

*The roles, motivations, and capacities of the
community in the desistance process: A case
study of the Knowsley area.*

Wayne Campbell

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of Liverpool John
Moore's University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

June 2019

Contents

Contents	Pp. i-vi
Abstract	Pp. vii
Acknowledgments	Pp. viii

Chapter 1 – Pp. 1-9

Introduction

Chapter 2 – Pp. 10-32

Establishing why, how, and when individuals desist and cease offending

Introduction	Pp. 10
The ontogenic outlook	Pp. 10-12
The sociogenic standpoint	Pp. 12-20
The liberative resolve	Pp. 20-25
Desistance is... ..	Pp. 25-28
The community can(not) play a role?	Pp. 28-31
Conclusion	Pp. 31-32

Chapter 3 – Pp. 33-57

Understanding what desistance-orientated policies regard as the role of communities in the desistance process of ex-prisoners

Introduction	Pp. 33
How to motivate and facilitate the community's role in desistance... is there a correct way?.....	Pp. 33-37
Early policy responses	Pp. 37-38

The ‘Rehabilitation Revolution’ begins	Pp. 38-41
Restorative Justice – encouraging communities to play a role in processes of desistance?.....	Pp. 41-47
Transforming Rehabilitation – the resolution to recidivism	Pp. 47-50
Transforming Rehabilitation – the unintended consequences discovered through empiricism.....	Pp. 50-55
Conclusion	Pp. 56-57

Chapter 4 – Pp. 58-82

The management of ex-prisoners in practice: A case study of Knowsley

Introduction	Pp. 58
Knowsley: home to deprivation	Pp. 58-62
The lived response to delivering and maintaining a ‘safer’ Knowsley	Pp. 62-63
1) Addressing the rise of crime and anti-social behaviour in Knowsley	Pp. 63-67
2) Protecting the vulnerable victims and communities of Knowsley	Pp. 67-70
3) Supporting formerly incarcerated individuals in Knowsley to change their behaviour.....	Pp. 70
The supervision and rehabilitation of Low–Medium risk individuals	Pp. 70-73
The supervision and rehabilitation of High-risk individuals	Pp. 74-76
Mentoring is (not) for you	Pp. 77-81
Conclusion	Pp. 81-82

Chapter 5 – Pp. 83-112

Methodology

Introduction	Pp. 83-84
--------------------	-----------

Research objectives	Pp. 84-86
Research questions	Pp. 86-88
Underpinning values to the research	Pp. 88-89
Why Knowsley?	Pp. 89-92
Sampling approaches	Pp. 92-93
Sample group one: Volunteer mentors from MALS	Pp. 93-95
Sample group two: Practitioners from Knowsley's IOM team	Pp. 95-97
Sample group three: Lay members from communities throughout Knowsley	Pp. 97-98
Methodological tools	Pp. 98
- Semi-structured interviews	Pp. 98-101
- Focus groups	Pp. 101-103
Political and Ethical dilemmas	Pp. 103-104
- Operating within the time/age of Transforming Rehabilitation (TR)	Pp. 104-105
- Maintaining boundaries during observations of MALS	Pp. 105-106
- Engaging people around challenging topics	Pp. 106-108
- Professional on professional, volunteer on volunteer	Pp. 108-109
Data analysis	Pp. 109-112
Conclusion	Pp. 112

Chapter 6 – Pp. 113-141

Voluntary and community sector involvement in process of desistance: The experiences of mentors at MALS

Introduction	Pp. 113-115
The subtle hierarchies and subjectivities within mentoring	Pp. 115

Articulating the qualities of ‘good’ and ‘better’ mentors	Pp. 115-120
Articulating the journey	Pp. 120
Journey of the mentor	Pp. 120-123
Giving and receiving	Pp. 123
Acquiring and sharing of skills	Pp. 123-126
Intersubjective relationships and change	Pp. 126
Challenging expectations - articulating the conditions of effective support	Pp. 126-128
The conditional and the unconditional - subjective approaches and attitudes to support	Pp. 128-131
Investing and investment	Pp. 132
Negotiating the challenges of investing in people when funders may not continue to invest in you	Pp. 132-135
Awareness of funding in day-to-day working	Pp. 135-137
Investment for effective interventions	Pp. 138-139
Conclusion	Pp. 139-141

Chapter 7 – Pp. 142-167

Public and private sector involvement in processes of desistance: The experiences of Knowsley’s Integrated Offender Management team

Introduction	Pp. 142
The structure of professional engagement with service users in Knowsley	Pp. 143
Who wants it more?	Pp. 143-145
Working cultures and practice tensions	Pp. 145
Unscripted joined-up thinking	Pp. 145-148

Leave it to the professionals	Pp. 148-152
Approaches to ‘service users’	Pp. 152
A question of politics	Pp. 152-156
The (un)deserving	Pp. 156-159
The role of the community	Pp. 159
Putting victims first	Pp. 159-162
Inciting communities to ‘do more’	Pp. 162-165
Conclusion	Pp. 165-167

Chapter 8 – Pp. 168-192

Lay member involvement in processes of desistance: The experiences of communities encompassing the Metropolitan Borough of Knowsley

Introduction	Pp. 168
A distinction without a difference	Pp. 169
‘The’ community	Pp. 169-171
‘The’ offender	Pp. 171-175
Framing the role of the community	Pp. 175
Responsibilising unmotivated and incapable communities is untenable	Pp. 175-178
The accountability of Knowsley’s CSP	Pp. 178-182
Conditioning the creation of supportive communities	Pp. 182
The potential of engendering motivations	Pp. 182-184
Facilitating the capacity to act	Pp. 184-186
The realities of reducing re-offending in Knowsley	Pp. 187
Communities, the solution or the problem?	Pp. 187-190

Conclusion	Pp. 190-192
------------------	-------------

Chapter 9 – Pp. 193-205

Conclusion

Main Findings	Pp. 194
---------------------	---------

What role(s) do members of society play in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?	Pp. 194-198
--	-------------

What motivates members of society to become involved in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?	Pp. 198-201
---	-------------

What capacity do members of society have to engage in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?	Pp. 201-204
---	-------------

Possible areas for future research	Pp. 204-205
--	-------------

Bibliography.....	Pp. 206-265
-------------------	-------------

Appendices

Abstract

This research study explores the roles, motivations, and capacities that communities within Knowsley, Merseyside, England, can play in the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners. It takes place during the time when transformations to rehabilitation are operational in practice. The research speaks to those directly involved and impacted by the success and failure of these measures to rehabilitate ex-prisoners. Speaking to these individuals serves to explore what impact this has had upon their role in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners (if any). Gaining a greater understanding of their readiness, willingness, and ability to play a role, this research can help influence how best to re-integrate and re-settle ex-prisoners. This was done through semi-structured interviews and focus groups, and the narratives of those representing who are active, passive, formally, and informally involved were collected. Upon doing so, it came to be established that communities are an important factor in an ex-prisoner's ability to desist and cease from re-offending. Having knowledge of an offender's life histories pre-, during, and post-release, was considered to increase the potential for an individual to be motivated to play an actively positive role in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners, with the role an individual performs being influenced by their capacities in practice.

Keywords:

Desistance, Ex-prisoner, Knowsley, Re-integration, Re-settlement.

Acknowledgments

This thesis has only been made possible due to the support of many people along its journey. I am sincerely grateful and appreciative to each one of you for all you have done in helping me throughout this experience. Especial thanks go to my family, most notably my mum, dad, wife, and son. Thank you to my dissertation mentors at LJMU, Matthew Millings and Lol Burke, who along with a few notable members of the School of Law have become close friends. I too would like to extend a personal thank you to each individual who chose to participate in the study, as well as those individuals who acted above and beyond as gatekeepers. For this research could not have been conducted without your hospitality and openness to sharing your experiences.

In memoriam:

This work is dedicated to Charlie Campbell.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

The involvement of members of the public as volunteers within the criminal justice system is not a new phenomenon, especially in respect of working with ex-prisoners to support their efforts of re-integrating and re-settling into their communities post-release. However, a succession of major policy shifts in recent times has placed increased emphasis on communities to play a greater role in the attempts made to reduce re-offending (See: House of Commons 2011; Ministry of Justice 2013b; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014). Whether as passive voters in elections for Police and Crime Commissioners, or more proactively as volunteer mentors, the rhetoric of policy interventions such as Transforming Rehabilitation (TR) that cite ‘the public...’ is bringing into sharper focus the extent to which communities are being identified as responsible for delivering processes designed to tackle future offending. This thesis, through employing a case study approach, and conducting fieldwork with volunteers, professionals, and members of the public, explores the challenges and tensions in the devolving of responsibility to communities for the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners. It is a snapshot of how practitioners and members of the public alike consume and act (or not) upon the key messages built into policy. It examines those actors involved in the operation of criminal justice policy – as volunteers looking to engage with services, professionals charged with delivery, and the public as (potential) responsibilised agents – and attempts to understand their capacity to support and drive efforts to rehabilitate ex-prisoners. What the study finds is that professionals and lay members of the public routinely make judgements about the potential for individuals to desist from crime, and that, through a combination of operational fatigue (for practitioners made weary through perpetual policy reform) and cynicism (for practitioners and public alike in drawing on sometimes real, sometimes imagined, tales of ex-prisoners’ experiences), there is much work to be done to secure greater public engagement in supportive desistance processes that help ex-prisoners re-integrate, re-settle, and reduce their likelihood of re-offending.

This study focused specifically on one area – the Metropolitan Borough of Knowsley in Merseyside in the North West of England – characterised by disadvantage and where official recorded crime statistics indicate crime and anti-social behaviour are especially problematic (Office for National Statistics 2015c; Home Office 2018a). This narrowing of focus allows the thesis to explore the dynamics at work in translating policy into practice in an area where

criminal justice and social policies need to operate at their most effective. It is a study that examines the enacting of desistance thinking in practice on a spectrum, from those volunteer mentors who proactively look to be involved in supporting ex-prisoners, through to professionals charged with overseeing policy implementation, and then the wider public as both a community of people whom ex-prisoners will look to interact and reside with, and as an audience to/for criminal justice policy. The fieldwork activity with all three constituent groups has been concerned with exploring their attitudes towards supporting ex-prisoners to desist from re-offending, to explore how they shape their views towards ex-prisoners, and of what role they feel the public can and should play in future efforts to tackle re-offending. The need to critically consider the readiness, willingness, and ability of professionals and lay members of the public to engage with criminal justice policy has been brought into sharper focus by recent initiatives that promote a mixed market approach to delivering rehabilitation services. Organisations working in criminal justice not only need to be able to better evidence how they are working with ex-prisoners to secure their operational legitimacy (See: Bowen and Donoghue 2013; Calder and Goodman 2013; Hedderman 2013; Bastow 2014; Fox, Bannister and Miszczak 2016; Clinks 2018; House of Commons 2018c), but also how delivering measurable impact is increasingly part of how they are funded and supported (See: Gosling 2016).

The TR reform agenda – launched in September 2013 – is the standout policy initiative in respect of shaping rehabilitation services (and articulating a role for the public in this process). However, it is just one element of a longer-term drift towards asking private providers and members of the community to play a greater role in delivering rehabilitation services. In a series of pronouncements that re-affirmed the vision articulated within the TR agenda (See: Home Office 2004; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2012, 2013a, b, 2015, 2018c; House of Commons 2011; Grimwood and Berman 2012; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014; Cabinet Office 2015), government documentation has become accustomed to identifying ‘stubbornly high’ re-offending rates to justify why new thinking is required to tackle re-offending. Between October 2014 and September 2015, approximately 430,000 adult offenders were cautioned, received a non-custodial conviction, or released from custody (Ministry of Justice 2017, 2018b). From this cohort, 102,000, or 23.8%, of adult offenders re-offended within the 12 months that followed (Ministry of Justice 2017, 2018b). Those with 11 or more previous convictions had a higher re-offending rate than those with no previous convictions, being 43.8% compared to 7.4% (Ministry of Justice 2017, 2018b).

