

## **Learning to Change: A Goal-Directed Perspective on Evidence-Based Rehabilitation**

Tilia Linthout<sup>1</sup>, Emilie Caspar<sup>1</sup>, & Pieter Van Dessel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Ghent University, Belgium

This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the final, authoritative version of the article as published in *Law & Criminology Journal*. The final article will be available, upon publication, via its DOI:

Linthout, T., Caspar, E., & Van Dessel, P. (in press). Learning to Change: A Goal-Directed Perspective on Evidence-Based Rehabilitation. *Law & Criminology Journal*.

<https://doi.org/10.21825/lcj.99704>

### **Author Note**

All correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Tilia Linthout, Department of Experimental-Clinical and Health Psychology, Ghent University, H. Dunantlaan 2, 9000 Ghent, Belgium. Email: [Tilia.Linthout@UGent.be](mailto:Tilia.Linthout@UGent.be).

## **Abstract**

Despite widespread calls to make prisons more rehabilitative, issues such as aggression, substance use, and recidivism remain pervasive. Evidence-based practices in correctional settings have struggled to deliver consistent improvements, partly due to weak theoretical and empirical foundations. Many programs rely on theories focusing on distal outcomes like recidivism that do not specify how behavior arises from interacting goals, beliefs, and contexts. This review examines the stagnation of evidence-based rehabilitation and how to enhance it by grounding practice in contemporary psychology. We identify three challenges: the replication and generalizability crisis, the mapping problem between theory and outcomes, and structural and institutional barriers to implementation. Building on recent cognitive accounts of behavior, we outline a framework that reconnects behavioral evidence with the processes it seeks to change. We conclude with recommendations for practice: supporting adaptive inference chains, strengthening coherent self-models, aligning environments with predictive learning, and embedding psychological expertise across institutional levels.

**Keywords:** evidence-based prison policy, rehabilitation, recidivism, psychology, behavior change, goal-directed predictive processing

## **Learning to Change: A Goal-Directed Perspective on Evidence-Based Rehabilitation**

Despite a growing consensus that prisons should shift from punitive to rehabilitative environments, behavioral problems remain pervasive and difficult to manage within correctional settings (Ward & Maruna, 2007). Rates of aggression, self-harm, substance use, and recidivism remain high, while staff burnout and turnover are widespread (Brown et al., 2017; Fazel et al., 2016). These issues are fundamentally behavioral, relating to how individuals act, react, and adapt within the specific social and institutional context of incarceration. Therefore, understanding and changing behavior is pivotal for effective prison policy and practice.

Yet, evidence-based behavior change approaches that build on robust scientific insights into the determinants of behavior are still rarely implemented in prisons (Blackaby et al., 2023; Gannon & Ward, 2014). Interventions are often developed or adapted on an ad hoc basis, guided more by institutional tradition, political pressures, or intuitive reasoning than by robust empirical evidence (Day et al., 2012; Latessa et al., 2020). In daily practice, prison staff often rely substantially on personal experience to manage complex behavior, and policy decisions may be shaped by the implicit beliefs of administrators rather than by behavioral science, even as rehabilitative cultures and new institutional models (e.g., detention houses) evolve (Liebling, 2011; Milićević, 2025). As a result, a substantial gap persists between what is known about behavior and how behavioral problems are actually addressed in correctional settings.

Existing studies on behavioral change in prisons are limited in both quantity and quality. Few studies are grounded in robust theoretical frameworks, and many lack experimental control, adequate follow-up, or replication (Beaudry et al., 2021). Furthermore, the outcomes typically emphasized, such as recidivism, are broad and distal, making it challenging to infer which behavioral mechanisms actually changed. This narrow focus

detracts progress from intermediate targets such as impulse control skills or goal alignment, which are crucial for sustained behavioral change (Bonta & Andrews, 2023; Ward & Fortune, 2016).

In this paper, we examine why evidence-based practices have struggled to take root in prison settings and why existing evidence often fails to translate into effective interventions. Established frameworks such as the Risk-Need-Responsivity model (Bonta & Andrews, 2023) and the Good Lives Model (Ward et al., 2025) provide robust principles for identifying criminogenic needs and structuring rehabilitative goals, and recent theoretical work has further clarified dynamic risk, explanatory targets, and the translation of causal theories into correctional practice (Heffernan & Ward, 2017; Prujean et al., 2022; Ward & Durrant, 2021, 2022). However, these developments stop short of specifying a formal generative account of how behavior is produced by moment-to-moment inferential processes. Without such a process model, the pathway from theoretical principles to concrete intervention techniques can remain underspecified. We propose that articulating cognitive processes more explicitly can strengthen the translation of established correctional theories into everyday practice. We therefore advance a framework to guide future evidence-based practice in prisons that is grounded in contemporary cognitive models of behavior and complements current approaches.

### **Why Evidence-Based Practice Struggles in Prisons**

Although the importance of evidence-based practice is widely acknowledged (Penal Reform International, 2025), its implementation in correctional settings remains limited. Decades of research have produced promising psychological models and interventions, yet few have been consistently applied or rigorously evaluated in prisons. In this section, we outline three major reasons for this disconnect: (1) the fragility of the current evidence base and its underspecified mechanisms for behavior change, (2) persistent mapping problems

between what is trained and what is measured, and (3) structural and institutional barriers that hinder sustainable translation of behavioral science into practice.

### **Fragile Evidence, Underspecified Mechanisms, and Cognitive Barriers to Implementation**

A first reason for the limited success of evidence-based rehabilitation lies in the fragility and limited applicability of the scientific foundations on which current interventions rest. Psychological science has undergone a series of self-examinations, often described as the replication, generalizability, and practicality crises, that together expose the gap between experimental research and effective real-world application.

The replication crisis revealed that many established psychological effects fail to reproduce under rigorous testing conditions, often due to small samples, publication bias, and analytic flexibility (Open Science Collaboration, 2015). Findings that appeared robust in the laboratory, such as priming effects, ego depletion, or even attitude-behavior correlations, frequently vanish in pre-registered or multi-lab replications (e.g., Hagger et al., 2016). This undermines confidence in the stability of the evidence base on which applied interventions, including those in correctional settings, have been built.

