incarcerated individuals it was for material gain. For the person actions, the offenders’ incentive was revenge whereas for the non-incarcerated individuals the incentive was self-defence. For the sensory crimes, the offenders’ motive was for monetary gain and for the non-incarcerated individuals for pleasure enhancement. The offenders also offered more accounts of negative emotions which were associated with their actions; supporting previous findings from Canter and Ioannou (2004). However, the negative emotions may also be part of the contaminated script that was presented in the offenders’ life narratives in chapter 6.

A further point to note is the number of similarities across the narratives of criminal and deviant acts. The main similarities resided in the individuals cognitive interpretations for their actions. First of all, the theme of blame showed the same attribution strategies were used by both the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals across each of the PPS actions; with the exception of drugs and alcohol sub-theme for the property crimes. This was the same as the minimisation methods that were used; suggesting that the crimes are cognitively represented in a similar way to deviant actions.

In sum, the study was successful in deconstructing the narrative of criminal action and presenting similarities and differences in criminal and deviant action. Tarry and Elmer (2007) suggest that psychological differences between offenders and non-offenders are hard to establish due to the actions being too far apart on the delinquency continuum. However, what the current findings demonstrate is that with the correct methodological approach key psychological differences are able to be identified. Support was found to suggest that different
acts were underpinned by distinct narrative roles, and similar findings were found among the non-incarcerated deviant acts. The findings from the current study suggest that criminality begins when there is an increased level of instrumentality for the act; this can be demonstrated in the motive for action.
Chapter 10

Thesis Discussion and Conclusions

The thesis points towards a clear narrative distinction between the stories incarcerated offenders’ tell about their lives and the stories told by members of the general public. The stories incarcerated offenders tell about their lives presents three themes that are not present in the life stories of non-incarcerated individuals. Firstly, when describing life-episodes, offenders’ demonstrate a contaminated script. Secondly, the overlap of criminality in the offenders’ life outside of the crime action suggests their criminal activity is an integral part of how offenders’ view themselves within their life-story. Finally, there is a level of instrumentality expressed in the narratives of crime episodes presented by the incarcerated offenders that is not visible in narratives of deviant episodes presented by the non-incarcerated individuals. What is consistent in the life-stories of offenders’ narratives is the basis of four archetypal stories that people tell about their lives and the underlying psychological components they represent. The archetypal themes are consistent over a series of life-episodes.

For the findings that have emerged, it is important to note that they are derived from life-stories of 61 incarcerated male offenders. Clearly, the findings suggest that differences are present in life-stories of those who are incarcerated and those who are not; it is therefore safe to assume that some of the narrative themes may occur in other samples of incarcerated offenders. However, further research is needed to confirm this. Active male offenders who are not incarcerated may demonstrate similar narrative themes as the incarcerated offenders; nevertheless this concept was not explored in the present thesis and additional research would be necessary to confirm this.

10.1. The Contaminated Script

The contaminated script (presented in chapter 6) extends the earlier idea of a contaminated sequence in narrative construction. Thematic analysis of the LAAF content variables presented a broader contamination script extending the contamination sequence
presented by McAdams et al. (1997) and identified features available in the condemnation script discussed by Maruna (2001). A similar contamination script was present in both the SE narratives and film narrative.

In his research Maruna (2001) describes broader elements of the offenders’ interpretations of their crime actions and role of self-victimisation that are formulated in the condemnation script. The contamination script also presents links to broader themes of victimisation, cognitive interpretations, and negative emotions within the life-story projections. A case study review of the contamination script identified two story plots. The first is a story of a protagonist who experiences a number of different forms of victimisation this story plot is named ‘victim of circumstance’. The second is a story of a protagonist who exerts power over others this story plot is named ‘a quest for honour’. Both are presented in a broadly similar manner in the SE and film narrative. The identification of dominant narrative roles, within the contamination script, offers a way of perceiving the problematic and habitual thinking patterns the incarcerated offenders’ use to talk about their lives. Such thinking is in line with White and Epston’s (1990) narrative therapy.

10.1.1. Contaminated script: victim of circumstance

The dominant role, presented within the contaminated script, first describes a life story that is full of examples of the narrator being wronged through descriptions of miss-treatment, betrayal, injury and loss of another; this creates the vision of the unjust society. The narrators with the ‘victim of circumstance’ script also present themes of wanting to have a normal-healthy life but struggle to see how they are able to get there.

Narrator 1, “I was always trying to get my family back together but ended up in care... At home I stay with friends but they are all drug users so it’s back to stage 1...I’ve asked for help with drugs but I haven’t heard anything yet”.

Narrator 26, “All I want for the future is to be released and be another guy who goes about his business with my family”.
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Narrators 1 and 26 present their perceptions of failed attempts at creating stability and their goals for attaining future stability. Through the incorporation of a life-narrative approach to rehabilitation and treatment, the offenders’ options to enhance goals and desires can be nurtured; helping the offenders regain a sense of stability is essential to a life away from crime (Sampson & Laub, 1995; Maruna, 2001). Identifying the offenders’ goals, in the form of stabilising features, have a number of benefits for reintegration on the offenders release from incarceration. Maruna, Immarigeon & LeBel (2004) reiterate that most desistance occurs outside the justice system. The reasons they present are due to difficulties for offenders’ to formulate close relationships with the probation staff they are assigned; therefore relationships with family and friends can provide greater means for desistance to occur. Knowledge of key relationships, whether good or bad, can be obtained through the stories offenders tell about their lives creating good insight into areas for stability to be nurtured.

A further point to note, in relation to offender management, is the potential for self-harm that is identified in the ‘victim of circumstance’ script. In both case studies, the offenders disclose self harm behaviours. Narrator 1 “I ended up cutting my wrists” and Narrator 26 “I’ve also self-harmed. All the worst things a human can do to their self I’ve done or considered it”. The context of the self-harm in the life-stories meets the model proposed by Snow (2006). The model presents factors, such as negative life events, mood state, and motivations that are situational or interpersonal, as predictors of self-harm and potential suicide behaviours; all of which are disclosed using the LAAF approach.

10.1.2. Contaminated script: quest for honour

The quest for honour presents a life story where the individual reacts in a hostile way to others. The features of this habitual script are based on the need for power over others and the use of external blaming systems through cognitive distortions and neutralisation strategies. The offenders who present this script show a high level of violent action during their life stories.