In response to these figures, a feature of criminal justice policy has been that empowering and mobilising the involvement of lay participation in the management of offenders will reduce rates of recidivism. Implicit within this policy shift is the belief that the public firstly has the capacity to support individuals when addressing their offending behaviour, and secondly that they are willing to perform this role. This discernible shift in policy has important consequences for desistance thinking, and it is the need to more critically think through the acceptability (and desirability) of the public having a greater role in rehabilitation work that the thesis explores. Desistance is the theoretical exploration of understanding why, how, and when a person is able to desist and cease from (re-)offending. Much of the early desistance thinking was characterised by a concern with how individuals shape more positive lifestyles, and how they make choices that help them desist from offending. In Chapter Two, the thesis draws on the leading desistance thinkers (Quetelet 1833; Glueck and Glueck 1940; Fanon 1952; Matza 1964; Maruna 2001; McNeill and Weaver 2010) to identify three distinct perspectives that articulate differently processes of desisting from crime. Common within the ontogenic, sociogenic, and liberative perspectives of desistance is the defining of roles for members of society to play. Particularly, the role of lay participants within the communities that ex-prisoners will (re-)join is key to the ex-prisoners' success in desisting and ceasing from re-offending (Marshall 1994; Duff 2001; Carlsson 2012; McNeill 2012, 2016; Barry 2013; Healy 2013; Morenoff and Harding 2014).

More than being a community of people that ex-prisoners will return to, the public has the capacity to shape the motivations of ex-prisoners to desist, with ex-prisoners desisting when both they and society come to recognise them as a non-offender, and they experience a sense of belonging to the community they reside within (See: Maruna and Farrall 2004; McNeill 2006, 2016; Weaver and McNeill 2007; Davis, Bahr and Ward 2013; King 2013). The sense of positive immersion within an accepting community, it is argued by, amongst others, Maruna (2001), Healy (2013), and Schlager (2018), will stimulate an ex-prisoner's desire to 'make good' and assimilate, as demonstrated through their propensity to embrace the opportunities and support made available to them. There is, on the face of it, a linear simplicity to these processes of the public and ex-prisoner alike being mobilised to play mutually beneficial roles. However, the desistance literature has shown how the journey of an ex-prisoner to a position of cessation from offending is often tumultuous, inherently individual, and lengthy (See: Maruna 1997; Burnett 2004; Kazemian and Maruna 2009; Moore 2011; Shapland and Bottoms 2011; Carlsson 2012; King 2013; Terry and Abrams

2017). The timeliness and quality of the progress that ex-prisoners make upon this journey is heavily influenced by the availability of support experienced following their release from custody (Maruna, Immarigeon and LeBel 2004; Raynor 2007; Kurlychek, Bushway and Brame 2012; Weaver and Weaver 2013; Cuevas, Wolff and Baglivio 2017; Diamond, Morris and Piquero 2017; Halsey 2017; Terry and Abrams 2017). In Chapter Three, the thesis explores how, in policy terms, these desistance principles have manifested themselves (or not) in the workings of criminal justice partners.

The desistance process, as outlined in theory, is a process predicated as much on the ex-prisoner imposing upon themselves efforts to change, as it is upon the communities they aim to (re-)integrate and (re-)settle into making the conscious effort to welcome and facilitate this change to occur (Ward and Maruna 2007; Canton 2011; McNeill 2012, 2016; Barry 2013; Morenoff and Harding 2014; Korobov 2015). The argument follows that, when the levels of involvement by communities in processes of desistance are low, ex-prisoners do not feel supported and are restricted in terms of accessing resources to impose change (Duff 2001; Hylton 2013; King 2013; Healy 2014; Plesničar 2015). This serves to counteract the motivations and capacity of the ex-prisoner in their efforts to sustain a period of desistance (Uggen, Manza and Thompson 2006). Healy (2010, 2013), Dufour, Brassard and Martel (2015) have shown that when faced with the inability to conform and solidify new identities through meaningful alternatives to crime, ex-prisoners are more receptive to re-offending. In all the key writings that have advanced theoretical explanations of desistance (See: Maruna and Farrall 2004; Ward and Brown 2004; Uggen, Manza and Thompson 2006; Ward and Maruna 2007; Ward 2011; Cobbina and Bender 2012; Deci and Ryan 2012; Lloyd and Serin 2012; Liem and Richardson 2014; Dufour, Brassard and Martel 2015; Seim 2016) there is emphasis placed on lay members of the community to support desistance processes. However, there is limited scope within these works in terms of how, why, and if communities are operationalised effectively to support these processes.

It is the need to understand better the readiness and willingness of the public to undertake a proactive role in efforts to support individuals desisting from crime that this study looks to contribute to knowledge. There has been a tendency within the articulation of criminal justice reform to not only see the increased potential engagement of the voluntary and community sector (VCS) representation in the management of offenders as avowedly positive (See: Home Office 2004; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2012, 2013a, b, 2015, 2018c; House of Commons 2011; Grimwood and Berman 2012; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014; Cabinet

Office 2015), but to predict an implicit and untapped level of support from lay participants to be responsibilised. This serves to undermine the very efforts made in practice to increase the accessibility for lay participation and VCS involvement in processes of desistance, which have often encountered ambivalence and even resistance. The ambitions to revolutionise rehabilitation services outlined by government (See: Ministry of Justice 2013a, b), by devolving the post-release supervision and management of ex-prisoners to local partners utilising local services, find themselves once more dependent upon those services being available and the organisations and communities of people local to them being clear and motivated to play their role in practice. This project's focus on Knowsley helps to explore the realities of how these dynamic processes of desistance play out in practice, framed by three key research questions:

1) What role(s) do members of society play in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?

Concerned with mapping and understanding the role members of the community play in processes designed to reduce re-offending.

2) What motivates members of society to become involved in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?

Focuses on establishing what serves to encourage or demoralise the involvement of communities within the act of playing a role in an ex-prisoner's attempts to cease from re-offending.

3) What capacity do members of society have to engage in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?

Addresses the abilities an individual is required to have to support successfully an ex-prisoner as they desist from re-offending.

Chapter Four outlines in greater detail how these questions have been operationalised to shape an agenda for research activity. At their core, the research questions build on the established assumptions of the desistance literature that the capabilities of an ex-prisoner desisting and ceasing from re-offending cannot be disaggregated from the structure and people of the social world in which they are released into post-custody (See: Meisenhelder 1982; Giddens 1991; Farrall 2002, 2004; Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph 2002; Burnett and Maruna 2004; Bottoms and Shapland 2011; McNeill 2012; Stone 2016). The dynamic processes that help create the conditions for successful desistance are challenging to generate,

especially in a locale like Knowsley, where the wider climate of disadvantage presents its own difficulties for the ex-offender, services and local people. Groups of people and organisations bid for and have to function with limited resources, where decisions have to be made in real time about how much of a priority can be given to supporting ex-offenders. Research has demonstrated that communities of lay participants experiencing deprivation are more inclined to have reduced levels of empathy for those who offend, and prefer them to be excluded indefinitely (See: Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997; Bazemore and Erbe 2004; Maruna and LeBel 2010; Canton 2017). Whilst examining the appetite of local people to be motivated to support mechanisms of support for ex-prisoners is important in all locations, it is the fraught landscape of operating with limited resources amidst heightened levels of recorded crime that justifies a sharpening of focus on locations like Knowsley.

In Knowsley, all neighbourhoods are recognised as being highly deprived on five or more of the following domains: income deprivation, employment deprivation, education, skills and training deprivation, health deprivation and disability, crime, barriers to housing and services, and living environment deprivation (Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016). So extensive are the levels of multiple deprivation experienced throughout the area of Knowsley, that approximately half of its neighbourhoods are recognised as being within 10% of the most deprived neighbourhoods throughout England and Wales (Office for National Statistics 2015c). The proclivity for crime to occur in Knowsley is enhanced due to the high levels of multiple deprivation that are indicative of neighbourhoods throughout the area. Most notably, the limited quality and quantity of accommodation, as well as education, training, and employment in Knowsley, have long since been attributable to heightening an individual's probability to (re-)offend (See: Social Exclusion Unit 2002). Unsurprisingly, there have been recent increases in overall crime within Knowsley, attributable to a rise during the past 12 months in anti-social behaviour, including violence and sexual offences (The Knowsley Partnership 2017; Home Office 2018a).

The three sample populations in this project work and/or live in Knowsley and, by extension, constitute the sources of support ascribed within policy upon how support and rehabilitative services are delivered in practice (See: Home Office 2004; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2012, 2013a, b, 2015, 2018c; House of Commons 2011; Grimwood and Berman 2012; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014; Cabinet Office 2015). On a spectrum, they extend from representatives of a VCS organisation where individuals actively volunteer to support processes of desistance. There are professionals from a range of public and private sector,

statutory and non-statutory organisations, who work in formalised partnership arrangements with a clear operational mandate to reduce re-offending. Then there are groups drawn from the everyday, groups of local people who reside and work in the communities and/or staff the services ex-prisoners will make routine use of in their day-to-day lives.

Participants that are representative of VCS involvement in the desistance process were selected from Mentor Achieve Learn and Support (MALS), a small and self-funded penal VCS organisation in Knowsley, which is one of only three penal VCS organisations in the area that provide a peer mentor service to ex-prisoners (MALS Merseyside 2017b). The purposes of the peer-mentoring service offered by mentors at MALS are to principally provide support to ex-prisoners identified as high risk, as they attempt to (re-)integrate and (re-)settle into the communities of Knowsley (MALS Merseyside 2017b). Through the act of mentoring, the participants from MALS aim to alter the attitudes, thinking, and behaviour of the ex-prisoners that they mentor (MALS Merseyside 2017b). However, in order to signpost their mentees to the support that they express would enhance their motivations and capacity to desist, the mentors are also required to work in partnership with the agencies who comprise Knowsley's Integrated Offender Management team (IOM), of which MALS is a member (Ministry of Justice 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017b). Thus, demonstrating how, despite the approaches taken in policy to improve offender management through lay participants and VCS representation, the roles of statutory agencies remain necessary in responding, devising, and delivering interventions and support to ex-prisoners (Barrett et al. 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017b; Merseyside PCC 2017).

Participants representative of public and private sector involvement in the desistance process were selected from organisations that encompass Knowsley's IOM. Knowsley's IOM is responsible for the supervision and joint management of ex-prisoners identified as persistent, problematic, and high risk (Ministry of Justice 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018a, c, e). To attain reductions to the re-offending by the cohort of ex-prisoners under its supervision and management, Knowsley's IOM is predicated upon the agencies involved working in partnership to provide a cross-agency approach, which takes advantage of their combined skills, knowledge, experiences, and resources (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). The local partner agencies comprising Knowsley's IOM encompass the public, private, as well as VCS (Ministry of Justice 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). These agencies are as follows: Merseyside police service, the National Probation Service (NPS), Knowsley Council, HM prison service, drug, alcohol, and mental health service providers,

First Ark housing services, penal VCS organisation MALS, and Jobcentre Plus (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017b). IOMs have benefited from the considerable leniency afforded to them in regard to the frequency and representation of agencies involved in their teams, as well as how they all serve to operate collectively in practice (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015). This has allowed IOMs to be reflective of, and responsible to, the local environment in which they operate (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). It is worth noting that it is also important to obtain a representation of practitioners involved in the supervision and management of ex-prisoners identified as posing a low to medium risk of re-offending following their release. Participants were also acquired from the Merseyside Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC), which is the lead agency involved in the desistance processes of this category of ex-prisoners (Interserve 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018a, e, f).

Participants who were representative of lay participant involvement in the desistance process were selected from social groups throughout the Borough of Knowsley, ‘the publics’ that help sharpen the focus on processes of re-integration and re-settlement being seen as a community issue (See: McCold 1996; Travis, Solomon and Waul 2001; Byrne, Taxman and Young 2002; Bazemore and Erbe 2004; Bain and Parkinson 2010; Brooks 2012). These are the groups that play formal/informal, passive/proactive, and/or artificial/organic roles in the lives of ex-prisoners as they return to their community. Therefore, lay participants were derived from pre-existing community centre groupings, local interest groups, parishes, tenant forums, and residents’ groups with participants drawn from across the borough and based in one or more of the following districts of Knowsley: Huyton, Kirkby, Prescot, Stockbridge Village, Halewood, Whiston, or Cronton.

The chapters that follow will demonstrate the importance ascribed to engaging with and listening to the voices of the three participant samples identified within theory and policy as possessing a definitive role in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners. Only through speaking with these individuals can their ideological reasoning be obtained on whether they are clear of the definitive role they have within processes of desistance, including knowledge and understanding of their motivations and capacities for and against performing this role in practice.

The study will show how desistance thinking has been one of a series of elements that have shaped and driven routine reform of criminal justice policy provision in the last two decades.