The generalizability crisis extends this concern beyond reproducibility. Many psychological studies rely on narrow, convenience samples, typically Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) participants (Henrich et al., 2010), and on highly controlled laboratory conditions. These contexts differ profoundly from the social, motivational, and environmental dynamics within prison. As Yarkoni (2022) and others have noted, the problem is not just that results may fail to replicate, but that they may never have been generalizable in the first place. When interventions derived from such research are transplanted into correctional environments, they often fail to capture the complexity of incarcerated individuals' lived experiences, social hierarchies, and long-term motivational structures.

Many influential prison studies rely on small samples, quasi-experimental designs, or historically contingent settings that cannot be ethically or practically replicated, undermining their generalizability (Haney & Zimbardo, 2009). Empirical research in prisons is further limited by ethical constraints, restricted access, administrative gatekeeping, and researchers' own cognitive and institutional biases against engaging with highly regulated and restrictive carceral environments (Liebling, 2001; Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Although some studies include control groups, these groups are typically unmatched in key variables such as education and socio-economic status, limiting the validity of inferences regarding effects observed in incarcerated samples (e.g., Meijers et al., 2018). Moreover, the prison literature is heavily skewed toward U.S. samples, despite the exceptional nature of the American penal system in terms of incarceration rates, racial disparities, sentencing practices, and institutional violence (Western, 2006; Wacquant, 2009). This U.S.-centrism limits cross-cultural validity and obscures how institutional, legal, and sociohistorical factors shape cognition and behavior in detention contexts elsewhere.

The practicality crisis concerns the limited relevance of much psychological theorizing for guiding interventions or policy (Lilienfeld, 2017; Tackett et al., 2019). Many dominant models, such as the Theory of Planned Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) or the Transtheoretical Model (Prochaska & DiClemente, 1983), describe correlates of behavior such as attitudes or intentions but provide little mechanistic insight into how behavior emerges or changes. Although these models may help identify determinants of behavior, they remain too abstract to guide intervention design. They rarely specify how these determinants relate to behavior in specific contexts or how these contexts can be shifted to impact this behavior. For example, while positive attitudes toward lawful employment may increase intentions to seek work, such models do not explain how those intentions are maintained or overridden in situations involving peer pressure or short-term incentives. As Ward and Durrant (2022) highlight in

their “black box” analysis of correctional psychology, programs are often evaluated in terms of whether they produce effects, but without a mechanistic understanding of why and how, it is difficult to replicate or sustain behavioral change. As a result, prison-based programs may combine general motivational or cognitive techniques without a clearly specified rationale for when, why, or for whom they should work.

Another reason why evidence-based principles are rarely adopted in correctional systems lies in human cognition itself. Like everyone, decision-makers in correctional systems may rely on intuitive beliefs shaped by their personal experiences. Research on belief bias and confirmation bias indicates that people tend to evaluate information based on whether it fits with their pre-existing views rather than its evidential strength (Evans et al., 1983; Mercier & Sperber, 2011; Nickerson, 1998; Pennycook & Rand, 2019). Because such beliefs are central to how individuals predict and control behavior, they are resistant to change, especially when new evidence threatens autonomy or professional identity (Hornsey & Fielding, 2017). Consequently, correctional institutions often remain guided by practices that “feel right” rather than those that are empirically validated.

### **Mapping Problems and the Dominance of Recidivism**

A central obstacle to evidence-based rehabilitation in prisons is the mapping problem: a mismatch between what is theorized, what is measured, and what is ultimately evaluated. Within psychological science, measures often fail to capture the constructs they are meant to represent (Borsboom, 2006). In correctional psychology, this internal mismatch is compounded by a second layer: the outcomes used to assess success rarely align with the processes that interventions actually target. Most prison studies assess proximal indicators such as attitudes, intentions, or readiness to change, whereas program effectiveness is judged by distal and highly aggregated outcomes such as recidivism (Butts & Schiraldi, 2018; McGuire, 2013). This disconnect prevents a coherent accumulation of evidence about how

behavioral change occurs. Even when programs influence behavioral processes that are central to sustained desistance, such as impulse control, moral reasoning, or empathy, these intermediate outcomes are often invisible in the final evaluation metrics. Using a medical analogy, it is akin to judging a treatment solely by whether patients show any sign of illness, ignoring improvements in the mechanisms of recovery, such as immune function or metabolic health. In a related vein, Ward and Durrant's (2022) "black box" model highlights the risk of evaluating correctional interventions solely in terms of outcomes without specifying or assessing the underlying mechanisms of change.

Recidivism, generally defined as committing a new criminal offense after previous conviction or incarceration, epitomizes this mapping problem. Although it appears simple and policy-relevant, this metric is suboptimal in several ways. First, recidivism is shaped by numerous external factors beyond the direct scope of prison interventions. Access to social support (Breese et al., 2000; Kjellstrand et al., 2023), neighborhood characteristics (Kubrin & Stewart, 2006), and employment opportunities (Holzer et al., 2002; Visher et al., 2010) all strongly influence reoffending. Consequently, a decrease in recidivism may reflect favorable life circumstances rather than genuine change in the processes targeted by an intervention, whereas relapse can occur despite important progress at other levels.

A further complication is definitional inconsistency. Some studies count arrests, others convictions or reincarcerations, and legal definitions differ across countries (Yukhnenko et al., 2020). Despite this heterogeneity, recidivism rates dominate international comparisons of correctional performance. This reliance may persist largely because of administrative convenience and the entrenched punitive logic of "success versus failure". However, such reliance distorts the policy environment: interventions rise or fall based on a binary criterion that tells us little about the mechanisms underlying change (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2022; Ubah, 2014).

The consequence is a deep misalignment between what is trained and what is measured. For example, a program may successfully strengthen impulse control, as evidenced by improved performance in structured role-plays or reduced aggressive responses in supervised settings. Yet these process-level improvements may not be reflected in recidivism statistics, which aggregate diverse contextual influences beyond the intervention's scope. An individual may show meaningful gains in impulse control and yet still reoffend due to an interaction of other factors such as unstable housing, unemployment and criminogenic peer networks (e.g., Kjellstrand et al., 2021; Visher et al., 2010). As a result, changes in the targeted behavioral mechanisms do not map directly onto the distal outcome used to judge program success.