Narrator 7 “it [film genre] would be about drugs guns and money. It would be a violent film”
Narrator 33 “action [film genre] – I’m always into something. I’ve got to be out there. I was going around fighting and getting into trouble. This must have been fate [ending up in prison]”

The presence of a warrior imago, by both individuals, suggests their idealised self is centred on controlling and asserting power over others. This, alongside justification methods such as denial of injury, distorting consequences, denial of responsibility; suggest the management and treatment of offenders, whose habitual script is the ‘quest for honour’, would have different treatment needs form those with the ‘victim of circumstance’ script.

The contaminated script presents two very different life stories that are presented in the life-stories of the incarcerated offenders, which have been identified through the use of the LAAF methodology. The scripts demonstrate two different circumstances from which the offending action has occurred based on the broader antecedents presented in the psychological and self-identity content within the life-stories. Such information demonstrates differing needs for treatment and management practices from the ‘victim of circumstance’ and ‘quest for honour’ offenders. However, the variations in the contamination script may not be presented as clear-cut for all offenders as it is in the examples provided; more research is necessary with a larger sample of offenders to explore the range in the level of contamination offenders’ show in their life-story. Nonetheless, the findings have demonstrated that the LAAF methodology is able to differentiate offenders, based on their life-story narratives.

Although elements of the contamination script were present in all the offenders’ SE or film narrative, the frequency occurrence of the contaminated items for the non-incarcerated individuals was far less. One concern that is raised is based on the number of participants in the non-incarcerated group who had admitted to committing a crime (75%) of which, 32% had claimed they had been convicted of a crime. This raises questions about the dominance of the contaminated script among the incarcerated offenders: is the contamination due to the incarceration, is the contamination due to the type of criminal action they have been involved in, or is the contamination part of the broader life script? Bush (1995) suggests that offenders show similar patterns of an anti-social logic. Based on this premise is it not surprising that the
contaminated script is presented in the life-story narratives of incarcerated offenders and not in the narratives of non-incarcerated individuals.

10.2. The Life of Crime

The life-story approach allows criminals narratives to be explored beyond the crimes they commit; it requires the narrator to disclose information from a number of different life episodes. This exploration of different life episodes is an important element to deconstructing the narratives that offenders use when talking about their lives. The first part of the study examined offenders’ accounts of life episodes that aimed to explore their Life Outside Of Crime (LOOC) rather than their offending action. Through a content analysis of the life-stories, using the LAAF content framework, and drawing comparisons to a non-incarcerated sample of males from the general public; the life-stories of offenders identified numerous scenes of criminal action. At no point in this section of the interview were the offenders asked to discuss criminal action. This demonstrates that the level of criminality incarcerated offenders encompass into their life-stories is a significant part of their self-identity.

The incorporation of scenes of crime in the offenders’ life story can be further explained using labelling theory which suggests a person’s self-identity is formulated through a socialisation process. Each of the offenders was incarcerated at the time of interview, as Bernberg, Krohn and Rivera (2006) propose; this incarceration will act as reinforcement to the ‘criminal’ label. Labelling theory places the ‘actor’ in with the action (Becker, 1963) the socialisation process provides a ‘label’ for the offenders to associate themselves with and becomes part of their dominant narrative. With the reinforcement of being incarcerated, being around other criminals, and taking part in treatment and rehabilitation programmes for their offences; each provides methods of influence for the offenders to place criminality as a large part of their self-identity. This opens up an area for novel approaches to establish differentiation methods for the offenders reducing the perception of a dominant aspect of their life as being a criminal. For example, White and Epston (1990) advocate that narrative therapy allows the person to externalise themselves from the problematic behaviours in order to change the habitual thinking and dominant narrative script they have created for themselves.
Such methods would be useful in work with incarcerated offenders to help separate their lives from criminal action. The lack of overlap with crime in the life-stories of non-incarcerated individuals offers an additional mode of psychological differentiation of incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals.

10.2.1. Negative life projection

The offenders incorporated the use of more negative connotations when asked to disclose their life-stories. The offenders’ narratives were more negative in comparison to the non-incarcerated group in the analysis of the individual LAAF items (chapter 5) and in the contamination script revealed in chapter 6. The archetypal themes in the significant life event (chapter 7) also provided examples of the negative outlook of the offenders. The finding supports previous research such as Maruna (2001), Farrington (1996), and Sampson & Laub (1995) who note the influences of negative life-trajectories on criminal action. Like the offenders, the non-incarcerated individuals also discussed negative events such as death and negative emotions; however the offenders stories overall tended to be more negative, plagued with contamination sequences and external attributions of blame.

10.3. The Instrumental Aims of Crime

Differentiating criminal and deviant acts of incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals based on psychological gains for the individual, provided interesting findings. Nearly half of the deviant actions committed by the non-incarcerated individuals were for sensory gain compared to only ¼ of the crimes committed by the incarcerated offenders. Further differences were presented in the level of instrumentality, modes of control and emotions across the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. Bandura & Walters (1963) argue that behaviours involved in most crimes are available to everyone; this is supported in the analysis of deviant and criminal actions. The commissioning of both sets of actions, across all action types is underpinned by the same sets of blaming sequences displayed by the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. For example, property acts were to obtain property from another source, person acts were to assert power over others, and sensory acts provided an internal
gain for the individuals. However, differences are presented in a psychological limitation that is expressed in the crimes. An issue regularly outlined in offender – non-offender comparative research is that criminal action is understood in terms of legal definitions rather than psychological ones (Canter & Youngs, 2009; Howitt, 2009). The present findings demonstrate that psychological distinctions are important in differentiating criminal and deviant action. The findings also demonstrate that Bandura’s (1986) gain incentives provide an adequate framework exploring different types of crimes and support Youngs (2006) findings of property, person and sensory gains are fundamental aspects of criminal action.

Differences in the criminal and deviant action also reside in negative emotional descriptions of crime and the role of drug addiction as an antecedent factor; the main difference is centred in the level of instrumental action. Instrumental action was expressed through the motive for action and was consistent across each of the crime types. Interestingly, instrumentality was expressed differently across the different crimes. In the property crimes, the use of planning and preparation to control the victim demonstrates instrumental violence which was implemented for the goal of obtaining the property. The sensory crimes imply a secondary goal due to the crime being committed for monetary gains. For the property and sensory crimes money was obtained to enhance lifestyle e.g. to fund drug habit. The person crimes were committed for revenge demonstrating instrumental aggression as the violence that was committed was for the secondary gain of seeking the revenge – this was confirmed by narrative verbatim. The lack of instrumental action expressed by the non-incarcerated individuals, as Youngs and Canter (in press) put forward, demonstrates a psychological limitation on the deviant actions disclosed by this group.