What is important is that current policy – articulated most forcefully through the TR reform agenda – has placed increased emphasis on the public to be responsibilised to play a greater role in supporting ex-prisoners. For all communities, this is an added expectation of citizenship that requires volunteers to give up wilfully their time, and to exercise patience with ex-prisoners in a process that can be lengthy and challenging. However, for communities like Knowsley experiencing social and economic disadvantage, and where crime and anti-social behaviour are a routine feature of community life, these are demands that can feel especially acute. As the study will demonstrate, individuals who themselves experience economic hardship often see criminal activity as a rational choice, as an act against the well-being of the community, and harden their attitudes towards ex-prisoners. For professionals who work in the criminal justice sector and have to make decisions about the allocation of diminishing resources, the study will show how they have to make routine judgements about what they feel is best for the service user they are working with, and of the needs of the community where these two elements are not always compatible. Conversely, there are those who wilfully give up their time to support others in their desistance journeys for a series of individual, and not always consistent, justifications.

Therefore, this study provides a thorough assessment of what happens at the interface of policy and practice and of the tensions in effect when rhetoric manifests itself in public engagement. It is a snapshot in time, situated in Knowsley, during a period where the management and delivery of rehabilitation services is undergoing profound reform. The study contributes to the desistance literature as it seeks to illustrate the very real dynamics at work in how communities of people – professional and volunteers – engage (or not) with messages to reduce re-offending and to support re-integration and re-settlement. The study explores why some people are motivated to volunteer their time to help ex-prisoners, and then explores with much more passive groups what scope there is to mobilise them in collective efforts to reduce re-offending. What emerges is a very fragmented picture where individuals are cynical about the prospects for change, and there is much debate about where and with whom responsibility lies to support ex-prisoners on their re-immersion into community life.

Chapter 2 – Establishing why, how, and when individuals desist and cease offending

Introduction

The thesis contests that lay individuals within communities throughout society play a definitive role in the successful re-integration and re-settlement of formerly incarcerated individuals into their communities. Moreover, members of the public can help ex-prisoners shape new pro-social identities and be better equipped to make lifestyle choices away from offending behaviour. At work are processes of desistance that reduce an individual's proclivity to offend, and this chapter explores how theoretical perspectives have developed to articulate how individuals cease offending. The chapter is structured around exploring three theoretical perspectives that conceptualise the role of society in processes of desistance: the ontogenic, sociogenic, and liberative perspectives. The discussion will review each in turn and detail the contributions made by each theoretical perspective to current knowledge and understanding of how, when, and why an individual ceases from (re-)offending. The critical examination of the literature in this field will help determine who, and what research evidence indicates, are significant in processes of desistance. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the challenges that currently exist in encouraging and mobilising societal involvement in processes of desistance, particularly when communities in reality are not always shown to be neatly stocked in the capital and resources that are required for an ex-prisoner to 'go straight'.

The ontogenic outlook

First developed by Adolphe Quetelet in 1833, the ontogenic perspective is the earliest of the theoretical perspectives of desistance (Quetelet 1833). Originating from the word ontogeny, the term ontogenic is used to describe desistance as actions attributable to a natural process of an individual maturing with age and growing 'out' of crime (See: Quetelet 1833; Moffitt 1993; Piquero 2015; Hill, Blokland and Van der Geest 2016). Sparkes and Day (2016) note that a person's maturation is influenced during their life course by the social world around them, and their interactions and experiences with the people cohabiting this environment. Over their life course, a person can mature cognitively, emotionally, socially, and physically

(Sparkes and Day 2016), and authors like Quetelet (1833), Glueck and Glueck (1940), and Davis, Bahr and Ward (2013) consider an ex-prisoner's physical maturation as a key reason for why, how, and when they will cease re-offending. Firstly, health problems become far more common as an offender ages and they become confronted with a depreciation in their physical vitality. Proponents of the ontogenic perspective claim that, upon conceiving their limitations, an offender will recognise that they can no longer continue their current criminal lifestyle indefinitely, and make the rational choice to stop offending (See: Ward and Laws 2010; Eman 2012; Davis, Bahr and Ward 2013; Andrews 2014). Secondly, ontogenic advocates state that, as these same offenders appreciate in age, they are increasingly likely to become physically fatigued by repeatedly entering and leaving prison, which serves to increase their motivation to cease their criminal behaviour (See: Laz 2003; Waskul and Vannini 2006; Bahr et al. 2010; Sparkes and Day 2016).

Those championing the ontogenic theoretical explanation of desistance have come to operationalise this process of maturity and growing 'out' of crime as an age-crime curve (Maruna 2001; Sampson and Laub 2016), irrespective of a person's gender, ethnicity, or the offence type committed that led to their incarceration (Huebner and Berg 2011; Sparkes and Day 2016). The person's proclivity to become involved in criminal activity is understood to begin in the early teenage years, peaking in both frequency and severity during their late adolescence (See: Barlow and Maruna 2012; Sparkes and Day 2016). Their involvement decreases progressively throughout adulthood, and their cessation from re-offending occurs approximately prior to their thirtieth birthday (Barlow and Maruna 2012; Sparkes and Day 2016). This concept of maturational reform has rarely deviated beyond those assertions first made by notable proponents such as Quetelet (1833) and, in time, Glueck and Glueck (1940). Nevertheless, the ontogenic theoretical explanation of desistance has continued to acquire growth, acclaim, and support through attracting new advocates (See: Hirschi and Gottfredson 1993; Dufour, Brassard and Martel 2015).

Ontogenic theoretical explanations of desistance have drawn criticism for the attention given to the physical maturation at the expense of all other variables in an individual's behaviour. Wootton (1962), Dufour, Brassard and Martel (2015) and Rocque (2015) argue that the preoccupation with age precludes a deeper understanding of why, how, and when ex-prisoners become architects of their own lives. Vere van Koppen (2018) claims that the expectation that offenders will come to cease involvement in crime by the age of 30 is refuted by the existence of individuals over the age of 30 who (re-)offend. Moreover, depreciations in

an offender's health are not guaranteed to occur abruptly and severely, as they are entirely dependent upon the individual (See: Massoglia and Uggen 2010; Lodge and Umberson 2013). For a considerable proportion of ex-prisoners, their incarceration can lead them to remain upon the trajectory of an indeterminate criminal career through the effect of institutionalisation (See: Massoglia 2008; Gatti, Tremblay and Vitaro 2009; Brooks 2012; Wermink et al. 2012; Soyer 2014; Tollenaar, Van der Laan and Van der Heijden 2014; Raaijmakers et al. 2017). There, too, exist a host of people content not to 'break the cycle', as their incarceration provides them with the assurances of amenities such as food and shelter that stand apart from the marginalisation they endured pre-custody, and expect to re-encounter post-custody (Harding, Morenoff and Herbert 2013; Harding et al. 2014). On those occasions when people are motivated to cease offending owing to, amongst others, the development of a new or renewed interest in religious faith, feelings of remorse, guilt and/or shame for their previous actions (Armstrong 2014; Pirutinsky 2014), the ontogenic theoretical perspective of desistance falls short. These processes may not be age dependent and the perspective is too blind to how an individual amasses the physical and psychological tools to support a motivation they may develop to desist from re-offending.

There is also no consideration of the potential for members of society to have an influential (in-)direct role upon an individual's motivation to change, and their capacity to demonstrate a willingness to change. Ulmer and Steffensmeier (2014) argue that an individual's desistance from crime is not predicated solely upon biological and physical factors, but also their surrounding environment where desistance is a multifaceted concept that involves social, political, historical, and cultural processes (See: Katz 2011; McNeill 2012; Rocque 2015; Sparkes and Day 2016). Therefore, although the appreciation for the ontogenic theoretical perspective of desistance has continued since its conception in the early nineteenth century (See: Dufour, Brassard and Martel 2015), the critique of this perspective has spawned new thinking and new ideas that look instead for wider explanations rooted in an individual's social relationships with others.

The sociogenic standpoint

Originally devised by Franz Fanon in 1952, the sociogenic theoretical perspective of desistance sought to take heed of the strengths and limitations with the ontogenic theory (Fanon 1952). Fanon (1952) believed that the efforts of ontogenic theorists to focus attention

solely upon what it is to be a human were meaningless, claiming it to be far more important to attribute greater understanding of what it is like to be a human (Fanon 1952). As Fanon (1952) stressed that numerous cultures exist throughout society composed of human beings, whereby, although they are the same species, it is their race, ethnicity, gender, and class that are different. It is for such reasons that not every human being has the same access to the sources of capital required to live a 'good life' (Fanon 1952; Farrall et al. 2011). The sources of capital that Fanon and proponents of the sociogenic perspective state are key and that people establish and maintain during their life course are cultural, physical, human, and social (Fanon 1952; Bourdieu 1986). Having an attachment to such capital provides individuals with a stake in conformity (Sampson and Laub 1993, 2003). When such bonds to society present themselves as weak or broken, an individual will be less inclined to live a 'good life' (See: Fanon 1952; Sampson and Laub 1993; Dufour, Brassard and Martel 2015). Sociogenic theorists also attach importance to individuals having active engagement in social processes, whereby such social processes as structured routine activities, local culture, social controls, and human agency, are necessary to the well-being and happiness of a person (See: Sampson and Laub 1993, 2003; McNeill 2006; Ward 2011; Carlsson 2012; Sampson 2015; Capaldi et al. 2016; Sampson and Laub 2016; Sparkes and Day 2016).

Although Fanon (1952) was the earliest advocate of sociogeny, David Matza (1964) first referenced the role of the sociogenic theory in relation to understanding desistance when discussing his notion of 'drift' (Fanon 1952; Matza 1964). Matza (1964) stated that it is not by reaching a particular age that enables a person to cease offending, but rather the availability to engage actively in social processes, and access capital that comes with maturation. Matza (1964) further claimed that, if positively harnessed, such capital and engagement allow for a transition from offending to non-offending, which, although not guaranteed, becomes far more likely to transpire. The principle put forward by Matza (1964) and fellow theorists in favour of the sociogenic theoretical explanation of desistance is that the majority of juvenile offenders are in constant limbo. They are 'trapped' between the social bonds of adulthood and deviant peer subcultures, with little attachment to either (Matza 1964; Huebner and Berg 2011). Huebner and Berg (2011) explain that sociogenic theorists believe that it is only once an individual matures, and their adolescence has ended, do adult roles and access to associated capital and social processes become available. It is at this period that an individual can either make a rational and free-willed choice to (re-)engage in crime (Healy 2010; Huebner and Berg 2011; Nahmias and Murray 2011) or make the

decision to invest in pro-social institutions that serve to restrict involvement in criminal behaviour (Wakefield and Uggen 2010; Huebner and Berg 2011; Doherty and Ensminger 2013). Acting as key turning points, these alternative sources of achievement and social satisfaction can enable people to become gradually less dependent upon past negative peer-group support (See: Sampson and Laub 1993; Huebner and Berg 2011; Laws and Ward 2011; Boduszek et al. 2013; Whited et al. 2014) by redirecting individuals away from delinquency as they turn anti-social trajectories into conventional pathways (Sampson and Laub 1993; Huebner and Berg 2011; Laws and Ward 2011; Boduszek et al. 2013; Whited et al. 2014). Proponents of the sociogenic perspective claim that individuals with positive social bonds to society are least likely to offend as they have the greatest to lose from social sanctions and ostracism (Hirschi 1969; Davis, Bahr and Ward 2013; Wahidin and Carr 2013).

The capital that sociogenic theorists stipulate as key for individuals to accrue and maintain in order to enhance their likelihood of desisting and ceasing offending are: cultural, physical, human, and social (Fanon 1952; Bourdieu 1986). Cultural capital is encapsulated as a person acting in accordance with culturally defined norms, values, and expectations (Bourdieu 1986; Lyons and Lurigio 2010; Calverley 2013; Durnescu 2017). Adopting the collective beliefs, attitudes, and identity of those in your community serves to promote building positive networks and desistance from crime (Bourdieu 1986; Lyons and Lurigio 2010; Calverley 2013; Durnescu 2017). Physical capital is recognised as fiscal savings, investments, and property. The greater the quantity and array of physical capital a person possesses serves to enhance their recovery options if they do commit a criminal act (Granfield and Cloud 2001; Piketty 2014). Human capital revolves around which facets of an individual are of greatest importance and value to improve for their own, society's, and future generations' lives (McNeill 2006; Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi 2009; Fox 2016). Human capital is the knowledge, skills, and attributes a person can acquire that serve to help develop and maintain a healthy well-being and reduce involvement in crime (McNeill 2006; Stiglitz, Sen and Fitoussi 2009; Fox 2016). Finally, social capital represents the (in)formal networks that exist in a community, which share norms, morals, and understandings of how to operate cohesively (Cid and Marti 2012; Cobbina, Huebner and Berg 2012; Duwe and Clark 2013; Wooditch, Tang and Taxman 2014). The quality and quantity of the trust an individual has in their fellow community members dictate whether they can expect to be supported if they became involved in crime (Cid and Marti 2012; Cobbina, Huebner and Berg 2012; Duwe and Clark 2013; Wooditch, Tang and Taxman 2014). All forms of capital demonstrate that the

relationships amongst individuals in communities throughout society are significant, for they serve to uphold moral values, civic norms, and thus promote an adherence to a law-abiding lifestyle.