Effective evidence-based rehabilitation requires theoretically specified and context-sensitive outcomes that map directly onto the processes targeted by intervention, an emphasis that is also central to evidence-based practice frameworks (Spring & Neville, 2011). Without such alignment, evidence cannot accumulate and theory cannot inform practice. Addressing this impasse calls for frameworks that explicitly link theory, behavioral targets, and institutional context, a challenge taken up in the next section.

### **Structural and Institutional Barriers**

Even when robust and theoretically grounded findings exist, their translation into correctional practice is obstructed by structural and institutional barriers. Implementing evidence-based programs requires sustained collaboration between researchers, practitioners, correctional staff and prison directors, and policymakers, yet current funding and governance systems have rarely supported such iterative partnerships (Fixsen et al., 2005). Research incentives favor novelty over replication and incremental refinement, leaving few mechanisms for evaluating, adapting, and maintaining interventions once they reach applied settings (Munafò et al., 2017).

The temporal and institutional distance between research and practice further compounds the problem. By the time interventions are adopted into policy, the supporting evidence base may already be outdated or contextually mismatched (Cartwright & Hardie, 2012). Correctional agencies, in turn, operate under intense political, operational, and administrative pressures that prioritize short-term, quantifiable outcomes, such as reductions in incidents, recidivism, or costs, over sustained behavioral and cultural change (Liebling & Crewe, 2013). As a result, programs are often implemented prematurely, evaluated inadequately, and replaced before cumulative evidence can develop.

At the organizational level, prisons are typically hierarchical and risk-averse institutions that discourage experimentation and adaptive learning (Day et al., 2012). Limited staff training, high turnover, chronic overcrowding, periodic labor strikes, and skepticism toward psychological expertise further erode fidelity and continuity in implementation (Penal Reform International, 2025). These obstacles mirror broader challenges in implementation science: the absence of an infrastructure that supports ongoing feedback loops between research and practice (Fixsen et al., 2005). In some areas of healthcare, learning health system models have been developed to embed continuous evaluation and iterative refinement into routine practice (Friedman et al., 2017). Such sustained infrastructures remain comparatively underdeveloped in many correctional contexts. Without them, both the science and practice of rehabilitation remain fragmented, and promising theoretical insights fail to achieve durable impact.

### **A New Framework for Evidence-Based Rehabilitation: Bridging Theory, Intervention, and Outcome**

A key challenge in rehabilitation science is the limited specification of the cognitive processes through which behavioral change occurs within existing frameworks. Models such as the Risk–Need–Responsivity approach and the Good Lives Model provide important

principles for identifying criminogenic needs and structuring rehabilitative goals. However, they do not offer a formal account of the inferential mechanisms through which goals, beliefs, and contextual representations are translated into action in specific situations. Many interventions are based on implicit or fragmented ideas about broad constructs like motivation, habits, or self-control without a clearly articulated cognitive process model linking these constructs to observable behavioral change, making it difficult to design effective programs or evaluate their impact. What is needed is a practical framework that makes these cognitive mechanisms explicit, linking them to intervention strategies and measurable outcomes, while remaining grounded in the institutional realities of correctional settings.

### **The Goal-Directed Predictive Processing Framework**

One promising framework that can help bridge theory, intervention, and evaluation is the Goal-Directed Predictive Processing (GDPP) framework. This framework builds on recent developments in psychology and cognitive (neuro)science that view the mind as a prediction system (Friston, 2010; Clark, 2016) and was developed in an attempt to integrate the most robust findings in psychology, such as prominent evidence about the belief-based (Ajzen, 1991; Kube & Rozenkrantz, 2021) and goal-directed nature of behavior (Locke & Latham, 2006; Moors et al., 2017).

The core idea is that people continuously generate predictions about what they will experience and how they themselves will behave, and these predictions determine behavior. This approach rejects the notion that behavior results from a series of arbitrary decisions made by some internal agent or homunculus. Instead, behavior is viewed as the emergent result of structured inferences within a dynamic belief system. These behavior predictions constitute causal inferences grounded in the beliefs that are activated within the current situation, with a special role for self-concept beliefs such as beliefs about wanted outcomes or goals. When

incoming sensory signals violate momentary predictions, the system registers a prediction error and evaluates which belief update would minimize future uncertainty. This belief updating process follows a principled mechanism: it favors revisions that minimize overall incoherence or uncertainty in the belief network, particularly in relation to superordinate beliefs governing self-representation and goal hierarchies.

This model helps explain why harmful behaviors often persist despite long-term negative consequences. When a behavior is expected to reduce incoherence in one's belief system, it may be predicted and enacted even when it conflicts with certain long-term goals. In correctional settings, such predictions may often emerge from belief structures shaped by prior adversity, fragmented goal hierarchies, or survival-based narratives. The GDPP framework may help make these dynamics visible, allowing interventions to target the beliefs and inferences that underlie behavior.

### **Mechanisms of Behavioral Change**

Within the GDPP framework, behavioral change is understood as a process of belief updating that alters the predictions individuals make about their own future actions. People act in ways that confirm what they expect of themselves and when experience repeatedly contradicts positive expectations, their predictive model of “who I am and what I do” will adapt. Within this perspective, primary human goods, as described in the Good Lives Model, can be understood as higher-order value beliefs that organize the predictive system and guide action selection. Rehabilitation, in this sense, involves helping individuals revise the inferential structures that link beliefs and behaviors so that their future predictions become more coherent with social norms and long-term well-being.

This updating unfolds through several interrelated mechanisms. First, change begins with the integration of meaningful self-concept related beliefs such as beliefs about who they are and what goals they strive for. These beliefs provide the top-down structure that shapes

predictions about the behavior that is relevant for them. In correctional settings, individuals may sometimes operate with fragmented goal hierarchies dominated by short-term goals such as seeking momentary control. Research on desistance from crime (Maruna, 2001) shows that sustainable rehabilitation is more likely when individuals develop a coherent, prosocial self-narrative. Interventions that support this process, such as through perspective-taking, narrative reconstruction, or social validation, can help build the required motivational scaffolding.