10.4. Archetypal Themes

A number of archetypal themes were presented in life-story narratives. First of all, dominant narrative roles in the form of Frye’s (1957) fictional mythoi are uncovered in the thematic structure of the LAADF variables from the incarcerated offenders’ life-stories. The dominant roles presented are the professional adventure, the revenger tragedy, the victim irony, and the hero quest. The LAADF variables within each dominant narrative region
represented a similar sequence to the story plots presented in Frye’s earlier work. The presence of the dominant narratives, within the life stories of offenders, adds support to the story plots in the narratives of criminal action, from published research by Youngs and Canter (2012). Pointing to the psychological consistency of the narrative roles over different life episodes narrators’ use in the stories they tell about their lives.

The use of the NRQ, as a method of exploring narrative roles, demonstrates the same four roles are present within the thematic structure of offenders self report responses of a crime episode they had discussed (Youngs & Canter, 2012), again supporting the finding. Finally, the same narrative roles were presented in a themed structure of NRQ responses from the non-incarcerated group further suggesting the four narrative roles are dominant in narrative life-stories outside of offenders’ narratives. That aside, the findings in the present thesis are based on collective findings from groups of incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals, more research is needed to support this finding on an individual basis. Such research was not intended in the present remit.

McAdams (2005) argues that a life-story is more than a literacy based production of an event but rather life-stories are significant representations to the real world. He also states that life-stories should portray a rich account of a lived experience rather than be based in dominant cultural narratives. However, the richness of the narrative is based on the ability of the person providing the narration. The social construction of life-story narratives is based on the same social construction of all human behaviour, which from Bandura’s (1986) socio-cognitive approach, is a from modelling of learned behaviour. Stories have offered a method of sharing information through story-making and story-telling over thousands of years. Stories have provided ways for information to be passed down from one generation to the next therefore it is not surprising that the stories people tell about themselves resemble story-plots found in fictional literature. Polkinghorne (1988; 1991) states that the presentation of a narrative, as a communication strategy, involves the use of story plots to provide a cognitive structure to human actions. The resemblance of archetypal themes is obtained from a limited number of schematic sequences of a storied formation. The plot allows the narrator to take the position of
the protagonist and therefore the story he presents is his schematic representation of his reality.

Archetypal themes present in the life-stories of offenders are themes of intimacy and potency which are also consistent over life episodes. Youngs and Canter (2012) propose a structure of how themes of intimacy and potency are presented within offenders’ narratives of crime actions; the same polarising structure was found in the narratives of the LOOC events. The themes of intimacy and potency are based on McAdams (1993) themes of agency and communion which he argues are central features to narrative identity. The findings support the notion of narrative identity being underpinned by such archetypal themes. On examining intimacy and potency events disclosed by the narrators, as part of the SE, the non-incarcerated individuals discussed more potency related events and the offenders more intimacy related. The theme of potency (and agency) is underpinned by dominance presented by the individual through power, autonomy, mastery and achievement (McAdams, 1993). The discussion of more potency-focused events would allow the narrator to present the action as a result of their achievements, their mastery, and demonstrate an internal locus of control of the action. This explains why elements of justifying behaviours and negative life projections are more readily found in the stories of offenders.

10.5. Theoretical Contributions

10.5.1. An aetiological approach to criminality

The study of criminality is substantiated by research exploring background characteristics of offenders such as environmental, social, family, and personality traits; drawing on comparisons to offenders and non-offenders. This research assumes that criminals are different non-criminals and criminal action is a subset of behaviours presented by only certain people. Bandura and Walters (1963) argue that most people have the behavioural potential for criminal action and Bush, Mullins and Mullins (1999) found over half of their non-offenders sample had reported being involved in delinquent acts; a finding that is replicated in the present findings. Conventional methods of exploring criminality ignore the conscious effort
and psychological intention to commit the act; which the present findings have demonstrated to be an important underpinning aspect of criminal action. The present thesis advances in the knowledge of criminal action in the way that focuses on the experience of the action presented through the life-story narratives of the individual; moving away from traditional methods but also demonstrating complimentary findings to more readily accepted explanations of criminality.

A new perspective on exploring criminal action is offered through collecting data from the offenders themselves, this data is not just focused on the crimes committed but data that explores other areas of their lives. The narrative approach offers a method for offenders to describe different life-episodes (including their criminal action) offering the offender an agentic role through self-reflection, of the actions they discuss. This allows knowledge of the action to be gained by those that are closest to it so motivations, intentions and experiences can be uncovered. Extensive research using the life-story model has demonstrated its usefulness in extracting psychologically rich data in among ‘normal’ individuals; what is presented here is how the life-story model can expand academic literature in researching criminal action. The findings demonstrate, through exploring the broader life narratives of offenders’ dominant narrative scripts are presented in addition to psychological limitations in the commissioning of crime and deviant actions; validating the use of life-story narratives a rich data source for the study of criminality.

The labelling process has had a long standing within theoretical criminology, through the identification of criminal aspects to a life story provides a method of exploring how different variations of the labelling process can occur. The LAAF framework, in the present study, demonstrates how criminal aspects of a life-story are presented by the offenders’ providing a new way of criminality – through the narrative experiences of offenders, with strong potential to extend extant theories. The stories offenders tell about their lives are based on tales of criminal action and contaminated cognition. Such knowledge demonstrates the theoretical implications of the narrative approach to the study of criminal action. Dominant narrative roles, linked to story plots, demonstrate psychological consistency over different life episodes that
are present in incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals. This provides a theoretical framework for further exploration of the dominant narrative roles presented, across life episodes, of criminals and in other samples of narrators. A framework for understanding the immediate precursors to offending action is provided. Extending the understanding of human behaviour through the use of the narrative approach provides a method for elaborating substance of what a narrative is in its psychological existence and what this means for the archetypal themes and story plots that people use to discuss their lives.

10.6. Methodological Contributions

10.6.1. Narrative approach as a method for exploring criminal action

A fundamental contribution is demonstrated in the importance and usefulness of the narrative approach in criminal research. It provides a data collection process that incorporates parts of the offenders’ personal lives, their interactions, motives, emotions, schemas and plans; that uncover important information about the offenders, extending beyond psychometric testing and case-file records. McAdams (1993) argues that the life-story approach uncovers important information about the individual which extends beyond the identification of traits. Although, such methods have had great success in psychological theory and practice, the study of criminality demonstrates that a range of psychological processors such as cognitive (Fisher, Beech & Brown, 1999), moral reasoning (Palmer, 2003a), personality traits (McGurk & McDougall, 1981), social factors (Elliot & Menard, 1996), environmental influences (Farrington, 1996), interactions (Canter, 1994) are involved in criminality. The narrative approach offers a way in which each of the psychological processes can be explored by how they interact with the various episodes within the offenders’ life-story and also the offenders’ perception of such interactions.