Despite the significance that all four forms of capital play in promoting desistance, both human and social capital are routinely regarded as essential for an individual to possess if they are to remain as, or become, a non-offender (Davey, Day and Balfour 2014). In essence, human and social capital do not exist in isolation from each other, whereby human capital engenders social capital, and likewise social capital promotes human capital. As noted, human capital encompasses a multitude of equally important traits and qualities that members of society should strive to encompass. Yet, the most prevalent and recurring measurement of human capital is an individual's positive contribution to the labour market (Giziene and Simanaviciene 2015). Educational attainment is, therefore, conceived as the greatest means for a member of society to contribute to the economy (Šipilova 2013). An individual with minimal skills or levels of educational attainment are substantially more likely to be unemployed (Travis, Western and Redburn 2014; Cook et al. 2015). Consequentially, such individuals are prone to social exclusion, have lower satisfaction in life, suffer from poor health, and are susceptible to becoming involved in crime (Travis, Western and Redburn 2014; Cook et al. 2015). In obtaining employment, an individual acquires wealth, which leads to increased life satisfaction and happiness (Varghese and Cummings 2012; Maruna 2014; Aaltonen 2016). Such wealth enables an individual to engage in their local community, and obtain trust from fellow members of society (Maruna 2014; Aaltonen 2016). Moreover, the educational attainment level and subsequent human capital of any children an individual has are more likely to emulate those of their parents, including a reduced proclivity to become involved in crime (Devereux 2014; Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2014; Lee et al. 2014).

The reason why sociogenic theorists attribute importance upon ex-prisoners gaining employment is two-fold (Blitz 2006; Lageson and Uggen 2013; Bushway and Paternoster 2014; Cherney and Fitzgerald 2016). Firstly, being employed not only enables the person to earn an income legally and afford them the possibilities that result from such wealth, but it also ensures that they are regularly engaged in productive and purposeful conduct, in turn reducing the opportunities for illicit activity (See: Blitz 2006; Lageson and Uggen 2013; Bushway and Paternoster 2014; Cherney and Fitzgerald 2016). This is achieved through limiting the necessity to undertake criminal opportunities, as well as providing positive networks of support (Sampson and Laub 2003; Bahr et al. 2010; Maruna 2014). Obtaining

full-time employment is of especial importance, as recidivism is not associated with employment status per se, but rather with the number of hours worked (Davis, Bahr and Ward 2013; Maruna 2014). The routine structure of attending a workplace diminishes the amount of time available for an ex-prisoner to associate with deviant peers, whilst also providing them the opportunity to associate with law-abiding peers (Bahr et al. 2010; Maruna 2014). Yet, Walters (2016) states that this process of severing existing networks with pre-existing criminal peers, and establishing entirely new networks of friends and mentors, can be exceptionally difficult, although it is crucial for an ex-prisoner to do so if they are to reconstitute their life on a pathway to desistance (Bushway, Paternoster and Brame 2003).

Finding employment upon release from custody provides individuals with structured activities that help create and establish social capital, with the scope to engage positive role models and to reinforce informal social controls (See: Bahr et al. 2010; Lageson and Uggen 2013; Bushway and Paternoster 2014; Cherney and Fitzgerald 2016). Temptations to participate in illegal behaviour are constrained by the potential loss of one's job, and the subsequent financial gains that come with being employed (Bahr et al. 2010; Maruna 2014; Ulmer and Steffensmeier 2014). However, Farrall (2002) stresses that it cannot be assumed that the acquisition of skills, knowledge, experience, qualifications, and employment will implicitly enable a person to remain a desister. Many ex-prisoners are entering into an unstable fiscal climate, with limited opportunities presented by the jobs market (Cho and Tyler 2013; Harding et al. 2014). Consequently, when and if an ex-prisoner acquires employment, it is primarily of low status, often temporary and/or limited to a small number of hours per week that equate to a low wage (See: Apel and Sweeten 2010; Cook et al. 2015). It should, therefore, not be overlooked as to how, for some individuals, employment can present the opportunities to (re-)engage within criminal behaviour (Blokland 2014; Hill, Blokland and Van der Geest 2016). For instance, Canton (2011) argues that obtaining a low wage can lead a person to commit illicit behaviour to circumvent their situation. Varghese (2012) similarly observes that the very nature of being in employment enables the potential for an individual to perform crimes only associated with being employed, namely both white-collar and corporate crimes.

This previous overview of human capital evidences that it is not the quantity of capital that an individual amasses which will aid them to desist, but rather the quality of the capital they are able to engage with (Laub and Sampson 1995). The generation of social capital is equally multi-layered as individuals embark on the accumulation of (in)formal networks of

relationships with a range of individuals in differing settings and contexts (See: Beckett-Wilson 2014; Simons and Barr 2014; Soller 2014, 2015; Walters 2016). Putnam (2000) best described the differential power of social capital through his distinction between bonding and bridging capital. Bonding capital serves to link like-minded individuals, those with a common identity, who reside in close proximity (Putnam 2000). Thus, strong relationships with members of one's family, childhood friends, and longstanding acquaintances can provide emotional, social, and economic support, which is considered 'good for getting by' in life (See: Putnam 2000; Huebner and Berg 2011; Cobbina, Huebner and Berg 2012; Barrick, Lattimore and Visser 2014; Wooditch, Tang and Taxman 2014; Markson et al. 2015). However, an overreliance on existing relationships can be detrimental, particularly for ex-prisoners, if these pre-existing relationships were negative and contributed to their past behaviour (Martinez and Abrams 2011; Cid and Marti 2012).

It is for such reason that sociogenic theorists assign greater importance to bridging capital (Walters 2016). Bridging capital describes the far more spatial relationships an individual has, be this due to the enhanced geographical proximity between individuals, or the infrequency to which two individuals communicate (Putnam 2000). Putnam (2000) claims that these 'social bridges' are able to prevent an individual from becoming an outsider amidst society, thus avoiding their economic progress being hindered. Bridging capital is envisioned as 'good for getting ahead' in life, enabling ex-prisoners to extend their contacts and opportunities beyond their immediate circle, and facilitating social mobility (See: Putnam 2000; Huebner and Berg 2011; Cobbina, Huebner and Berg 2012; Barrick, Lattimore and Visser 2014; Wooditch, Tang and Taxman 2014; Markson et al. 2015). The bridging of social capital is thus a far more productive means of promoting change in an individual, compared to relying upon pre-existing social bonds that serve to promote feelings of temporary security and stability. Barry (2006) thus claims it is necessary to be able to both expend and accumulate social and human capital in order to progress forth in life.

Sociogenic theories are not without critique, especially through the connection to classicist and rational choice-based theories of crime (Bentham 1789; Becker 1968; Newman and Marongiu 2009). The sociogenic theoretical perspective of desistance assigns a considerable presumption that all offenders are rational and free-willed actors, who consider the positive and negative connotations of committing crime. The consequential ramification is that responsibility and guilt lie with the individual offender for a failure to engage with positive social bonds and capital as they mature (Healy 2010). Yet, as Doherty and Bersani (2016)

argue, not all members of society have equal access to positive sources of capital due to their diminished economic, social, or political position, and it is thus unreasonable to associate culpability with all offenders when they are unable to harness capital that sociogenic theorists put forth is crucial to desistance. It should not be underplayed how an individual's potential involvement in crime is further influenced by their relationship with, and the morals gleaned, from family members and the environment in which they mature (See: Faulkner 2003; Simons and Barr 2014; Soller 2014, 2015; Markson et al. 2015). For, if an individual is born into a pre-existing criminogenic network, they may naturally associate with, and interpret, such behaviour as conventionally understood and accepted norms to be upheld, as there is no reason for the individual to believe otherwise (See: Wikström and Treiber 2006; Murray and Farrington 2008; Arditti 2012; Visher, Bakken and Gunter 2013; Yonai, Levine and Glicksohn 2015; Jardine 2018). As Ramakers et al. (2016) stress, there is limited discourse by proponents of the sociogenic perspective on the barriers experienced by ex-prisoners actively seeking capital due to their criminal record, nor suggestion on how individuals can overcome this considerable obstacle to desistance.

Furthermore, the sociogenic perspective does make note of how turning points or 'hooks for change' during the life course have the potential to fluctuate, between acting as positive and developing into having negative effects (Sampson 2015; Doherty and Bersani 2016). Sampson (2015), as well as Doherty and Bersani (2016) amongst others, argue that the sociogenic perspective does not do enough to explain the negative effects of capital, but rather chooses to exemplify the positive potential of capital (See: Arditti 2012; Kirk 2012; Monsbakken, Lyngstad and Skardhamar 2012a, 2012b; Visher, Bakken and Gunter 2013; Barnes et al. 2014; Craig, Diamond and Piquero 2014; Simons and Barr 2014; Soller 2014, 2015; Steiner, Makarios and Travis III 2015; Theobald, Farrington and Piquero 2015; Taylor 2016; Kansky and Allen 2018). For instance, similar to acquiring employment, there exists a plethora of research promoting the profound effect that marriage/civil partnership or a new relationship can have on enabling an ex-prisoner to be introduced to a social network of individuals and opportunities, which can encourage their capacity and motivation to desist (See: DeLisi and Piquero 2011; Forrest and Hay 2011; Barnes and Beaver 2012; Craig, Diamond and Piquero 2014; Skardhamar, Monsbakken and Lyngstad 2014; Zoutewelle-Terovan et al. 2014), although it is the characteristics of an ex-prisoner's partner and their social relationships which are of major importance (DeLisi and Piquero 2011; Forrest and Hay 2011; Barnes and Beaver 2012; Craig, Diamond and Piquero 2014; Skardhamar,

Monsbakken and Lyngstad 2014; Zoutewelle-Terovan et al. 2014). For instance, a spouse who is law abiding is far more likely to exhibit disapproval of deviant behaviour by their partner, as opposed to a spouse who is involved in crime and can promote or reinforce such negative tendencies through increasing one's criminal networks (See: Barnes and Beaver 2012; Van Schellen, Apel and Nieuwbeerta 2012; Lyngstad and Skardhamar 2013; Zoutewelle-Terovan et al. 2014). Such evidence reaffirms that the act of marriage is not sufficient enough to guarantee that an ex-prisoner will desist from crime, and is instead predicated upon the person marrying a law-abiding partner (Forrest and Hay 2011; Bijleveld, Van der Geest and Hendriks 2012; Van Schellen, Apel and Nieuwbeerta 2012; Barnes et al. 2014; Skardhamar, Monsbakken and Lyngstad 2014; Zoutewelle-Terovan et al. 2014; Doherty and Bersani 2016; Paternoster et al. 2016). Furthermore, becoming a parent also has the potential to hinder an individual's potential to desist and cease (re-)offending, whereby former prisoners may naturally feel the necessity to engage in illicit behaviour as a means of financially supporting a partner and/or child(ren), especially in instances when legitimate opportunities will not suffice (See: Visher, Bakken and Gunter 2013; Lindegaard and Jacques 2014; Zoutewelle-Terovan et al. 2014; Theobald, Farrington and Piquero 2015; Doherty and Bersani 2016).

