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• Over 40% of new arrivals in Welsh prisons are alcohol-dependent
• 25% get medication to help reduce immediate distress
• Community-based studies show that medication has no long-term benefits, but the addition of psychosocial support may improve outcomes

• The GASP trial:
  – Two-armed group-based (9 sessions over 3 weeks) RCT
  – Short-term prisoners who misuse alcohol

• The GASP intervention:
  – Aim: Increase internal locus of control and reduce relapse
  – Method: Motivational interviewing and skills development
  – Adaption: Some catch-up work possible for up to 2 missed groups
• Using the MRC guidance on conducting process evaluations

• Examine three factors (contextual, participant, group) across six process evaluation components (reach, fidelity, exposure, recruitment, retention and contamination)

• Range of qualitative and quantitative data collected
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process evaluation component</th>
<th>Data type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>Protocol, Logic model, intervention manual, staff training records, staff diaries, post cycle staff interviews, participant quantitative data time 1 and time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>Intervention manual, post cycle staff interviews, participant qualitative data time 2, participant quantitative data time 2, Participant attendance records, participant workbooks, participant personal plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination</td>
<td>Staff diaries, participant qualitative data time 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Staff diaries, staff CVs, staff post cycle interviews, participant qualitative data time 2 &amp; 3, participant quantitative data time 2, participant attendance records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach</td>
<td>Prison/literature demographics, participant demographics, consort diagram, screening records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment &amp; retention</td>
<td>Participant attendance record, consort diagram, number of completers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory Testing</td>
<td>Participant qualitative data time 2 &amp; 3, participant quantitative data time 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Contextual factors that may impact on delivery and retention:
  – Prison time-tabling
  – Security procedures
  – Prisoner transfers

• Personal factors that may impact on engagement and completion:
  – Level of alcohol dependency
  – Anxiety levels
  – Depression status
  – Criminal history

• Group factors that may impact on delivery:
  – Variation in group facilitators
  – Group dynamics/cohesion (attendance and engagement)
  – Sentence status

• To date 37.8% have been categorised as ‘completers’
CONCLUSIONS

• Report due in March 2017
• Final follow-up data being processed
• Data analysis begun

• Change in group facilitators does not impact on delivery
• Prison contextual factors can cause significant challenges to delivery
• Group dynamics impacts on engagement levels (characterisation of groups (i.e. the good group, the risky group, the emotional group))

• But, a core group benefitted from the intervention
• Personal factors may be important to ensure engagement and successful delivery
Questions?

Contact:
- Yvonne Moriarty: MoriartyY@Cardiff.ac.uk
- Pamela Taylor: TaylorPJ2@Cardiff.ac.uk
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