Second, when relevant goals are activated, individuals make inferences about action-outcome relationships: “If I act this way, what will follow?”, a process that aligns with the agent–action–context structure articulated in the Black Box model (Ward & Durrant, 2022). Harmful behaviors can persist when people have learned causal models that seem internally consistent with these behaviors, e.g., “aggression earns respect,” or “substance use relieves tension”. GDPP reframes these fixed beliefs as contextual predictions, which allows them to be changed based on new evidence. Consistent with evidence-based practice such as in therapeutic contexts (Beck, 2011; Hofmann et al., 2012), interventions can help participants test and revise these inferences in structured contexts. This relates to the well-established role of self-efficacy beliefs in behavior change: when individuals infer that change can lead to desirable outcomes, they are more likely to pursue relevant changes.

Finally, because predictive models are continuously shaped by context, behavior change must be supported by feedback from the environment. The responses of staff, peers, institutional structures, communities, and society as a whole either confirm or contradict the new inferences participants form. For example, useful day planning is often cited as a key component of effective rehabilitative practice (Bonta & Andrews, 2023; Lipsey et al., 2007; McNeill et al., 2005). From a GDPP perspective, its impact lies not merely in keeping individuals occupied, but in the belief updates it facilitates: by engaging in structured activities, individuals begin to infer that their actions can produce predictable, positive

outcomes (“I can contribute something,” “I have useful skills,” “People respond to me differently”). Environments that consistently reinforce these new predictions may help consolidate adaptive belief structures (Blagden et al., 2014). In contrast, unpredictable or punitive settings may reintroduce uncertainty and reactive behavior loops. This mechanism resonates with the responsivity principle within the RNR framework, which emphasizes delivering interventions in contexts, ideally community settings, where adaptive behaviors can be reinforced and generalized (Bonta & Andrews, 2023). It also accords with the well-established role of self-efficacy beliefs in behavior change: as individuals begin to infer that their actions can produce desirable effects, their confidence in positive outcomes, and thus the likelihood of change, increases (Bandura, 1997).

### **Recommendations for Practice**

The Goal-Directed Predictive Processing (GDPP) framework suggests that effective rehabilitation depends on reshaping the inferential structures through which people predict their own behavior in context. From this perspective, behavior change arises when individuals revise their belief networks and the behavior predictions those networks generate based on the process of uncertainty reduction. This view has several implications for correctional practice.

#### **Support Adaptive Inference Chains**

Interventions should focus on how individuals infer which actions are likely to satisfy their goals, an emphasis that resonates with the Good Lives Model’s focus on pursuing primary human goods, rather than merely “punishing” unwanted behavior. Harmful actions may reflect predictions about how to restore control or reduce uncertainty (Friston et al., 2017). For example, aggression may express the belief that dominance secures safety, or substance use the belief that relief from distress is only achievable chemically. Rehabilitation should therefore help participants construct alternative inference chains and embed these in their existing belief networks. This aligns with RNR-informed efforts to reduce cognitive

distortions and with GLM-inspired approaches aimed at strengthening individuals' capacities to pursue prosocial goods.

Practically, this means (a) identifying current beliefs and goals, (b) proposing plausible alternative inferences that are compatible enough with the present network to be considered, and (c) progressing in graded steps (scaffolded within the learner's "zone of proximal development"; Vygotsky, 1978) (Van Dessel & Boddez, 2025). For example, a participant who believes that "asserting dominance prevents victimization" might be guided to test alternative predictions, such as whether consistent rule-following or alliance-building can also enhance safety, through structured role-play and supervised social interactions. Because belief networks are often deeply entrenched, this process requires thoughtful, step-by-step progression that respects the structure of the existing belief system while gradually introducing alternative predictions. The structure of belief networks reflects both individuals' learning histories and evolutionarily shaped motivational architectures that organize goal domains and recurrent concerns (Del Giudice, 2022).

Rehabilitation should therefore help participants construct alternative inference chains and embed these in their existing belief networks. In criminological frameworks, familiar neighborhoods or antisocial peers are described as risk factors because they increase the likelihood of reoffending. From a GDPP perspective, these factors function as contextual cues that reactivate prior predictions. Even after new inferences are formed, returning to old settings may trigger beliefs that were once adaptive, such as "this person will betray me" or "I need to show dominance to stay safe." Conversely, protective factors can be understood as contexts that stabilize and reinforce newly formed predictions. Interventions should therefore also target context resilience: the ability to recognize and override outdated predictions in relevant contexts when they are no longer helpful.

### **Strengthen Supportive Self-Concept Beliefs**

Sustained change requires a coherent, future-oriented self-concept that anchors behavioral predictions (Clark, 2016; Hohwy, 2013). Within the GDPP framework, self-concept beliefs function as higher-level beliefs that generate expectations about one's own likely actions and outcomes. When individuals lack a positively integrated sense of who they are, harmful behavior becomes a self-confirming outcome: if a person predicts that they will offend, that prediction guides behavior generation in ways that make offending the expected and enacted outcome, thereby confirming and stabilizing the underlying self-concept belief. Interventions that foster a positive and coherent self-concept, such as through narrative identity work, agency reflection, and perspective taking, can stabilize this predictive system and make adaptive actions more expected and self-consistent. This perspective parallels the criminological distinction between primary and secondary desistance (Maruna, 2001). Primary desistance refers to the observable cessation of criminal behavior. Secondary desistance, in contrast, involves an internal identity shift: genuine reintegration follows when people not only refrain from crime but also come to predict themselves as non-offending individuals, for whom criminal behavior is no longer compatible with their new self-concept.

### **Align Environments with Predictive Learning**

Because belief networks are updated through experience, the environment must provide consistent evidence for adaptive inferences. Institutional routines, incentives, and staff interactions should therefore reinforce the expectations that behaviors such as related to cooperation, honesty, and self-regulation lead to outcomes that the individual values (Gendreau et al., 2006). Within the GDPP framework, sustained change depends on minimizing prediction error between new beliefs and lived experience: if adaptive behaviors are not reliably rewarded or modeled, old predictions will quickly reassert themselves (Bonta & Andrews, 2023. Bouton, 2004; De Houwer & Hughes, 2020).