Critics of the sociogenic theoretical perspective go further and argue that the perspective also fails to understand the role, motivation, and capacities of society to engage with ex-prisoners and enable them the opportunities to equally access sources of capital (Sampson 2015; Doherty and Bersani 2016). Dufour, Brassard and Martel (2015) state that former prisoners must be able to sense a genuine feeling of belonging to the community they are released into, and be permitted access to the capital of fellow community members in order to desist. Admittedly, as Giordano, Cernkovich and Holland (2003) explain, ex-prisoners could, in effect, choose to resist engagement in social processes and capital even when available to access. Healy (2010) states this poses considerable concern, as the sociogenic perspective is void of discussion upon efforts to counteract such incidents if they were to occur, alternatively relying upon dialogue that ratifies a belief of attributing responsibility and guilt with the individual for their failure to engage. Therefore, enhancing the narrative of an ex-prisoner by identifying and building upon their positive characteristics, ambitions, and opportunities is necessary to encourage and assist their progression (Hylton 2014). This acts alongside the (in)direct support from the environment that the ex-prisoners are released into, and social actors within, to facilitate such change. In order to attribute a greater understanding

of the role that personal narratives play in providing insight into addressing the readiness, willingness, and abilities in order for an ex-prisoner to conform to socially expected norms and values, a third theoretical perspective of desistance was generated.

The liberative resolve

The third and most contemporary theoretical explanation of desistance derives from a liberative perspective, and asserts that what distinguishes those who can desist from crime is their narrative script. The use of the term narrative in the context of desistance first arose in the Liverpool Desistance Study, conducted by Shadd Maruna in 1998 (Maruna 2001). The research by Maruna sought to emphasise the significance of attributing attention to offenders' own views on how they see their future, and establish the variables in them being able to 'make good' (Maruna 2001; Stevens 2012; O'Sullivan et al. 2018). Specifically, whether they want to change, and whether they can imagine themselves living a different kind of life (Maruna 2001; Veysey, Martinez and Christian 2013). Liberalist theorists thus attach significance to those not least harnessing a willing desire to alter their previous criminally inclined behaviour, but rather a genuine attempt to integrate their past, present, and perceived futures into a personal identity that sustains and guides such positive behaviour (See: McNeill and Weaver 2010; Farrall et al. 2011; Rowe and Soppitt 2014). How people view themselves and make sense of their past and present experiences, as well as future aspirations, is deemed by liberative theorists as the sole reason for an individual to be capable of desisting from re-offending (Rocque, Posick and Paternoster 2016). Plesničar (2015) states that attention is therefore aligned with stressing the importance of individual agency and offenders rebuilding their social identity. Iselin et al. (2012) agree, and claim that emphasis is aligned with the offender coming to the realisation that such prior involvement in illicit activities was morally and socially wrong. Therefore, any 'failure' to establish an alternative narrative, from viewing oneself as an offender to a person who is not defined by this label, will equate to an inability to successfully cease from re-offending (See: Iselin et al. 2012; King 2013; Wahidin and Carr 2013; Healy 2014).

The process by which an ex-prisoner views themselves no longer as an offender, but rather as a person not defined by this label, was first encapsulated in research by Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph (2002). For Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph (2002), there are four decisive and sequential elements towards a person's desistance. All of these require an

environment that is open to providing ‘hooks for change’ to facilitate desistance, but denote it to be the ex-prisoner who must ‘put in the work’ and engage with these opportunities (Giordano 2014; Rocque 2015; Sparkes and Day 2016). Firstly, individuals must develop an openness to personal change, conceiving it to be a genuine possibility (Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph 2002). Davis, Bahr and Ward (2013) state that only when a person wishes to wilfully attempt to change their behaviour can this process begin. Secondly, the ex-prisoner must expose themselves to situations that will provide them with the capacity to make their desire to change a reality (Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph 2002; Davis, Bahr and Ward 2013). Thirdly, an individual must develop a new representation of themselves, one who no longer wishes to be involved in crime (Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph 2002; Davis, Bahr and Ward 2013). Therefore, unless they believe in their own self-efficacy, they could alternatively utilise newly acquired capital to re-enact prior criminal behaviour (Lloyd and Serin 2012). The fourth and final stage, deemed most crucial by Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph (2002), stipulates that ex-prisoners must re-frame deviance as being unacceptable, with them expressing some manifestation of remorse for their previous involvement in illegal activities (Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph 2002). Davis, Bahr and Ward (2013) and King (2013) stress that an individual’s failure to do so will heighten the possibility of them re-offending in the future.

Liberative theorising upon desistance, as evidenced in the work of Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph (2002), installs the notion that human behaviour is intentional and purposeful (Maruna 1997). The liberative explanation of desistance serves to impose that positive change will not occur unless an individual has an internal motivation to enact such change (See: Laub and Sampson 2001; Vaughan 2007; Gideon 2010; Stevens 2012). It is apparent that, by not taking into consideration the existence of potential inferences upon a person’s decision-making processes, the liberative explanation is promoting or inferring a one-sided perspective (Vaughan 2007). This perspective serves to diminish the support that can be provided by members of society to a person in order to heighten their probability of desisting from re-offending (Stevens 2012). Considerable blameworthiness is alternatively assigned solely upon the former prisoner irrespective of whether they claim to be ill prepared, unwilling and/or unable to desist from re-offending. This is not to say that liberalist theorists do not believe that society has a prominent role in processes of desistance. As Healy (2014) explains, society is considered by liberalist theorists as responsible for constructing what is

denoted as the moral and civic order that is to be upheld and expected of individuals aspiring to desist.

Those who oppose the liberalist theoretical explanation of desistance claim that society has the potential to play a far greater role (Plesničar 2015). They claim that, to expect an individual to rebuild their social identity, they must be provided with the hope that they be allowed access to the resources to impose change (See: Healy 2014; Plesničar 2015). As Bracken, Deane and Morrisette (2009) assert, ex-prisoners will already possess a distrust and bitterness towards the communities they look to (re-)enter. Therefore, as Dufour, Brassard and Martel (2015) explain, these individuals are less likely to be receptive of the proximal social control exerted by a community if they (re-)experience labelling/stigma due to their previous actions. Healy (2010) agrees, stating that ex-prisoners are already afflicted by the personal shame and memories of lost chances each occasion they re-offend. Therefore, rather than promote a person's powerlessness and temptation to re-offend, by limiting resources and meaningful alternatives to crime (Healy 2013), increasing focus upon their pro-social goals and developing support for them to create and maintain opportunities for change is beneficial for all of society (See: Locke and Latham 2002; McNeill 2006, 2009; Hylton 2014). As Cuevas, Wolff and Baglivio (2017) note, if a person attempting to desist and cease from re-offending believes they do not possess the capacity to produce a positive change, then they will not have the motivation to attempt change. The environment around them and the people/actors within this setting therefore influence an individual's self-control (Diamond, Morris and Piquero 2017).

In light of such ongoing critiques of the liberative perspective, the Sheffield Desistance Study conducted by Bottoms and Shapland (2011) sought to build upon Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph's (2002) earlier explanation of the desistance process. This most recent elucidation led to a seven-stage process, in which its additional three stages acknowledged and detailed how some obstacles, barriers, and temptations that may impede a person's motivations and capacities to establish and maintain a crime-free identity are created by society (Bottoms and Shapland 2011; McNeill 2012). This restructured explanation put forth by Bottoms and Shapland (2011) has resulted in the liberative theoretical perspective of desistance to develop from its original conception. This has led to conceive that an individual's progression on their journey towards desistance is affected, for better or worse, by the choices of the individual and the society around them (Bottoms and Shapland 2011; McNeill 2012), with their renewed identity shaped within the constraints and opportunity structure of the social world in which

they live (See: Meisenhelder 1982; Giddens 1991; Stone 2016). As Maruna (1997) argues, it is imperative to recognise that the new self-images that formerly incarcerated individuals construct are not created in a vacuum. Since the Sheffield Desistance Study in 2011, it has also come to be increasingly perceived that an individual attempting to desist will benefit both from a belief in their own ability, and also someone else having a belief in them and their ability to succeed (Maruna 2001). This discovery of agency and the role of another person(s) believing in your ability to enact an alternative identity for the future can help instil and preserve hope and confidence, especially through periods when the desister cannot see these possibilities for themselves (See: Maruna 2001; McNeill and Weaver 2010; Schlager 2018). Liberative theorists have, therefore, come to accept that feelings of hope, self-efficiency and motivation to change, which can be linked to a person's general outlook and disposition, cannot be disaggregated from the environment and circumstances in which people live (See: Farrall 2002, 2004; Burnett and Maruna 2004).

Healy (2013) argues that desisting individuals employ one of two narrative scripts, depending on how they are perceived and supported pre-, during, and post-release from custody by members of society (Maruna 2001). Those who re-offend are considered to use a narrative script of condemnation (Maruna 2001; Healy 2013), where they determine that they have little to no hope within themselves of changing their lives and feel unable to control nor affect the forces that bind them to their 'fate' (Schlager 2018). The individual succumbs to the belief that they will be unable to alter their past criminal behaviour, reserving considerable blame upon society for their inability to do so (Healy 2013). Alternatively, those individuals who desist are said to employ a narrative script of redemption, where they harness a desire to 'make good' and positively alter their past behaviour (Maruna 2001; Healy 2013). They possess a belief that they have the agency to take control of their own life, by making the choice to set goals and attain them on their pathway to desistance (Healy 2013). This process is helped considerably if this personal belief is aligned with member(s) of society expressing a genuine belief in their ability to desist (See: Maruna 1997; McNeill and Weaver 2010; Schlager 2018).

The liberative theory has gathered appeal in that it seeks to benefit both offenders and non-offenders alike. Maruna (1997) claims that acts of support and forgiveness can encourage ex-offenders to find solace in giving something back to society from which they have taken. The ability to pay back or make amends, referred to as 'generativity', is envisioned as a significant stage in a person's journey towards 'making good' (See: Maruna 2001; Halsey

and Harris 2011; Shapland and Bottoms 2011; Arditti 2012; Williams and Gantt 2013). The opportunity to earn redeemability through ‘giving back’ and enacting a positive contribution to society that has been (in)directly affected by the person’s previous actions, and/or serve as a role model to those potentially on the cusp of committing criminal behaviour, can have a profound impact on sustaining desistance (Maruna and King 2004, 2009; Weaver and Weaver 2013; Hylton 2014). This is because it can serve as a reminder to a desister, who may be contemplating re-offending, that their actions will not only affect their own life, but those that may replicate their behaviour (Weaver and McNeill 2007; Paternoster et al. 2015). However, acts of personal redemption through generativity by desisters should not be expected by society in exchange for them supplying desisters with positive capital in order to alter their social identity (Wright and Cesar 2013). This is because ex-prisoners should not be provided with support because they are in need of help, but rather because members of society want to help selflessly their fellow human beings (Loader 2010; Ward 2011).

Acquiring a transformative narrative alone will not be able to change behaviour in isolation (Ward 2011; Liem and Richardson 2014). Quintessentially, there needs to be context as well as conduct (See: Cobbina and Bender 2012; Lloyd and Serin 2012; Dufour, Brassard and Martel 2015; Seim 2016) that understands that, without a reciprocal willingness to support people to re-integrate and re-settle following their release from custody, what prevails is reduced rights and capacities for individuals to attain full citizenship (Uggen, Manza and Thompson 2006). These status deficits serve to undermine commitment to conformity and create new obstacles to desistance and the assumption of pro-social roles. Uggen, Manza and Thompson (2006) thus argue that, if an individual articulates a desire to adopt pro-social roles, and has the capacity and motivation to do so, this is redundant if society conspires to prevent them to establish new role commitments and solidify new identities. Therefore, although not a guarantee, if individuals were afforded the opportunities to develop a legitimate means of achievement in order to live good lives (See: Ward and Brown 2004; Ward and Maruna 2007; Deci and Ryan 2012), their criminogenic needs and risks would be transcended by a way of living in which crime increasingly has no place. It is, thus, difficult to underestimate the importance of the role society has in supporting (or undermining) new self-conceptions, and the reinforcement of pro-social identities within the desistance process (See: Maruna and Farrall 2004; Ward and Brown 2004; Ward and Maruna 2007; Deci and Ryan 2012). Therefore, the liberative theoretical perspective of desistance has provided the opportunity for additional exploration and further explanation of desistance that considers the

role of society within processes of desistance. It is an analysis which does not solely consider the motivations of society to have a role, but also whether society is aware of the role it is expected to play, and whether it has the capabilities to perform a role.

Desistance is...

The splintering into three different theoretical positions evidences how broad the conceptualisation of desistance thinking has become in explaining why, how, and when an individual is able to desist and cease from (re-)offending. In collaboration with and in isolation from one another, Sparkes and Day (2016) observe that fully robust explanations for desistance remain elusive. Each of the three have limitations owing to their tendency to concentrate efforts on one component at the expense of other contributing factors (Rocque 2015). To stimulate new thinking, Rocque (2015) stresses that the focus of attention should be aligned upon the role of society in processes of desistance, given that it is a common feature that weaves throughout each explanation. Whilst the explicit defining of society's role in processes of supporting the desister is never clearly articulated, there is an implied role for members of the community to impact an individual's post-custody experiences. If society's involvement in processes of desistance is to be positive, and people are to have the prospect of ceasing offending, then the wider public need to be engaged in desistance pathways, even though those most committed will sometimes stumble and lapse (Carlsson 2012; Healy 2013).