The LAAF approach implemented in the current thesis has demonstrated a strong methodological approach for eliciting offenders’ narratives. Interviewing offenders about their crime action can be difficult for both the offender and the researcher conducting the interviews. The LAAF framework offers a method of interviewing that allows the offenders to talk about more general aspects of their lives rather than just focusing on the criminal actions
they have committed. By focusing on life in general, a more positive approach to interviewing problematic behaviours’ is provided. For example, the LAAF (CY-NEOv1 interview protocol) model applied in the present study focuses on three life events. The first section of the interview asks the interviewee to describe a significant life event; there is no pressure on the interviewee to disclose a challenging event, this helps to build rapport during the early stages of the interview. The second section explores the problematic (or criminal action). The final section asks the interviewee to describe their life as a film; this section of the interview offers a ‘wind-down’ process. Describing life as film allows the interviewee to evaluate their life without the pressure of asking them to do so. The LAAF model offers an un-invasive method of self-assessment and self-reflection which provides a number of implicit benefits for the narrator; therefore the methodological implications extend beyond a data collection method for academic research.

10.6.2. Life As A Film (LAAF)

The LAAF also offers a structured framework for systematically analysing psychological themes presented in an offender’s life-story. The LAAF framework is developed from extensive research identifying psychological themes that are presented in narratives. The LAAF offers a detailed content dictionary for use of coding life-story interview data and is designed to explore the story content, psychological content, narrative complexity, and psychological components. The present study is the first to employ the LAAF framework to deconstructing offenders’ narratives; it has demonstrated the framework is stable enough to explore life-story narratives of incarcerated offenders and non-incarcerated individuals. In addition, the LAAF framework offers promising results when the variables are subject to empirical testing which highlights internally consistency of thematic constructs. Previous concerns by researchers, such as Presser (2010), have highlighted the lack of a systemic method of collecting and analysing the stories of offenders, what the LAAF framework alongside the additional measures (e.g. NRQ) offered in the CY-NEO interview protocol is method of doing so.
In addition, the LAAF approach as a more detailed interview structure is currently being further developed by researchers at the International Research Centre for Investigative Psychology. The LAAF as an interview is aimed at an un-intrusive method of further exploring story plots, character roles, scenes, emotions during different scenes, and self-reflective elements.

10.6.3. Narrative Roles Questionnaire (NRQ)

A further methodological implications reside in the contribution of the reliability and validity of the self-report NRQ scale. The NRQ has been presented in previous research (Youngs & Canter, 2012) as a measure of dominant narrative roles. A number of psychological components can be uncovered based on a number of modalities of emotion, self-identity, cognitive interpretation, and themes of intimacy and potency; each provides a classification system for identifying dominant narrative roles. The present research adds to the validity of the scale showing support for the psychological sub-themes and dominant narrative roles and also demonstrates the scales usefulness in measuring narrative roles in a non-incarcerated general public sample of males.

10.7. Practical Contributions

10.7.1. Treatment and rehabilitation

The capability of an offender is an important part of making the ‘change’ that treatment requires; appropriate methodologies are necessary to understand the offender, their treatment needs, and their potential response to treatment (Thomas-Peter, 2006). The study of an offender’s life-story offers a method of obtaining information using the offender as the expert. For example, narrated descriptions of behaviour are an essential part of therapeutic practice. Narrative provides a tool for uncovering a person’s reality as it makes sense to them (Bruner, 1991); the role of the therapist is to work with the client to co-construct the narratives to help the person to develop a new meaningful reality (McAdams, 2005). Identification of different narrative roles among offenders, whether they are in the form of the contamination script or as
the archetypal themes, suggests that different treatment and rehabilitation strategies may be implemented to suit each different narrative role.

The structure of the dominant narrative roles (also known as archetypal themes) – hero, victim, revenger and professional - are based on modalities of reoccurring psychological components of emotion, cognitive interpretation, and identity which are centralised around the polarising themes of intimacy and potency. The four dominant narrative roles are prominent in the offenders’ descriptions of life-episodes outside of crime action and demonstrate a consistency of the four narrative roles across the life-episodes. Consistency of narrative roles over life-episodes opens up the opportunity for a typology system that can be used to classify incarcerated offenders based on the dominant narrative roles they use when describing life-episodes. Therapeutic efforts can, therefore, be tailored to the individual needs of the offenders based on the psychological components that are presented in the narrative roles. For example, in chapter 8, the archetypal theme of a victim demonstrates this narrative role is underpinned by negative emotions and a weak self-identity; this is replicated in the contaminated script of the ‘victim of circumstance’ presented in chapter 6. However, the archetypal theme of a revenger provides a narrative role that is underpinned by distortions and justifications for their behaviour; this is also replicated in the contaminated script of the ‘quest for honour’. Each narrative theme presents a different set of psychological needs and therefore would benefit from different types of therapies. For example, in the victim of circumstance script the offenders discuss self-harming behaviours, scenes of when they have been a victim and the negative emotions that surround that; therefore the use of Dialectical Behavioural Therapy, which is designed to work with those specific issues, maybe more beneficial for those with a victim narrative role. Whereas, those offenders with the revenger narrative demonstrate more use of different forms of justifications for their behaviours and therefore may benefit from the use of Cognitive Behavioural Therapy which is designed to work with restructuring thought processes. The role of group-based intervention can also be focused on working with offenders, collectively, who display similar dominant narrative roles.

10.7.2. Offender reintegration and crime reduction
Examination of the ‘criminal aspect’ in an offender’s broader life-story, is able to identify areas within the offender’s life, that, may have a negative influence on their reintegration once the incarceration period is fulfilled. Such knowledge will also expose elements that are likely factors to contribute to recidivism. For example, the role of drug addiction, support networks such as family and friends, stability factors i.e. children, and the habitual narrative role; can all influence offending and desistance from offending (Sampson & Laub, 1995; Maruna, 2001). Therefore, uncovering the offenders’ perception of such stability factors, in the past and present, can help to predict where efforts can be focused to support such areas on release.

In comparing criminal action discussed by the incarcerated offenders and deviant action discussed by the non-incarcerated individuals, the study demonstrated psychological differences in the commissioning and execution of the behaviours showing a limitation in the action displayed by the non-incarcerated individuals through the lack of instrumental incentive. While the incarcerated and non-incarcerated individuals maintain similar actions of stealing, violence against a person and involvement with illegal substances; the psychological differentiation resides in the motivation of the acts and secondary intentions of the acts displayed by the incarcerated offenders. Such methods of psychological differentiation can better inform crime prevention strategies such as zero tolerance policy.