Rehabilitation should thus be embedded in daily prison practices so that interactions consistently provide confirmatory feedback that helpful beliefs and behaviors “make sense”. GDPP thus underscores the ethical responsibility of institutions to avoid reinforcing maladaptive predictions that may ultimately impair reintegration, what some have described as the unintended “damage” of detention settings.

This recommendation may seem contradictory to the fundamental nature of prison: an environment where rules are typically imposed, outcomes are limited and often lack personal value, and autonomy is minimal. Such conditions cultivate a mental model optimized for control and compliance or passivity. This model, that may have been functional during incarceration, becomes maladaptive once released: ex-incarcerated individuals must suddenly navigate a world requiring capacities that were neither encouraged nor practiced inside prison. Detention houses, such as promoted by the European movement RESCALED (RESCALED, 2024), may provide a more favorable environment for predictive learning, as they suggest three core principles for detention of the future: small-scaled, differentiated, and community-integrated. For example, a person might learn to predict that taking a walk outside to calm down after a conflict better aligns with their emerging self-concept than responding aggressively. Because what coheres with one person’s self-concept differs from another’s, incarcerated people need opportunities to test strategies that are personally meaningful. In traditional prison settings, such opportunities are limited (e.g., incarcerated people can often not leave their cell to take a walk). A detention house, by contrast, may allow incarcerated people to experiment with prosocial strategies in realistic settings, receive personalized feedback, and update behavior based on meaningful outcomes, thereby supporting adaptive inference chains.

This perspective does not replace RNR- or GLM-based therapeutic principles, which already emphasize responsivity, capacity building, and the pursuit of prosocial goods. Rather,

GDPP specifies the environmental conditions under which these principles are most likely to consolidate into durable predictive structures. Realizing these conditions may require more fundamental institutional reform, including movement toward detention-house models, which will take time. In the meantime, substantial improvements can be achieved within existing prisons by systematically aligning daily practices with adaptive belief updating. In this sense, correctional psychology faces a dual challenge: to work toward more humane, belief-supportive environments while simultaneously optimizing rehabilitation within existing prisons.

### **Cultivate Psychologically Informed Institutions**

Prisons are not neutral spaces but dynamic predictive systems: the expectations of staff shape those of imprisoned individuals, and vice versa. When officers consistently anticipate resistance or deceit, they may act defensively, unintentionally eliciting the very reactions they fear (Liebling & Arnold, 2004). A GDPP perspective highlights that these reciprocal expectations are themselves institutional predictions, beliefs about how people will behave that guide action at the systemic level. This reframes well-established responsivity and social learning principles within a predictive architecture, clarifying how staff expectations become part of the learning environment that shapes behavioral inference.

To promote adaptive cycles, prison environments should therefore be deliberately informed by psychological evidence about the determinants of behavior (Day et al., 2012). Staff training can help personnel identify how their own expectations influence inmates' responses and replace intuitive reactions with evidence-based, goal-aligned practices. While intuitive beliefs will always play a role, it is essential to examine which expectations support constructive behavior and which reinforce maladaptive cycles. Training should therefore not only offer general guidelines but also help individuals reflect on their own belief patterns and develop more adaptive, personalized inference strategies (see Linthout et al., 2025, for an

example). Embedding psychological expertise across all roles, consistent with RNR principles of responsivity and social learning, may enhance the fidelity of implementation by making explicit the predictive processes through which staff behavior shapes institutional climate. In this way, GDPP may assist not in replacing established correctional frameworks, but in supporting their consistent and psychologically informed application.

### **Evaluate Relevant Behaviors and Beliefs in Context**

Within the GDPP framework, rehabilitation should be evaluated by examining whether people act and reason differently in contexts that matter for their daily lives. Because behavior arises from goal-directed predictions, change can only be demonstrated by looking at the specific actions and beliefs that an intervention targets. Evaluations should therefore assess whether participants display new, context-appropriate behaviors, such as negotiating rather than reacting aggressively, or seeking support rather than avoiding conflict, and whether their underlying beliefs and goals have shifted accordingly.

This also addresses a common problem in evaluation practice: the mismatch between what interventions implicitly train, sometimes vague notions like self-control, and what is measured, typically distal outcomes such as recidivism. Measures should instead reflect the psychological processes being targeted. These might include behavioral indicators (e.g., cooperative responding), self-reported beliefs (“I can earn respect through collaboration”), or observed choices that reveal updated inferences about which actions are effective. Such belief-sensitive measures ensure that evaluation remains anchored to the intervention’s theoretical basis and clarify what change actually looks like in daily practice. Importantly, these measures can also capture how individuals represent and pursue primary human goods in context, by assessing the belief structures, such as self-concept beliefs, goal representations, and action–outcome expectations, through which they shape daily behavior.

By contrast, global outcomes such as recidivism offer little insight into why people change or persist and in what way (Kennedy et al., 2024). While such statistics may serve administrative or comparative purposes at the policy level, they are too distal and unspecific to guide evidence-based practice. Evaluating context-relevant behaviors and beliefs closes this gap: it aligns the level of measurement with the level of intervention, ensuring that what counts as “success” reflects genuine learning and adaptive prediction within the lived prison environment.

### **Ethical and Integrative Rationale**

Finally, GDPP complements existing rehabilitation models such as the Good Lives Model (Ward et al., 2025) and the Risk-Need-Responsivity framework (Bonta & Andrews, 2023) by clarifying the cognitive processes through which values, goals, and needs are represented and updated in context. While GLM articulates the normative importance of primary human goods and RNR identifies criminogenic needs and responsivity principles, GDPP operates at a different level of analysis: it explains how such goods and needs are instantiated within belief networks and translated into context-sensitive actions. In this sense, GDPP does not offer a competing philosophy, but a process-level account that may strengthen the psychological coherence and implementation of established correctional frameworks.