Proponents of all three perspectives recognise that, rather than follow a linear progression to a state of non-offending, people have a greater tendency of 'zigzagging' in and out of crime prior to their eventual cessation (See: Kazemian and Maruna 2009; Moore 2011; Shapland and Bottoms 2011; Carlsson 2012; King 2013). The empirical evidence demonstrates that, for an array of individuals, many of their initial attempts to desist are indeed unsuccessful (King 2013). Figures from the Ministry of Justice show that, between October 2014 and September 2015, of the approximately 430,000 adult offenders who were cautioned, received a non-custodial conviction, or were released from custody (Ministry of Justice 2017, 2018b), 102,000 or 23.8% of adult offenders from this cohort re-offended within the 12 months that followed (Ministry of Justice 2017, 2018b). Moreover, of the cohort that re-offended (23.8%), those with 11 or more previous convictions had a higher re-offending rate than those with no previous convictions: 43.8% compared to 7.4% (Ministry of Justice 2017, 2018b).

The empirical evidence produced by the Ministry of Justice (2017) highlighting annual release from and recalls to custody in England and Wales, is robust validation of the assertion that desistance is recognisably a process and not a singular event. Brame et al. (2018) concur, stating that high recidivism rates are an indication that ‘failures’ by individuals attempting to desist are a common experience and should be expected.

There is, therefore, a necessity for members of society to comprehend that a period of desistance is not going to occur abruptly for offenders, with relapses increasingly likely to occur for them in the beginning (Maruna 1997; Burnett 2004; Terry and Abrams 2017). This is because individuals make progress at different times for a variety of reasons (See: Raynor 2007; Terry and Abrams 2017). As Halsey (2017) notes, any would-be desister can become overwhelmed on their journey toward cessation from offending, in spite of having been on this journey many times before. Maruna, Immergreen and LeBel (2004) agree, stressing that a former prisoner can go potentially days, weeks, months and, in some instances, years before they commit another criminal offence following their release. However, the period in which they remain crime-free is no guarantee that their involvement in offending has terminated entirely (Kurlychek, Bushway and Brame 2012). Weaver and Weaver (2013) reassert that change is neither a straightforward nor an immediate process; it is merely compounded by barriers experienced during rehabilitation, including discriminatory labels such as ex-offender and/or ex-prisoner. Consequently, people should not be judged negatively on their inability to desist and cease from offending on their first attempt, but encouraged for their attempts to impose change (See: Maruna 1997; Burnett 2004; Halsey 2017; Terry and Abrams 2017). As King (2013) explains, a greater propensity by members of society to recognise attempts by an ex-prisoner to change positively, can serve to enhance the probability that they will successfully transition in the near future to a period of long-term desistance. Achieving desistance for a more prolonged period is only problematic when an individual experiences disadvantages and exclusion, and is not in possession of the capacity and motivation to desist (King 2013). As Duff (2001) states, it is important that, rather than declaring offenders as having continually broken the law and wronged moral and civic values, re-offending should be viewed as symptomatic of the unresolved conflict between the offender and the community they are re-integrated and re-settled into. Hylton (2013) agrees and claims that, to expect any change and rehabilitation to occur, an individual must only be conceived as an offender at the time of committing an offending act and not once the act has ended.

Maruna and Farrall (2004) argue that difficulty continues to arise when society focuses its collective attention and concern upon primary desistance rather than secondary desistance, or the more recent addition to this area of discourse, namely ‘tertiary desistance’ (McNeill 2016). Primary desistance is characterised as the evidential natural ebbs and flows of criminal activity – or any lull or crime-free gap, to be precise – which punctuates an individual’s criminal career (See: Maruna and Farrall 2004; McNeill 2006; Weaver and McNeill 2007; Davis, Bahr and Ward 2013). Secondary desistance is considered as the moment when an individual exhibits a period of non-offending. Irrespective of whether or not members of society label them as an offender, the individual personally comes to view themselves no longer as an offender and adopts the role or identity of a non-offender (See: Maruna and Farrall 2004; McNeill 2006; Weaver and McNeill 2007; King 2013). Tertiary desistance describes when a previously incarcerated individual not least identifies as a non-offender, but also feels settled and that they belong to the community they reside in (McNeill 2016). McNeill (2016) argues that, in overlooking secondary and tertiary desistance in favour of primary desistance, society is focusing its attention and concerns exclusively upon persistent offenders. In doing so, society becomes increasingly fearful and unwilling to play a role in processes of desistance due to overlooking those who do successfully desist and cease (McNeill 2016). Thus, McNeill (2016) claims that the potential to learn from those who are able to desist and cease from re-offending, and apply this to those who pose greater difficulty, can be lost somewhat intentionally.

The stages of desistance ultimately demonstrate that the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners is a social project as well as a personal undertaking (McNeill 2012). Korobov (2015) therefore believes it is important that society acknowledges that offenders are not moral strangers, and thus possess the potential motivation to alter positively their criminal behaviour. For, their aspirations are none too dissimilar with those of non-offenders; it is the means by which they choose to attain such goals that are inappropriate and distorted, compared to generally accepted legitimate means (Ward and Maruna 2007; Canton 2011). Desistance should therefore not just involve offenders making a conscious effort to change, but that the society into which they wish to re-enter also makes a conscious effort to welcome them (Barry 2013; Morenoff and Harding 2014). As McNeill (2016) notes, people do not desist, but rather desist into something, with desistance ‘success’ seen to be predicated upon the role and level of involvement that members of society choose to play in supporting individuals to reach a level of tertiary desistance. It is, therefore, necessary for members of

society to be required to do more to mediate relationships with those attempting to desist, and be clear of their roles and their limits to support their transition from offender to non-offender (Marshall 1994; Duff 2001; McNeill 2012).

The community can(not) play a role?

Theoretical perspectives of desistance have come to suggest that the communities throughout society, in which prisoners are to be re-integrated and re-settled following release from custody, have a role to play. Walgrave (2003) states that a community is a network of relationships, composed of individuals who have the potential to be (in-)directly involved in and/or affected by crime as a victim, an offender, or both. In this setting, individuals possess the choice to provide or withhold support to those who are impacted by crime, victims, offenders, or both. Warren (1977 cited in Bazemore and Schiff 2005:277) explains that a community can therefore be defined by what it does, as much as what it does not. In regard to the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners, Bazemore and Erbe (2004) state that this process is as much about the community as it is the offender. Walgrave (2003) agrees, and believes that, at minimum, offenders and community members must share a common interest in associating and settling together. Bazemore and Schiff (2005) claim that this common interest should expectedly be that the community seeks to promote the civic engagement, collective efficacy, and accessibility to capital for all its members, irrespective of their past criminal behaviour. However, there is a considerable disconnect between what communities represent in reality, with what they are expected to be (Crawford 1997). For, in spite of communities being considered as the entities with the greatest influence upon an offender's capacity to desist, they possess the support that offenders require in their efforts to 'go straight' (See: Shaw and McKay, 1942 cited in Bazemore and Schiff 2005:275; Kornhauser, 1978 cited in Bazemore and Schiff 2005:275; Braithwaite 1989; Pranis 1997; Johnstone 2001; Morenoff, Sampson and Raudenbush 2001; Brooks 2012). The communities that formerly incarcerated individuals re-enter are not always the homogeneous, cohesive, and egalitarian environments that they and rehabilitative commentators would like them to be (See: Van Ness and Strong 1997; Crawford and Newburn 2003).

Communities are not an absolute and, as such, there does not exist a model on the construction and maintenance of a 'universal' community (Nancy 2000; Esposito 2010; Pavlich 2017). In fact, the agreed-upon criteria for a person's membership in a community is

susceptible to change at any time (Pranis 2001; Bazemore and Schiff 2005). Therefore, communities should be approached with caution, as it is not always clear what their motives and exigencies might be (Pavlich 2017). This is because a community is not a singular entity; it is re-constructed through the changing relations between its members with each other (Esposito 2010; Pavlich 2017), with new collective meanings, objectives, motivations, and capabilities created through the addition of and/or in the absence of community members (Esposito 2010; Pavlich 2017). This poses a considerable problem for ex-prisoners seeking to re-integrate and re-settle. For, as the community is not a fixed entity, its members that offenders once assimilated with could have altered considerably to what they recall prior to their imprisonment (Nancy 2000; Pavlich 2017), most notably their motivations and capacities to engage in processes of desistance. For, as Christie (1982 cited in Johnstone 2001:119-120) highlights, communities are not required to have a responsibility to perform what can be regarded as this civic duty. Despite being principal stakeholders, they are not accountable if they decide to withhold support (Bazemore and Schiff 2005). Johnstone (2001) asserts that the majority of individuals simply do not have the time in modern societies to support offenders. Yet, McCold (1996) argues that people abstain from playing a role, given that there has been a clear failure to address what role people should play, and a failure to encourage and foster participation by not highlighting the importance they have upon reducing recidivism.

Communities possess resources and opportunities for individuals to desist, and their members are aware of their roles and the importance of their involvement. Garland (1990) claims that people may not feel comfortable in actively supporting ex-prisoners to desist through fear of repercussions from fellow community members who oppose such actions. For, there are routine structural inequalities fostered by multiple hierarchal formations that divide the members of a community and, subsequently, nurture (re-)offending (See: Crawford 1999; Crawford and Newburn 2003). Crawford and Newburn (2003) stress that, due to these structural inequalities, the 'moral voice of a community' can actually be parochial and unrepresentative of all the interests and values held by members of a community. Subsequently, there can exist an inverse relationship between the active engagement of communities in processes of desistance and the significance they possess in curtailing recidivism (Rosenbaum 1988; Crawford and Newburn 2003). Johnstone (2001) argues that increasing opportunities for lay participation in processes of desistance and criminal justice does not assure that people will be motivated to play a role, nor whether their involvement

will be positive. Moreover, if an individual's motivations to become involved are to seek vengeance against ex-prisoners, then this serves to impose upon their capacity to reform, re-integrate, and re-integrate ex-prisoners (Brooks 2012).

Even though all individuals have their own conception of what constitutes a good society, evidence has been able to demonstrate that the one constant all conceptions share is that the well-being of members in any given society is diminished by inequality (See: Wilkinson and Pickett 2009; Dorling 2010; Canton 2017). Canton (2017) argues that inequality assures a reduction in empathy to be shared amongst members of a community. Subsequently, individuals become increasingly insular and likely to promote the fact that people should be accountable for their own circumstances and choices they enact, namely self-efficacy (Maruna and LeBel 2010; Canton 2017). Disaffected, deprived, and demoralised communities thus heighten the likelihood for crime to occur, and increase the propensity for re-offending (Canton 2017). A weak collective efficacy or social cohesion, coupled with an unwillingness to promote the common good, can manifest itself in people being reluctant to play a role in processes of desistance, and a preference to condone the punishment and exclusion of those unable to refrain from offending (See: Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997; Bazemore and Erbe 2004; Canton 2017). Canton (2017) states that, too often, this occurs with communities denying ex-prisoners the opportunities to go straight through a process of stigmatisation, in part due to a community's excessive hostility and suspicion towards an ex-prisoner's potential to re-offend. However, this preoccupation with a retributivist focus on culpability can inhibit the opportunities for a community to learn how best to draw upon the resources they have to offer, in order to prevent and respond to crimes when they occur (Stuart 1996; Zellerer and Cannon 2002; Canton 2017). Consequentially, there exist no guarantees that members of a community can ever become motivated to play a role in processes of desistance (Canton 2017). Sampson (2004) reaffirms that this is detrimental towards the potential of reducing crime, particularly when all members of a community are stakeholders in processes of desistance, and have a duty to accept the fact that they have responsibilities for the resolution of re-offending (McCold 1996). As Braithwaite and Roche (2001) note, there can never be enough people actively involved in re-integration and re-settlement. Yet, their involvement in processes of desistance can only exist if a sense of community already exists; although, there are numerous locales throughout society where communities have eroded over time or have never existed (Goodey 2005). Former prisoners and the community must have a symbiotic relationship for successful re-entry to occur

(Schlager 2018). However, any emphasis upon reaching a mutual understanding on how best to approach and reduce crime, repair harm, reconcile relationships, and transform offenders, cannot begin until members of society are ready, willing, and able to do so (Bazemore and Schiff 2005; Schiff 2007; Brooks 2012).