Finally, as outlined by Nee (2004) and Stevens (1994) through exploring criminals narratives of their crime action, opens up the opportunity to understanding their temporal and spatial movements in addition to first hand-knowledge’s of their target selection. Such information has benefits for advancing geographical profiling techniques. Knowledge obtained can also have benefits for uncovering the offenders’ interpretations for their opportunities for crime; this can also better inform crime prevention and reduction strategies.

10.7.3. Conversation management tools

With regard to interviewing suspects, knowledge of the dominant narrative roles can inform investigative interviewing strategy. Youngs and Canter (2009) argue that the dominant narrative roles presented in crime action provide a psychological basis to offence patterns and
background features of the offenders. The process of the investigative interview is for the interviewee to provide information about the event under investigation; in which case the interviewee provides a narrated account focused on their interpretations of the event. Having knowledge of the different narrative roles that individuals’ use when discussing autobiographical events, can help equip officers with the different interpersonal styles people use to disclose information about themselves; extending beyond open or closed questioning strategies.

10.7.4. Police investigation and Criminal Justice System (CJS)

A further contribution of the study of offenders’ narratives of their crime action provides a method for law enforcement agencies to better understand the actions of those they seek to convict. The narrative approach offers law enforcement officials an alternative way to viewing criminal action which has direct implications to reviewing how cases are managed within the CJS. By understanding criminals’ narratives, using the life-story approach, law enforcement officials can better predict patterns in offending behaviour alongside motives for action; such information has benefits to inform sentencing and referral orders.

10.8. Future Directions

Although the narrative approach does provide a useful paradigm structure for the study of criminality, the findings of the present study do highlight some limitations that need to be addressed. The narrative themes discussed in the current findings are obtained from a sample of incarcerated male offenders who have been convicted for a range of offences. Therefore, the role of the narrative themes among other offending populations will need further exploration to elaborate and confirm how the themes exist among other types of offenders. Future research should consider samples which explore the life narratives of different offender samples. For example, (Galbry, 2003) found female delinquency to be a result of family issues and male delinquency a result of peer influence; such differences may present different dominant narrative structure and precursors to criminal action which can be identified through further narrative research of female offenders. Youth offending may offer alternatives to
understanding features such as the role of crime in the life story. For example, McAdams (1993) argues that the formulation of narrative identity begins in the adolescence therefore research implementing the life-story approach among youth offenders would offer insightful knowledge about turning points underpinning the onset of criminal action.

Comparisons were drawn from a sample of non-incarcerated males from the general public. Within the sample of non-incarcerated males’ three levels of criminality emerged: those who had not admitted to committing any crimes, those who had committed crimes but had no convictions and those who had committed crimes and been convicted. This highlights an agenda of study based on life-story approach and level of deviant action future research may consider this in terms of exploring themes of general public offending. The general public group, in the present research, was incorporated as a control group for the incarcerated offenders therefore detailed examination of the narrative of this sample was not part of the present research agenda.

The crime action presented by the offenders was restricted to broad categories of crimes based on their gains of property, person and sensory. Although various other crimes were reported in the dataset such as sexual offences, fraud, and arson; only few accounts of those crimes were reported. Future researchers should consider the categories of offences the narrators have committed. Collecting life-story narratives of a broader group of offenders may present further narrative themes of differentiation within and between the crimes groups. A useful study for future research to consider is the examination of LAAF variables across crime types. Such knowledge has benefits for treatment practices and law enforcement agencies for the understanding the types of offenders who commit different types of crimes.

Although a number of areas of future research are identified, it does not disadvantage the findings of the present study. The areas highlighted for research only add weight in the argument that narratives of offenders’ are an under-researched area of psychology. The numerous suggestions of areas for future researches to explore highlight the vast area that narrative psychology can add to the understanding of criminality. The current work is a unique
attempt to explore the life-stories of offenders and how they impact their offending action. Overall, the life-stories of offenders are plagued in negative scenes and distorted thinking patterns. Narratives have psychological purpose for the narrators who present them, this purpose is to be heard, to express meaning, and to provide explanation; and therefore provide a rich source of information for psychological exploration.
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APPENDIX

1(i)

CY-NEOv1 Narrative Interview Protocol

For incarcerated offenders
Life narrative interview section: Significant event

1) I want you to tell me about a significant event in your life that you can remember very clearly. It can be anything at all. Tell me in as much detail as you can what happened.

- (Tell me more, what happened)
- Tell me why it was significant
- Tell me what impact it had on your life

- That’s really interesting; we would like to know a little bit more, could you complete the following boxes.
2) For the **significant event you have just talked about**, please tell me how you felt. Indicate the extent to which you felt each of the following:

**Emotions questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Just a little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lonely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scared</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exhilarated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Confident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Upset</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pleased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Calm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Safe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Worried</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Depressed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Enthusiastic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Thoughtful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Annoyed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Excited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Confused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Miserable  1  2  3  4  5
19. Irritated  1  2  3  4  5
20. Relaxed  1  2  3  4  5
21. Delighted  1  2  3  4  5
22. Unhappy  1  2  3  4  5
23. Courageous  1  2  3  4  5
24. Contented  1  2  3  4  5
25. Manly  1  2  3  4  5
26. Pointless  1  2  3  4  5

3) For the significant event in your life you have just talked about, please indicate the extent to which each of the statements below describes what it was like.

Narrative Roles Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Just a little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I was like a professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I had to do it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It was fun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It was right</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It was interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It was like an adventure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It was routine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I was in control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It was exciting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I was doing a job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I knew what I was doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It was the only thing to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It was a mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Nothing else mattered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I had power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I was helpless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It was my only choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I was a victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I was confused about what was happening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I was looking for recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I just wanted to get it over with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I didn’t care what would happen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. What was happening was just fate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. It all went to plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I couldn’t stop myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. It was like I wasn’t part of it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. It was a manly thing to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. For me, it was like a usual days work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I was trying to get revenge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. There was nothing special about what happened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I was getting my own back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I knew I was taking a risk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Life narrative interview: Crime episode

Crime Interview:
INITIAL ACCOUNT

Crime narrative.

I would like you to tell me about and an offence that you have committed and can remember clearly. Describe one that is typical of the type of offences you have carried out in the past (except for murder then describe that). If you have only committed the offence you are incarcerated for then describe that. Please tell me in as much details about the event.