This perspective also reframes the ethical purpose of rehabilitation. From a GDPP standpoint, promoting agency, coherence, and psychological stability are not abstract ideals but prerequisites for sustainable behavior change. When individuals experience themselves as capable of effective action (agency) and as consistent with their environment and values (coherence), their predictive models become less dominated by uncertainty and avoidance. This in turn supports well-being and reduces maladaptive cycles of prediction and control. In this sense, evidence-based rehabilitation is both a scientific and an ethical project: it seeks to

create conditions under which people can accurately predict, and thus genuinely change, their own behavior.

Crucially, this also implies a shift in how problematic behavior is understood. As previously outlined, the prison environment may shape predictive models oriented towards control and compliance, rendering certain behaviors contextually functionally adaptive within the detention context but maladaptive upon release. For instance, a belief such as “raising my voice restores control” may have helped reduce uncertainty and preserve status in prison, even if it later leads to conflict or job loss. GDPP emphasizes that such behaviors are not irrational, they are predictions that made sense in a particular environment. Rehabilitation should therefore not aim to fix a broken person, but to support belief revision in a way that respects prior adaptations while preparing for new contexts. This view aligns with recent developments in domains such as addiction (Heather et al., 2017) and chronic illness (Károly, 2021; Kiverstein et al., 2022), where behaviors like avoidance or passivity are increasingly understood as rational responses to internal models shaped by experience. Across these fields, effective change does not involve imposing “normal” behavior, but equipping individuals to revise and update their own predictive models toward personally and socially meaningful goals.

Importantly, such belief revision unfolds within environments that may themselves generate new instability. Prisons are often characterized by chronic stress, limited autonomy, interpersonal tension, and high rates of mental health difficulties. These conditions can continuously reshape predictive models, sometimes reinforcing withdrawal, hypervigilance, or substance use as locally coherent responses. A GDPP-informed approach therefore cannot assume stable progress; it must incorporate ongoing monitoring and iterative recalibration of belief structures in response to environmental change. Rehabilitation in this sense is not a linear transition from “maladaptive” to “adaptive” behavior, but a dynamic process that

unfolds under conditions of uncertainty and institutional constraint. While the central target remains the restructuring of belief networks, the stability of such restructuring depends on whether environmental inputs consistently support, rather than undermine, emerging adaptive predictions.

### **Future Directions and Conclusion**

Advancing evidence-based rehabilitation requires continued conceptual refinement and empirical precision. Future work should focus on examine more closely how belief systems give rise to behavior in prison contexts, and how interventions can effectively reshape these beliefs toward adaptive, goal-consistent action. This includes examining how personal and institutional belief networks interact, and how environments can be designed to support constructive learning rather than reactive control.

Empirically, studies should test interventions that target specific belief updates and behavioral predictions, linking observed behavior directly to the cognitive and behavioral processes they are designed to influence. Such designs will clarify which elements of an intervention actually change how people think, decide, and act. This approach would allow correctional programs to be evaluated in terms of mechanisms of change, rather than distant outcomes like recidivism, making the evidence more interpretable and actionable.

Conceptually, frameworks such as Goal-Directed Predictive Processing can help structure this endeavor by providing a coherent account of how goals, beliefs, primary human goods, and contextual conditions interact to produce behavior. While GLM articulates the normative importance of primary goods and RNR identifies criminogenic needs and responsivity principles, GDPP contributes a process-level specification of how such goods and needs are instantiated within predictive belief structures and translated into context-sensitive action. Yet, the broader message extends beyond any single model: evidence-based rehabilitation must integrate robust scientific evidence with the lived realities of correctional

environments. By grounding correctional practice in robust psychological theory, prisons can move from managing behavior to understanding it, and from enforcing compliance supporting sustainable, context-sensitive change. In doing so, they can become environments where rehabilitation is not an exception but a default trajectory.

### **Declaration of Conflicts of Interest**

All authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

## References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Beaudry, G., Yu, R., Perry, A. E., & Fazel, S. (2021). Effectiveness of psychological interventions in prison to reduce recidivism: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 8(9), 759-773. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(21\)00170-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(21)00170-X)
- Beck, J. S. (2011). *Cognitive behavior therapy: Basics and beyond* (2nd ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Blackaby, J., Byrne, J., Bellass, S., Canvin, K., & Foy, R. (2023). Interventions to improve the implementation of evidence-based healthcare in prisons: A scoping review. *Health Justice* 11, 1 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-022-00200-x>
- Blagden, N., Winder, B., & Hames, C. (2014). “They treat us like human beings”—Experiencing a therapeutic sex offenders prison: impact on prisoners and staff and implications for treatment: impact on prisoners and staff and implications for treatment. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 60(4), 371-396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X14553227>
- Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2023). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (7th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003292128>
- Borsboom, D. (2006). The attack of the psychometricians. *Psychometrika*, 71(3), 425–440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11336-006-1447-6>
- Bouton, M.E. (2004). Context and behavioral processes in extinction. *Learning & Memory*, 11(5), 485-94. <https://doi.org/10.1101/lm.78804>. PMID: 15466298.
- Breese, J. R., Ra’el, K., & Grant, G. K. (2000). No place like home: A qualitative investigation of social support and its effects on recidivism. *Sociological Practice*, 2(1), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010103821490>
- Brown D., Igoumenou A., Mortlock A. M., Gupta N., & Das, M. (2017). Work-related stress in forensic mental health professionals: A systematic review. *Journal of Forensic Practices*, 19, 227–238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFP-05-2016-0024>