Conclusion

This chapter has examined and critically discussed the ontogenic, sociogenic, and liberative theoretical perspective of desistance. The discussion explored how the three perspectives articulate understandings for how, when, and why an individual ceases from (re-)offending. Whilst key differences do exist between these explanations, all are united in positing a role for the wider community, some perspectives making this role more explicit than others do. The role performed by the community is often as an audience that recently incarcerated individuals encounter. Yet, it is an audience that can help ex-prisoners build their esteem, and where positive associations can help forge the social capital that helps individuals move away from criminal activity. Equally as powerful is the capacity for communities to negatively reject ex-prisoners, stigmatise their offender status, and restrict the scope for individuals to develop more pro-social identities. Highlighting the fragility of communities further demonstrates how strengthening their involvement in processes of desistance is not clear-cut, for there is a considerable disconnect between what communities represent in reality, with how they are expected to perform (Crawford 1997). As a result, disaffected, deprived, and demoralised communities exist, unable at present to support the well-being and quality of life of ex-offender's (Canton 2017).

However, as the empirical and intellectual labour invested in studying patterns of desistance has, understandably, focused on ex-offenders themselves, there has been an under-theorisation of the role of the public in this process. As the literature review has illustrated, there is acknowledgment of the role that the public need to play in desistance processes in shaping the social contexts within which ex-prisoners (re-)immerse themselves post-custody, but little evidence is available around whether members of society are motivated and capable of playing a role. At times, some aspects of the 'community' are identified as being helpful to offenders (Plesničar 2015; Diamond, Morris and Piquero 2017), whilst in other areas of the literature the wholly negative attitudes of the community towards offenders are seen as threatening (Maruna and King 2009). However, what is less understood are the pervasive

ambient attitudes towards ex-offenders that exist more generally. Having frequently identified a role for wider society in the ‘successful’ re-integration and re-settlement of recently incarcerated individuals in processes of desistance, this shortcoming in the literature compromises the robustness of articulations of reducing re-offending. The intent of this study is to help fill the vacuum that has emerged and provide a richer insight into the capacity of ‘the public’ to deliver on the role – and there is a crucial one – articulated for them in desistance thinking.

Chapter 3 – Understanding what desistance-orientated policies regard as the role of communities in the desistance process of ex-prisoners

Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to consider how the key messages from the literature on desistance, outlined in the previous chapter, have informed (or not, as the case may be) contemporary criminal justice policies particularly in relation to the role of the community in the desistance process. The chapter begins by highlighting how different perspectives regarding how best to enhance the motivations and capacities of individuals within communities can play out in terms of supporting former prisoners to re-integrate and re-settle following their release. The focus will then shift to examining how contemporary reforms to the delivery of criminal justice services have attempted to engage voluntary organisations, and encourage community involvement as a mechanism of devolving State responsibility for the delivery of rehabilitative services. Using the adoption of restorative justice approaches, the chapter will highlight the gaps in knowledge in terms of how best to successfully encourage and maintain community participation in the delivery of frontline services in practice to support attempts by former prisoners to desist and cease re-offending. Restorative justice has been promoted as a means of encouraging and facilitating greater communal involvement, but this is predicated on community members already feeling responsabilised, motivated, and capable of playing a role in processes of desistance. The chapter concludes by evidencing the lived experiences of VCS involvement in relation to its role in delivering services in what has now become an increasingly competitive, hostile, politicised, and unpredictable arena following the transformative reforms to rehabilitation.

How to motivate and facilitate the community's role in desistance... is there a correct way?

Despite their differences, the commonly held thread amongst the three theoretical explanations of desistance, as discussed in the previous chapter, is that communities have a significant role to play in supporting former prisoners in their attempts to cease from re-offending (See: King 2013; Korobov 2015; Rocque 2015; Canton 2017; Terry and Abrams 2017; Schlager 2018). Nhan, Bowen and Polzer (2017) and Polaschek, Yesberg and Chauhan (2018), however, contend that society's collective understanding on how it can serve to

promote the ‘successful’ re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners remains less understood than the concepts themselves. Fox (2016) notes that, if the rehabilitative outcome of an ex-prisoner is to be a sustained period of tertiary desistance, an openness is required by communities (victims of crime included) to contemplate what they could ‘do’ individually and collectively to support this process. Berri and Yuval (2013) agree, but assert that society should possess an innate desire to become involved in the advancement of ex-prisoners’ rehabilitative outcomes, readily seeking out means in which it can be, rather than could be, offering its services to support the restoration of ex-prisoners’ identities (Berri and Yuval 2013). The authors argue that communities should not wait for instruction on when or how to support the rehabilitation of ex-prisoners, but acknowledge and prepare for their re-entry. However, as Fox (2016) accepts, to expect all members of society to be ready, willing, and able to play a role is highly utopian, and does little to advance discourse on how ‘best’ to strengthen their motivation and capacity. Alternatively, Fox (2016) suggests that the limited theoretical understanding of the role individuals can play, and whether they are motivated and capable of performing this role, is principally at fault due to the choice made by some individuals to refrain from playing a positive role in processes of desistance and, in turn, impeding the advancement of rehabilitative outcomes.

Given, then, that the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners is at the most fundamental level a community issue (See: McCold 1996; Travis, Solomon and Waul 2001; Byrne, Taxman and Young 2002; Bazemore and Erbe 2004; Bain and Parkinson 2010; Brooks 2012), developing an understanding of moral sentiment – how an individual’s feelings and emotions influence their actions – is imperative, as communities are themselves (in)directly impacted and impactful in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners (Alvarez and Brehm 1995; Feldman 2003; Garland, Wodahl and Schuhmann 2013). Listening to the voices of volunteers throughout the VCS, practitioners from the public and private sectors, and the communities to which ex-prisoners will (re-)enter, can therefore shed light on the roles that can be played, and gauge motivations and capabilities for and against involvement in processes of desistance (Travis, Solomon and Waul 2001; Byrne, Taxman and Young 2002; Wlezien 2004; Nicholson-Crotty, Peterson and Ramirez 2009; Garland, Wodahl and Schuhmann 2013; McCulloch 2015). As Currie (2013) notes, it is through reflecting upon how and why some individuals feel motivated, capable, and clear of their role in processes of desistance, which can serve to help to understand how to positively influence those who feel less ready, willing, and able to become actively involved. For, an individual’s negativity

towards offenders may be sustained, too, by their lack of awareness of what is currently being achieved ‘successfully’ with current resources to promote desistance, and what more could potentially be attainable with their involvement (Burke and Collett 2010; McNeill et al. 2012). Currie (2013) and Nhan, Bowen and Polzer (2017) claim that, if negatively held attitudes towards offenders are unchallenged, this contributes towards social disintegration. This, Currie (2013) states, increases the likelihood for (re-)offending to occur, and perpetuates societal fears, which motivate political rhetoric and policies to direct funds away from advancing rehabilitative outcomes.

Therefore, due to a growing academic consensus that the difference between an ex-prisoner’s desistance and reconviction is ensuring post-release support is accessible and encouraged (See: Bain and Parkinson 2010; Veysey, Ostermann and Lanterman 2014; Garland and Hass 2015; Mears and Cochran 2015; Polaschek, Yesberg and Chauhan 2018), it is becoming ever necessary that communities are informed that the ‘successful’ desistance of ex-prisoners will stimulate the collective good of society (Cullen, Fisher and Applegate 2000; Cullen and Moon 2002; Garland, Wodahl and Schuhmann 2013; Corcoran and Grotz 2016). As Tyler (1990) and McCulloch (2015) note, it cannot be taken for granted that communities are clear in terms of the role(s) they can play in the processes of desistance, nor that they are motivated and able to engage and contribute towards the desistance of ex-prisoners. McCulloch (2015), Nhan, Bowen and Polzer (2017), and Polaschek, Yesberg and Chauhan (2018) argue that the consequences of this lack of understanding of the significance of the processes of desistance have resulted in offenders being regarded as the objects upon which justice is done, and, as such, it is they who are expected to comply and conform without the contribution of society. However, as Crook and Wood (2014) note, this is unfair, as offenders act as both products – namely, reflections of their supervision and management, and consumers engaging with available programmes, services, and support – of the criminal justice system. Yet, with society routinely positioned as the notional consumer, the State has, at times, exploited an antagonistic dichotomisation between law-abiding members of society and (ex-)offenders (Crook and Wood 2014). Maruna, Immarigeon and LeBel (2004), McNeill (2004), and Hedderman (2007) agree with Fox (2016) in that the gaps in theoretical understanding of the role, motivations, and capacity of society in processes of desistance have impeded the advancement of rehabilitative outcomes. However, they believe the overarching problem lies in the very formation of policy, and the challenging interplay between aiming to appease the needs and wants of an ill-informed, yet law-abiding, majority of society, and (although

routinely lesser so) those of (ex-)offenders (Maruna, Immarigeon and LeBel 2004; McNeill 2004; Hedderman 2007). Snacken (2016) explains that this tension with striking a balance between internal legitimacy (in terms of the expectation on former prisoners to ‘make good’) and external legitimacy (the communal responsibility to support ex-prisoners achieve change) will continue as long as society remains unclear of what is to be gained from its involvement.

In addition, many of the difficulties in creating policies that aim to promote the interests of (ex-)offenders stem, although not exclusively, from how the criminal justice system is underpinned by the belief that the actions of individuals are rational and free-willed (See: Kendall 2004; Lewis 2005; Newman and Marongiu 2009). In favouring the philosophical stance of indeterminism and the encompassing classical school of thought, a risk-based approach to crime has prevailed (Maruna and LeBel 2002; Lewis 2005; Andrews, Bonta and Wormith 2011). Kendall (2004) argues that the rhetoric of successive governments over the past two decades has had welfarist undertones, aimed at upholding the existence of an inclusive society featuring equality of opportunity for all. Yet, in reality, this is unattainable as not all individuals throughout society have equality of opportunity, nor do they feel they are an inclusive member of society (See: Rawls 1971; Kendall 2004; Ferreira and Peragine 2015). There routinely exist members of society who are unable to participate in economic, social, cultural, and/or political arenas (Levitas et al. 2007). Thus, members of society cannot be expected to act rationally when not all individuals possess the capacity to lead the kind of life they so ‘choose’ (Fleurbaey 1995; Sen 1999; Wolff 2008; Dean 2010; Dwyer 2013). However, those members of society unable to ‘succeed’ socially and/or economically are viewed as responsible for their own inequality due to the poor decisions they have rationally made (Kendall 2004; Spandler 2007).

It is concerning that, in the pursuit of advancing rehabilitative outcomes, blameworthiness is solely attributed to offenders for their actions (Canton 2017). Canton (2017) stresses that a preoccupation with blameworthiness has only served to discourage communities from learning from their role in the indirect facilitation of crime. Indeed, there is the growing argument that suggests offending does not take place in a social vacuum, and is liable to occur when an individual’s basic human needs are not being fulfilled (See: Maslow 1954; Rawls 1971; Rotman 1986; Crow 2001; Platt 2002; Kendall 2004; Lewis 2005; Spandler 2007). The same argument is applicable to re-offending committed by ex-prisoners (Travis, Western and Redburn 2014; Polaschek, Yesberg and Chauhan 2018). Polaschek, Yesberg and Chauhan (2018) assert that the influential impact of sociological factors upon the autonomy

of ex-prisoners is no better illustrated than when they are released into a deprived and fractured neighbourhood. According to Polaschek, Yesberg and Chauhan (2018), these individuals do not return to custody simply because they lack the motivation to ‘go straight’, but because they do not have the basic capabilities and support from society to desist (See: Burnett 2010; Visser and Travis 2011). As such, in seeking to protect and preserve their communities, members of society continue to validate the (re-)inclusion of offenders based upon their worth and place against those who are already part of the fold (Bain and Parkinson 2010; Fox 2016). Therefore, members of deprived communities are less inclined to include and share access to the limited opportunities already available, with those who have the added label of ex-prisoner (See: Agnew 1999; Bain and Parkinson 2010; Wright and Cesar 2013; Fox 2016). However, as Bain and Parkinson (2010) stress, the ‘success’ of an ex-prisoner’s re-integration and re-settlement is proportionate to the level of their social inclusion. Thus, when seeking to advance the rehabilitative outcomes of ex-prisoners, it is necessary to note that interventions are not just technical exercises, but also a “human and moral enterprise” (Burke and Collett 2010:244).