- Tell me more, what happened.
- Tell me who else it involved
- Tell me what impact it had on your life

DETAILED ACCOUNT

Note to interviewers:
Idea is ask to describe in as much detail as possible. Use question prompts to ensure you are getting the richest and fullest possible description, so should ask all, even if it means some repetition. Asking all the questions will also help us to understand how to interpret missing information (i.e. if you ask all the questions and they don't mention e.g. a weapon, we can assume they didn't have one).
So output will be a free text account that we content analyse, not set of answers to specific questions.

Description of a Crime

Please could you tell me about what you did in a bit more detail.....

BEFORE
What were the events leading up to you committing the crime?

What preparations, if any, did you make?

What type of place or person did you pick?

Who did you go with?
What did you take with you?

What did you do before you started?

How did you start the crime?

Did anyone see you starting the crime? Yes____ No____
If someone saw you starting the crime what did you do?

What happened next?

DURING: THE DETAIL OF THE MAIN EVENT
What were your reasons for doing this crime/ what was the main purpose? How did you go about trying to achieve this?

So what did you actually do?:
i.e. (property crime) what did you nick?
i.e. (Person/ Damage Crime) what did you actually do to the person or place?

Burglary Specific questions:
   How did you get in?
      What did you do as soon as you were inside the house?
      What else did you do inside the house?
      What did you do to make sure you were safe from the people that lived there?
      Did the people living in the house come across you? Yes_____ No____
          IF yes, what did you do?

Alternatives
You could have done this offence in a different way. What other ways might you have done it in? Why didn't you do it in these ways?

Sometimes you might decide to do a crime differently- can you think when and what you would have to adjust?

What else could you have done or taken that you didn't? If so why?
(Property crime) What stuff did you leave behind that you could have taken?
(Person crime/ Damage crime) So why did you stop/ leave it there?
You said your main reasons/ purpose was…. Why did you choose this/ get this by doing this particular crime, rather than another type?

**CHANGES due to SITUATIONAL FACTORS or INTERACTIONS**
Did you change what you planned to do during the course of the crime at all? (if so how and why)

Did anything unexpected happen? How did this change what you did?  
Did anyone/ the person do anything you didn't expect? So what did you do?  
Was there anything in the place or about the place that you didn't expect? So what did you do?

**ENDING**
What did you do to make sure you didn't get caught?

How did you get out or away?

What did you do as soon as you got out or away?  
Where did you go?

**OVERVIEW**
How long did the incident last?  
How strong are your memories of the incident? Please tick a box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERY STRONG</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>QUITE STRONG</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>VERY WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) For the **event that you have just talked about**, please tell me how you felt. Indicate the extent to which you felt each of the following:

**Emotions Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Just a little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Lonely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scared</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Exhilarated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Confident</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Upset</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pleased</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Calm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Safe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Worried</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Depressed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Enthusiastic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Thoughtful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Annoyed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Angry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Excited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Confused</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Miserable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Irritated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Relaxed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Delighted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Unhappy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Courageous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Contented</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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6) For the **event that you have just talked about**, please indicate the extent to which each of the statements below describes what it was like.

**Narrative Roles Questionnaire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Just a little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I was like a professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I had to do it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It was fun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It was right</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It was interesting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. It was like an adventure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. It was routine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I was in control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. It was exciting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I was doing a job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I knew what I was doing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It was the only thing to do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It was a mission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Nothing else mattered</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I had power</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I was helpless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. It was my only choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I was a victim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I was confused about what was happening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I was looking for recognition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I just wanted to get it over with</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I didn’t care what would happen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. What was happening was just fate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. It all went to plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I couldn’t stop myself</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. It was like I wasn’t part of it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. It was a manly thing to do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. For me, it was like a usual days work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I was trying to get revenge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. There was nothing special about what happened</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I was getting my own back</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I knew I was taking a risk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. I guess I always knew it was going to happen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Life narrative interview: Life as a film**

3. **Life as a film**

The aim is to get the participants to describe their life as a film sequence. Again use the prompts to get as much detail as possible.
If your life was a film what film would it be?

What would be the main events?

Who would be the central characters?

Who would play you?

7) Here are some words that people sometimes use to describe themselves. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following words describes you.

**Life Trajectories Questionnaire section 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Hero</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Comic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tragic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Worthless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Courageous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Just a clown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Unfortunate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Insignificant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) Here are some statements that people sometimes use to describe life. Please indicate the extent to which each of those statements describes you.

**Life Trajectories Questionnaire section 2**
9) Below are some statements that people sometimes use to describe their feelings or actions. Please indicate the extent to which each of the statements describes how you feel.

**Life Trajectories Questionnaire section 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>A lot</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Life is meaningless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Things usually turn out for the best</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am fated to fail miserably</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If I try hard enough I will be successful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. There is not much point to life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Overall I am an optimist about things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can be a winner if I want to be</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel there is no hope for me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. It is important in my life to have lots of different experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. I have done wrong things in the past but I am decent underneath, it will all work out well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. I tend to get myself noticed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. I am just trying to make the best of myself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### D45 Questionnaire