- Butts, J. & Schiraldi, V. (2018). *Recidivism reconsidered: Preserving the community justice mission of community corrections*. National Institute of Justice. <https://nij.ojp.gov/library/publications/recidivism-reconsidered-preserving-community-justice-mission-community>
- Cartwright, N., & Hardie, J. (2012). *Evidence-based policy: A practical guide to doing it better*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:osobl/9780199841608.001.0001>
- Clark, A. (2016). *Surfing uncertainty: Prediction, action, and the embodied mind*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190217013.001.0001>
- Day, A., Casey, S., Ward, T., Howells, K., & Vess, J. (2012). *Transitions to better lives: Offender readiness and rehabilitation*. Willan Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781843927204>
- Del Giudice, M. (2023). A general motivational architecture for human and animal personality, *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *144*, Article 104967, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2022.104967>
- Evans, J. St. B. T., Barston, J. L., & Pollard, P. (1983). On the conflict between logic and belief in syllogistic reasoning. *Memory & Cognition*, *11*(3), 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03196976>
- Fazel, S., Hayes, A. J., Bartellas, K., Clerici, M., & Trestman, R. (2016). Mental health of prisoners: Prevalence, adverse outcomes, and interventions. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, *3*(9), 871–881. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(16\)30142-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(16)30142-0)
- Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M., & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature*. National Implementation Research Network. <https://fpg.unc.edu/sites/fpg.unc.edu/files/resource-files/NIRN-MonographFull-01-2005.pdf>
- Friedman, C. P., Rubin, J. C., & Sullivan, K. J. (2017). Toward an information infrastructure for the learning health system. *Yearbook of Medical Informatics*, *26*(1), 16-23. <https://doi.org/10.15265/IY-2017-004>
- Friston, K., FitzGerald, T., Rigoli, F., Schwartenbeck, P., & Pezzulo, G. (2017). Active inference: A process theory. *Neural Computation*, *29*(1), 1-49. [https://doi.org/10.1162/NECO\\_a\\_00912](https://doi.org/10.1162/NECO_a_00912)

- Gannon, T. A., & Ward, T. (2014). Where has all the psychology gone? A review of evidence-based psychological practice in correctional settings. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 19*(4), 435–446. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2014.06.006>
- Gendreau, P., Smith, P., & French, S. A. (2006). The theory of effective correctional intervention: Empirical status and future directions. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. R. Blevins (Eds.), *Taking stock: The status of criminological theory* (pp. 419–446). Transaction Publishers.
- Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., Alberts, H., Anggono, C. O., Batailler, C., Birt, A. R., Brand, R., Brandt, M. J., Brewer, G., Bruyneel, S., Calvillo, D. P., Campbell, W. K., Cannon, P. R., Carlucci, M., Carruth, N. P., Cheung, T., Crowell, A., De Ridder, D. T. D., Dewitte, S., ... Zwieneberg, M. (2016). A multilab preregistered replication of the ego-depletion effect. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 11*(4), 546-573. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616652873>
- Haney, C., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2009). Persistent dispositionalism in interactionist clothing: Fundamental attribution error in explaining prison abuse. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(6), 807-814. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167208322864>
- Harris, D. A., Pedneault, A., & Willis, G. (2019). The pursuit of primary human goods in men desisting from sexual offending. *Sexual Abuse, 31*(2), 197-219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1079063217729155>
- Heather, N., Best, D., Kawalek, A., Field, M., Lewis, M., Rotgers, F., Wiers, R.W., & Heim, D. (2017). Challenging the brain disease model of addiction: European launch of the addiction theory network. *Addiction Research & Theory, 26*(4), 249–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16066359.2017.1399659>
- Heffernan, R., & Ward, T. (2017). A comprehensive theory of dynamic risk and protective factors. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 37*, 129-141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2017.10.003>.
- Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 33*(2–3), 61–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0999152X>
- Hofmann, S. G., Asnaani, A., Vonk, I. J., Sawyer, A. T., & Fang, A. (2012). The efficacy of cognitive behavioral therapy: A review of meta-analyses. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 36*(5), 427–440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-012-9476-1>

- Hohwy, J. (2013). *The predictive mind*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199682737.001.0001>
- Holzer, H. J., Raphael, S., & Stoll, M. A. (2002). Will employers hire former offenders? Employer preferences, background checks, and their determinants. In M. Patillo, D. Weiman, & B. Western (Eds.), *Imprisoning America: The social effects of mass incarceration* (pp. 205–246). Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hornsey, M. J., & Fielding, K. S. (2017). Attitude roots and Jiu Jitsu persuasion: Understanding and overcoming the motivated rejection of science. *American Psychologist*, 72(5), 459–473. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0040437>
- Karoly, P. (2021). How pain shapes depression and anxiety: A hybrid self-regulatory/predictive mind perspective. *Journal of Clinical Psychology in Medical Settings*, 28, 201–211. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10880-019-09693-5>
- Kennedy, T. D. , Coker, K. L. , Hess, D. T. , Shapiro, D. (2024). Editorial: Rethinking juvenile recidivism: Towards a more holistic view of success. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1416703>
- Kiverstein, J., Kirchhoff, M. D., & Thacker, M. (2022). An embodied predictive processing theory of pain experience. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology*, 13(4), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13164-022-00616-2>
- Kjellstrand, J., Matulis, J., Jackson, A., Smith, J., & Eddy, J. M. (2023). The importance of positive social support during reentry from prison: Examining the role of volunteer mentoring. *International Journal of Offender Therapy Comparative Criminology*, 67(5), 567-587. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X211059316>.
- Kube, T., & Rozenkrantz, L. (2021). When beliefs face reality: An integrative review of belief updating in mental health and illness. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 16(2), 247-274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620931496>
- Kubrin, C. E., & Stewart, E. A. (2006). Predicting who reoffends: The neglected role of neighborhood context in recidivism studies. *Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 44(1), 165–197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2006.00046.x>
- Latessa, E. J., Johnson, S., & Koetzle, D. (2020). *What works (and doesn't) in reducing recidivism*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429341366>
- Liebling, A. (2001). Whose side are we on? Theory, practice and allegiances in prisons