**GENERAL BACKGROUND**

*Have you ever...?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>ONCE OR TWICE</th>
<th>A FEW TIMES (LESS THAN 10)</th>
<th>QUITE OFTEN (10-50 TIMES)</th>
<th>VERY OFTEN (MORE THAN 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Broken into a house, shop or school and taken money or something else you wanted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Broken into a locked car to get something from it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Threaten to beat someone up if they didn't give you money or something else you wanted?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Actually shot at someone with a gun?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Pulled a knife, gun or some other weapon on someone just to let them know you meant business?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Beat someone up so badly they probably needed a doctor?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Taken heroin?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Broken the windows of an empty house or other unoccupied building?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Bought something you knew had been stolen?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Intentionally started a building on fire?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Been involved in gang fights?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Taken things of large value (worth more than £100) from a shop without paying for them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Taken Ecstasy (Es)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Broken into a house, shop, school or other building to break things up or cause other damage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sniffed glue or other solvents (e.g. tippex thinner)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Used or carried a gun to help you commit a crime?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Prepared an escape route before you carried out a crime?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Taken care not to leave evidence (like fingerprints) after carrying out a crime?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Got others to act as ‘watch’ or ‘lookout’?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Acted as ‘watch’ or ‘lookout’?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Taken special tools with you to help you carry out a crime?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Molested or fondled someone (in a sexual way) without their permission?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Stolen a car to ring it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Nicked a car to go for a ride in it and then abandoned it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEVER</th>
<th>ONCE OR TWICE</th>
<th>A FEW TIMES (LESS THAN 10)</th>
<th>QUITE OFTEN (10-50 TIMES)</th>
<th>VERY OFTEN (MORE THAN 50)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unc</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Stolen things you didn't really want from a shop just for the excitement of doing it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Nicked things from a shop and then sold them on?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Carried a gun in case you needed it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Stolen something to eat because you were so hungry?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Made a shop assistant give you money from the till?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Helped your mates smash up somewhere or something even though you really didn't want to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Beat up someone who did something to one of your mates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Nicked stuff you didn't want just because all your mates were doing it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Done a burglary in a place that you knew would be hard to get into?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Stolen stuff from a shop that had a lot of security?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Had to take part in a fight your mates were having with another group of kids even though you didn't want to?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Taken drugs you didn't want because everyone else there was having them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Nicked a badge or something from an expensive car (like a BMW) to keep for yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Pretended your giro had been nicked because you needed a bit more money?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Actually used a knife to hurt someone?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Bought pirate videos or CDs to sell on?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Bought pirate videos or CDs to keep for yourself?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Sold heroin?</td>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>ONCE OR TWICE</td>
<td>A FEW TIMES (LESS THAN 10)</td>
<td>QUITE OFTEN (10-50 TIMES)</td>
<td>VERY OFTEN (MORE THAN 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Sprayed graffiti on a building or public wall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Done a burglary on a really big, posh house?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Broken into a warehouse and stolen goods worth more than £1000?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Smashed the glass of a bus shelter or phone box?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Set fire to a bin?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Set fire to a car even though you didn't know whose it was?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Killed someone in a fit of anger or emotion?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Parked in a disabled space?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Got a bit violent with your family at home?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Pretended that you had lost stuff to the insurance company?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Drawn benefit when you were working?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Gone to a sauna or massage place to get sex?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Nicked the purse of someone you knew?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Done a burglary on the house of someone you knew?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Sold marijuana (pot/grass?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Threatened someone you knew with a knife?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Set fire to a building when people were still in there?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Made new credit cards with stolen card numbers?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic Questionnaire**

Now please tell me about yourself….

Male ______ or Female ______

How old are you? ______________

What ethnicity are you? Please tick below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black-Caribbean</th>
<th>Black-African</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Other Please say what</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What qualifications did you get at school? (GCSEs/ O levels/ CSEs)
Do you have any A-Levels? Yes_____ No_____

Write down any other qualifications or training that you have? (Things like NVQs or military training or sports skills)

What courses/ sessions have you attended in prison if any?

How old were you when you were first given an official warning by the police?

How old were you when you were first found guilty of a crime in court?

What was this for? ___________________________________________

About how many convictions have you got in total (include everything)?_________

About how many times have you been up in court?_____________

What do you have convictions for? Please write all the different types of convictions that you have.

What are most of your convictions for?

What was your first conviction?

Do either of your parents or step-parents have convictions? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, what for?__________________________________________________

Have you been to a prison or a Young Offender's Institution before? Yes_____ No_____

If yes, how long were you away for before? ____________months
How long was the sentence you were given (this time)? ___________months

How much of this have you served so far? ___________months

Have you been on probation before? Yes_______ No_______

As a child did you live? (If you lived in different places please tick all those that apply) :-

with my Mum and Dad -__________________________
with just one of my parents -__________________________
with my Mum and step-Dad -__________________________
with my Dad and step-Mum -__________________________
with other relatives -__________________________
with foster parents -__________________________
in a Children's or Community Home -__________________________
Other (please say) -__________________________

Did any brothers or sisters (or step brothers or step sisters) live with you? 
Yes _________ No___________

If yes, how many lived with you? -___________

What ages are they now?

Do they have any criminal convictions? Yes__________ No__________

If so, what are these for?

If you know, please tell me what job your parents (or step-parents) do. 
If they are unemployed tell me about their most recent job:-

**Father/ Step-father:**

What is the job called? ____________________________

What do they do? ____________________________

Full time or Part time? ____________________________

Are they unemployed now? Yes______ No_______
Mother/ Step mother:  

What is the job called? __________________________

What do they do? ____________________________

Full time or Part time? ________________________

Are they unemployed now? Yes_____ No_______
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CY-NEOv1 Narrative Interview Protocol

Sections that were amended for use with non-incarcerated members of the general public

- crime description changed to socially unacceptable event description
- demographic information edited down
Life narrative interview: Crime episode amended for use with the general public

4) Socially unacceptable behaviour

Note to interviewers:

Idea is ask to describe in as much detail as possible. Use question prompts to ensure you are getting the richest and fullest possible description, so should ask all, even if it means some repetition. Asking all the questions will also help us to understand how to interpret missing information (i.e. if you ask all the questions and they don’t mention e.g. a weapon, we can assume they didn’t have one).

So output will be a free text account that we content analyse, not set of answers to specific questions.

**Description of behaviour**

Please describe a socially unacceptable event you were involved in.

How did you feel at the time?

Could it have been done differently?

What happened leading up to the event?

What happened during?

What happened after?

Was anyone else involved?

How strong are your memories of the incident? Please tick a box

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERY STRONG</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>QUITE STRONG</th>
<th>WEAK</th>
<th>VERY WEAK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic questionnaire for use with the general public

Now please tell me about yourself....

Age: ........

Ethnicity (please tick below)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black-Caribbean</th>
<th>Black-African</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Pakistani</th>
<th>Bangladeshi</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What qualifications did you get at school? (GCSEs/ O levels/ CSEs)?

Do you have any A/ AS levels? Yes....... No.......

Do you have higher education qualifications? (Degree, Masters, PhD)?

Write Down any other qualification or training (e.g. NVQs, military training or sports skills)

Occupation: ........................................................................................................

Have you talked to the police as either a victim or offender? Yes....... No.......

In what capacity? ................................................................................................

Have you committed a crime? Yes....... No.......
If so, what?..............................................................................................................................................................

Do you have any convictions? Yes........ No.........
APPENDIX

2

LAAF Content coding dictionary
Canter-Youngs CODING SYSTEM for Narrative themes in Life as Film and Significant Event Interviews*

1. Descriptives

a. Content

Genre Comedy- Yes-1 / No-0
Genre Romance- Yes-1 / No-0
Genre Crime- Yes-1 / No-0
Genre Action- Yes/No
Genre Tragedy - Yes/No
Genre Thriller- Yes/No

Events - all Yes=1/ No=0

Doing Crime
Imprisonment
Victim of Crime
Birth
Death
Material success
Relationship problem
Relationship success

Behaviours conducted by interviewee (all Yes=1/ No =0):

Proactive
Reactive
Avoidant of others
Confronting others
For Material/ Financial gain
For Sensory gain (pleasure based, sensation, stimulation, boredom avoidance)
For Power/ Status gain
For Social (approval, advancement) gain

b. Complexity

Length in words
Number of people cited
Presence of distinct roles for 'characters' Yes-1/ No-0
Number of distinct events cited
Number of distinct psychological ideas
Presence of contingent sequences- Yes-1/No-0
Presence of distinct beginning, middle and end components to story Yes-1/No-0
Presence of coherent theme (s)- Yes-1/ No-0

2. Narrative Components.

Happy Ending/ Sad Ending
Positive tone/ Negative Tone
Passive / Pro-active

Agency themes (all Yes=1/ No=0) from McAdams (2012)
Self-mastery
Status- Victory
Achievement/Responsibility
Empowerment
Communion Themes (all Yes=1/ No=0) from McAdams (2012)

Love/ Friendship
Dialogue
Caring/ Help
Unity/ Togetherness

Change type (Adjusted from McAdams et al) see http://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/foley/

For definitions

a. Redemption (all Yes=1 No=0)

General Redemption: Movement from negative situation to positive
Specific Themes: Enjoys a special advantage
Specific Themes: Witnesses suffering or injustice in lives of others during childhood
Specific Themes: Development of sense of moral steadfastness
Specific Themes: Repeatedly encounters negative events that are transformed into redemption sequence (i.e. become good/ obtain positive results from)
Specific Themes: Sets forth prosocial goals

b. Contamination

General Contamination: Movement from positive to negative

Specific Forms of contamination: (see http://www.sesp.northwestern.edu/foley/ for more detail) yes=1; no=0

Victimisation
Betrayal
Loss of significant others
Failure
Physical or psychological illness or injury
Disappointment
Disillusionment
Sex guilt, humiliation

**Imagoes - Characterisations of self in terms of following Imagoes: (all yes=1; no =0) see McAdams (1993) p124 for definitions**

- Healer
- Teacher
- Counsellor
- Humanist
- Arbiter
- Warrior
- Traveller
- Sage
- Maker
- Lover
- Caregiver
- Friend
- Ritualistic
- Escapist
- Survivor

**Characterisations of others in terms of following Imagoes: Imagoes:- (all yes=1; no =0) see McAdams (1993) p124 for definitions**

- Healer
- Teacher
- Counsellor
- Humanist
- Arbiter
Warrior
Traveller
Sage
Maker
Lover
Caregiver
Friend
Ritualistic
Escapist
Survivor

**Yes =1/ no=0**

Self identity as Stronger or Weaker than others
Others as Significant or Non Significant to them (self-identity)

Empathy for others
Hostility towards others

Emotions from Aroused- Positive Quadrant
Emotions from Aroused- Negative Quadrant
Emotions from Non-aroused- Positive Quadrant
Emotions from Non-aroused- Negative Quadrant

**Justifications of general types used (all Yes=1/ No=0) see Sykes and Matza (1956) and Bandura (1990) for definitions :**

denial of responsibility,
denial of injury,
denial of the victim,
condemnation of condemners,
appeal to higher loyalties
displacement of responsibility,
diffusion of responsibility,
distorting the consequences of an action,
dehumanising the victim,
assuming the role of victim for one’s self

Mention of following ideas (all Yes=1/ No=0)
Overcoming Struggles/ Obstacles/ Mission
Wrong done to them/ theirs
Impotence/ Hopelessness
Effectiveness/ Skills/ competencies
Victory/ Proving Self/ Success
Revenge
Fate
Tangible Rewards/ acquisitions
Masculinity/ Bravery
Compulsion
Confusion/ misunderstanding
Fulfilment/ satisfaction
Information Sheet
Participant Information Sheet

Interviews with non-incarcerated individuals (members of the general public)

Aim: To compare narratives themes from life events of incarcerated offenders to non-incarcerated individuals to explore whether distinct narrative themes underpin criminal action.

You have been selected to be part of the non-incarcerated participant group.

Taking part in the research will include an audio recorded interview where you will be asked to describe 3 life episodes: significant event, socially unacceptable event, life as a film. This will include answering a set of questionnaires relating to each life event. In addition to the interview you will be asked to complete a demographic information sheet. This is to obtain general background information about each participant such as age, gender and details of occupation.

The interview will last around 30 minutes (but no longer than an hour). The audio recording of the interview will be transcribed for an analysis - at this point the researcher will omit any information which may allow identification to the participants and any other persons discussed in the interview.

You have the right to withdraw from the research after completing the interview. To do so send an email titled ‘withdraw’ to u0972868@hud.ac.uk. In the email simply state your unique identification number (in the box at the top-right of the sheet). You do not have to give a reason for your withdraw; however this should be within three month of taking part in the interview.

The data obtained from the interviews will remain confidential throughout the process of the research and will be stored in a locked filing cabinet within the research centre.

The primary use of the data will be for the current PhD research project; however it may also be used for future research by the team at the centre.

If you give permission, once the current research is finished, the anonymised interview transcript obtained from this interview will be stored in the archives at the IRCIP for additional study and research purposes by me or another member of the team. If you do not want your interview protocol to be stored after the current project is finished please state on the consent form.

Researcher contact details: This research is part of PhD project conducted by Nikki Carthy, University of Huddersfield. The project is supervised by Professor David Canter and Dr Donna Youngs.

If you have any questions or concerns about the project please email the main researcher: Nikki Carthy u0972868@hud.ac.uk.
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Consent Form
Please take the time to read the following information carefully. Ask us if there is anything you do not understand or if you would like more information.

The interview is entirely confidential, and will explore your particular experiences that you have had and how you feel about them. The only people that will have access to any information obtained from the interview will be qualified research associates in the psychology department at the University of Huddersfield. Moreover, your name (or any other identifiable characteristics) will not appear anywhere in the study. Some portions of the interview may be reproduced in the materials that result from this research, but respondents will remain anonymous in any such documents. Your name will only appear on this consent form, and this will be kept separate from the material obtained from your interview.

Please now read and sign the following consent form.

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information for the above study.
2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without my legal rights being affected.
3. I understand that none of my personal details will be recorded and that my responses are anonymous.
4. I agree that anonymous interview quotes can be reproduced.
5. I agree my data can be stored in the IRCIP achieves.
6. I agree to take part in the above study.

Name of Participant ____________________ Date ________________ Signature ____________________

Researcher __________________________ Date ________________ Signature ____________________

Thank you very much for agreeing to take part in this study.