- research. *British journal of criminology*, 41(3), 472-484.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/41.3.472>
- Liebling, A. (2011). Moral performance, inhuman treatment, and prison pain. *Punishment & Society*, 13(5), 530–550. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474511422159>
- Liebling, A., & Arnold, H. (2004). *Prisons and their moral performance: A study of values, quality, and prison life*. Oxford University Press.
- Liebling, A., & Crewe, B. (2013). Prisons beyond the new penology: The shifting moral foundations of prison management. In J. Simon & R. Sparks (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Punishment and Society* (pp. 283–307). Sage Publications.  
<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446247624.n14>
- Lilienfeld, S. O. (2017). Psychology’s replication crisis and the grant culture: Righting the ship. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 12(4), 660–664.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616687745>
- Linthout, T., Van Dessel, P., & Boddez, Y. (2025). Targeting predicted actions to shift impulsive behavior. OSF projects. <https://10.17605/OSF.IO/3YM54>
- Lipsey, M. W., Landenberger, N. A., & Wilson, S. J. (2007). Effects of cognitive-behavioral programs for criminal offenders. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 3(1), 1–27.  
<https://doi.org/10.4073/csr.2007.6>
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2006). New directions in goal-setting theory. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15(5), 265–268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2006.00449.x>
- Maruna, S. (2001). *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*. American Psychological Association. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10430-000>
- McGuire, J. (2013). 'What works' to reduce re-offending: 18 years on. In L. A. Craig, L. Dixon, & T. A. Gannon (Eds.), *What works in offender rehabilitation: An evidence-based approach to assessment and treatment* (pp. 20–49). Wiley Blackwell.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118320655.ch2>
- McNeill, F., Farrall, S., Lightowler, C., & Maruna, S. (2005). Re-examining evidence-based practice in community corrections: Beyond “a confined view” of what works. *Probation Journal*, 52(3), 251–267. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550505055111>
- Meijers, J., Harte, J.M., Meynen, G., Cuijpers, P. & Scherder, E. J. A. (2018). Reduced self-

- control after 3 months of imprisonment; A pilot study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, Article 69. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00069>
- Mercier, H., & Sperber, D. (2011). Why do humans reason? Arguments for an argumentative theory. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 34(2), 57-74. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X10000968>
- Milićević, M. (2025). Dynamics of staff–prisoner relationships: A narrative literature review. In *Prison Life Organization and Security: Criminological, Penological, Sociological, Psychological, Legal, and Security Aspects* (pp. 233–255). Institute of Criminological and Sociological Research. <https://doi.org/10.47152/PrisonLIFE.D4.5.12>
- Moors, A., Boddez, Y., & De Houwer, J. (2017). The power of goal-directed processes in the causation of emotional and other actions. *Emotion Review*, 9(4), 310-318. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1754073916669595>
- Munafò, M. R., et al. (2017). A manifesto for reproducible science. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 1(1), Article e0021. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-016-0021>
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. (2022). *The limits of recidivism: Measuring success after prison*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/26459>.
- Nickerson, R. S. (1998). Confirmation bias: A ubiquitous phenomenon in many guises. *Review of General Psychology*, 2(2), 175–220. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.2.2.175>
- Open Science Collaboration. (2015). Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*, 349(6251), aac4716. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac4716>
- Penal Reform International (PRI). (2025). Global Prison Trends. <https://www.penalreform.org/global-prison-trends-2025/>
- Pennycook, G., & Rand, D. G. (2019). Lazy, not biased: Susceptibility to partisan fake news is better explained by lack of reasoning than by motivated reasoning. *Cognition*, 188, 39-50. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2018.06.011>
- Prujean, C., Ward, T., & Vandeveld, S. (2022). Translating science to clinical practice in correctional settings. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 63, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2021.101703>
- Prochaska, J. O., & DiClemente, C. C. (1983). Stages and processes of self-change of smoking: Toward an integrative model of change. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*,

51(3), 390–395. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.51.3.390>

- RESCALED. (2024). *The detention house*. <https://www.rescaled.org/the-detention-house/>
- Roberts, L. D., & Indermaur, D. (2007). Predicting punitive attitudes in Australia. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, 14(1), 56–65. <https://doi.org/10.1375/pplt.14.1.56>
- Spring, B., & Neville, K. (2011). Evidence-based practice in clinical psychology. In D. H. Barlow (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of clinical psychology* (pp. 128–149). Oxford University Press.
- Tackett, J. L., Brandes, C. M., King, K. M., & Markon, K. E. (2019). Psychology's replication crisis and clinical psychological science. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 15, 579–604. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050718-095710>
- Ubah, C. B. (2014). Using recidivism rate as the sole indicator of prison-based rehabilitation program usefulness: Lessons for 21st century corrections policy. *Journal of Social Science for Policy Implications*, 2(1), 67-83.
- Van Dessel, P., & Boddez, Y. (2025). Theory-based intervention for transforming harmful behavior: The Goal-Directed Predictive Processing approach. *Review of General Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10892680251386723>
- Visher, C. A., Debus-Sherrill, S. A., & Yahner, J. (2010). Employment after prison: A longitudinal study of former prisoners. *Justice Quarterly*, 28(5), 698–718. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418825.2010.535553>
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Wacquant, L. J. D. (2009). *Prisons of poverty*. University of Minnesota Press. <https://www.upress.umn.edu/9780816639014/prisons-of-poverty/>
- Walgrave, L., Ward, T., & Zinsstag, E. (2021). When restorative justice meets the Good Lives Model: Contributing to a criminology of trust. *European Journal of Criminology*, 18(3), 444-460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370819854174>
- Ward, T., & Durrant, R. (2021). Practice frameworks in correctional psychology: Translating causal theories and normative assumptions into practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 58, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2021.101612>
- Ward, T., & Durrant, R. (2022). Targets of explanation in correctional and forensic psychology: A black box model. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 67, 101782. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2022.101782>

- Ward, T., & Fortune, C.-A. (2016). The role of dynamic risk factors in the explanation of offending. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 29*, 79–88. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2016.06.007>
- Ward, T., Willis, G. M., Prescott, D. S., Vandavelde, S., Barnao, M., & Wanzele, W. (2025). *The good lives model of correctional rehabilitation: Integrating theory, research, and practice*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-95559-4>
- Western, B. (2006). *Punishment and inequality in America*. Russell Sage Foundation. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/9781610445559>
- Ward, T., & Maruna, S. (2007). *Rehabilitation: Beyond the risk paradigm*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203962176>
- Yarkoni, T. (2022). The generalizability crisis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 45*, Article e1. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X20001685>
- Yukhnenko D, Sridhar S, & Fazel S. (2020). A systematic review of criminal recidivism rates worldwide: 3-year update. *Wellcome Open Research, 3*, 4-28. <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.14970.3>