Early policy responses

The deep-seated social problems facing former prisoners were highlighted during the New Labour administration (Williams 2001; Byrne 2005; Walker 2013). The creation of the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) in 1997 was an attempt to identify and address the factors that can have an impact on the likelihood of an ex-prisoner re-offending (Hedderman 2007). The SEU’s report ‘Reducing Re-offending by Ex-prisoners’ in 2002 listed a total of nine ‘pathways’ (later refined to seven) that contributed to re-offending (See: Social Exclusion Unit 2002). Furthermore, the report claimed that some institutional structures and statutory agencies were, at the time, unfit to support and/or manage an individual in addressing and alleviating these inter-related problems (Social Exclusion Unit 2002). The solution to addressing these seven pathways in and out of offending, as identified by the ‘Reducing Re-offending National Action Plan 2004’, was through increasing the involvement of VCS organisations to work in partnership with statutory agencies and the public in the planning and delivering of services (Home Office 2004). However, the push to involve VCS organisations and members of society in processes of criminal justice had already begun prior to the recommendations made in the ‘Reducing Re-offending National Action Plan 2004’,

with the establishment of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (CDRPs) (Crime and Disorder Act 1998; Home Office 2004). Emanating from the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, CDRPs have empowered local authorities with a responsibility to take action to prevent and reduce crime (Crime and Disorder Act 1998), with localised CDRPs seeking to prevent and reduce crime by focusing on how best to tackle problems that impoverish communities (Crime and Disorder Act 1998; National Audit Office 2004). This was to be achieved by allowing community members to communicate and work in partnership with statutory agencies, public sector services, and VCS organisations (Crime and Disorder Act 1998; National Audit Office 2004). Harnessing an array of resources and expertise was seen as the most effective means of innovatively reducing the occurrence of crime (Crime and Disorder Act 1998; National Audit Office 2004). This approach validates the role of the community as an essential participant in the desistance process of ex-prisoners (Levitas 2012; Walker 2013; Fox 2016). However, it is important to note that, for CDRPs to be effective, they must remain dependent on the motivations and capacities of community members to engage and play a role – which is, of course, not guaranteed (Levitas 2012; Walker 2013; Fox 2016).

The 'Rehabilitation Revolution' begins

Mobilising community members is an ongoing challenge for policymakers to address, despite the State's increases in the opportunities for society to become involved (See: Bazemore and Schiff 2005; Schiff 2007; Brooks 2012). This has particularly been evident in the State's most recent efforts to revolutionise rehabilitation, both in its initial attempts to break the cycle of re-offending, and its subsequent efforts for a wholesale transformation of rehabilitation (See: Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2013a, b). However, the roots of this policy in terms of providing opportunities for the VCS to become more involved, especially at the forefront of practice, can be found in the notion of 'The Big Society'. The notion of 'The Big Society' was promoted by the incoming coalition government as a means of modernising commissioning (House of Commons 2011; Defty 2014). It sought to promote volunteerism, as well as localism, devolution, and governmental transparency (House of Commons 2011; Gelsthorpe and Dominey 2016). As Gelsthorpe and Dominey (2016) note, this was attempted by instilling an increased sense of local ownership and responsibility amongst members of society to their local neighbourhoods, in the hope that more targeted and successful solutions to local needs could be found. Norman (2010) states that 'The Big Society' was an

acknowledgement by the government that society possesses an important and more significant role than the State in being able to address and tackle entrenched social problems, namely crime and anti-social behaviour. The government was, thus, keen to stress that crime is an indication of something inherently wrong in a community, which creates an obligation for its members to work collectively to make things ‘right’ (Zehr 1990; Canton 2011).

The vision of ‘The Big Society’ in enabling communities to become involved and take social action to discover ways of addressing their own needs (MacDonald 2011) has not been free of criticism. A prominent argument amongst its opponents has been that the push to empower communities and reform the delivery of public and criminal services is merely a means of ‘dressing up’ austerity (See: Watt 2010; Morgan 2012). Hayton (2012) asserts that there has existed a naïve belief amongst the State since this time that voluntary organisations and communities would welcome opportunities to become involved in the frontline of service delivery. Both Atkinson (2012) and Avis (2016) contest that empowering individuals to take social responsibility for themselves and their communities neither guarantees that they will do so, nor does it allow for all members of society to have their voice heard on what aspects of their community need addressing and how best to address these concerns (Atkinson 2012; Avis 2016). Fraser (1999) agrees, stating that those individuals who continue to struggle for representation in the local public domain following ‘The Big Society’ rollout have been those who were already previously susceptible to marginalisation and requiring support, notably (ex-)offenders. As Avis (2016), Malloch and Munro (2016), as well as Corry and Stoker (2017) stress, in championing localism and devolving powers and responsibility to communities, ‘The Big Society’ did not foresee that this could enable some communities to prioritise the needs of some of its members above others.

Despite the criticism associated with the introduction of ‘The Big Society’ agenda, decentralisation and enhancing VCS involvement in service delivery have remained key components of the government’s plans. For, as outlined in the ‘Breaking the Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders’ green paper, a range of radical reforms building upon the principles of ‘The Big Society’ began to be implemented to punish offenders, protect the public, and reduce re-offending (Ministry of Justice 2010a). For instance, a new joined-up approach to supporting those ex-prisoners identified as being at greatest risk of re-offending was adopted into practice (Ministry of Justice 2010a). Taking the form of IOM teams, these are composed of statutory agencies including the police, probation, and prison services, as well as representatives of local authorities and VCS organisations

(Ministry of Justice 2010a, b). Working in partnership to manage the cohort of high-risk offenders under their supervision, IOMs are a practical attempt to take advantage and thereby benefit from the ability to utilise the skills, knowledge, experiences, and resources of all key stakeholders (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b). Moreover, the responsibility for the cross-agency response that IOMs provide falls entirely upon the IOM (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015). There is no governmental template for IOM teams to abide by in the course of their structure and procedures (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015). IOMs are afforded considerable leniency in regard to the frequency and representation of agencies involved in their teams, as well as how they operate collectively in practice (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015). In theory, this allows IOMs to be more representative of, and responsible to, the local communities in which they operate (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015), thus utilising localised VCS organisations that supposedly have the experience and knowledge of the local environment and this cohort of offenders (Etherington 2006; Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). However, Annison, Bradford and Grant (2015) and Burke, Millings and Robinson (2017) contend that the State, in encouraging multi-agency working, did not fully appreciate the challenges that would occur when different criminal justice organisations and their occupational cultures come together.

Another way in which the principles of decentralisation, volunteerism, and government transparency have served to reform service delivery was through the introduction of Police Crime Commissioners (PCC) (Ministry of Justice 2010a). The Green paper, in conjunction with the Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011, has led to the replacement of police authorities with directly elected PCCs (Ministry of Justice 2010a; Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011). However, the Green paper was keen to stress how the police service is at the frontline of maintaining public safety and reducing crime (Ministry of Justice 2010a). In order to ensure the police service continues to prioritise the concerns of local residents, and for communities to hold them directly accountable (Ministry of Justice 2010a), PCCs assumed responsibility for the totality of policing (Cabinet Office 2015; Association of Police and Crime Commissioners 2018). As such, they have been tasked with distributing annual funds to the police services encompassing their area (Association of Police and Crime Commissioners 2018). Furthermore, with an increased focus upon localism, it was hoped from the outset that PCCs would also be able to improve relationships between communities and the police service, through efforts to build confidence and restore trust (Association of

Police and Crime Commissioners 2018). Indeed, PCCs are viewed by the State as acting as ‘champions’ to victims in their locale, routinely establishing and facilitating services to help those susceptible to victimisation (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015). PCCs also, through co-commissioning, now work in partnerships with IOMs, their local Community Safety Partnerships (CPS), and the VCS, in the hope of developing local approaches to prevent and reduce crime (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Cabinet Office 2015). Yet, as argued by Fox, Bannister and Miszczak (2016), there remains limited evidence to suggest that PCCs have led to greater innovative and efficient means of reducing crime, or a strengthening of the relationship and confidence that the public has in policing. Moreover, those elected as PCCs are rarely representative of the area’s demographics in which they work and serve (Mawby and Smith 2013). With lay participants from communities seldom represented as PCCs, the role of PCCs has and remains typically occupied by individuals with experience of the criminal justice system (See: Loveday 2015, 2018; Mawby and Smith 2017). Moreover, Mawby and Smith (2017) argue that the role of PCCs has become politicised. From this perspective, PCCs are increasingly representative of and distinguished by their political party allegiances, and are in reality a tool to work their party’s political agenda (Mawby and Smith 2017).

The promotion of restorative justice was another strand within the Green paper, to encourage individuals (either as victims or members of a community) to become engaged in addressing conflicts within their neighbourhoods (Ministry of Justice 2010a). The Green paper outlined the government’s commitment to developing practices of restorative justice within the criminal justice system for the first time with adult offenders (Ministry of Justice 2010a). In practice, implementing a restorative approach involves addressing a number of concerns in addition to establishing whether communities are motivated and capable of becoming involved in this alternative form of transformative justice. It is with these concerns that the focus of this chapter now turns.

Restorative Justice – encouraging communities to play a role in processes of desistance?

Restorative justice is a practice of conflict resolution between victims, offenders, and the wider community (See: Marshall 1999; Braithwaite 2000, 2012; Shapland, Robinson and Sorsby 2011; Brooks 2012; Zehr 2015; Canton 2017). It is an attempt, through informal communication, to mutually reach a position as close to that held prior to the conflict arising

(Roche 2003; Williams 2005; McCold 2008; Shapland, Robinson and Sorsby 2011; Braithwaite 2012; Brooks 2012; Zehr 2015). In addition to resolving the aftermath of the conflict or offence committed, parties involved in restorative justice practices consider how the implications of any resolution/outcome will serve to impact on their individual and collective future well-being (See: Zehr 1990; Wright 1991; Van Ness and Strong 1997; Braithwaite and Strang 2001; Daly 2003; Dignan 2005; Walgrave 2007; Zernova and Wright 2007; Shapland, Robinson and Sorsby 2011; Braithwaite 2012; Brooks 2012). Restorative justice typically takes one of three forms, either as victim-offender mediation, family group conferences, or sentencing circles (See: Bazemore and Umbreit 2001; Ashworth 2002; Bazemore and Erbe 2004; Dignan 2005; Shapland et al. 2006; Robinson and Shapland 2008; Rossner 2013).

It has been claimed (Christie 1977; Garland 1990; Canton 2017) that restorative justice provides an alternative to the formal mechanisms of criminal justice. These authors argue that, unlike restorative justice, these formal mechanisms serve to take power, influence, discourse, and overall participation away from the offender(s), victim(s), and communities (in)directly involved in and affected by crime. Proponents of restorative justice argue that this fails to take into account the unique perspectives of victims and communities in terms of their expectations, and associated meanings, on crime (Braithwaite 2002; Zehr 2015; Canton 2017). The voices of victims and communities can at present be expressed and heard in a courtroom setting via individuals acting as witnesses or delivering victim impact statements (See: Dignan 2005; Brooks 2012; Canton 2017). However, as Brooks (2012) notes, restorative justice advocates stress that the formal courtroom is not the most appropriate setting in which individuals can collectively resolve a conflict that has transpired. Proponents of restorative justice stress that the adversarial criminal justice system is predicated on establishing winners and losers, with no broad social purpose (Brooks 2012; Zehr 2015). Restorative justice practices, on the other hand, seek to benefit the futures of all stakeholders (in)directly involved in and impacted by a crime (Cullen, Sundt and Wozniak 2001; Brooks 2012).

Restorative justice has accrued support from those critical of traditional adversarial and retributivist criminal justice processes in responding to and preventing crime (Garland 2001; Crawford and Newburn 2003). However, whilst restorative justice offers an alternative forward-looking form of 'transformative justice' (See: Rossner 2011), O'Mahony and Doak (2017) contend that restorative justice has come to be a victim of its own success. As a result,

the development of restorative praxis has transpired so exponentially that accompanying theoretical inquiry has been unable to keep pace (O'Mahony and Doak 2017). Consequently, there remains a conceptual barrier and dearth in quality (See: Shapland et al. 2006; O'Mahony and Doak 2017). There exists little collective agreement and clarity regarding how restorative justice in practice should reach a resolution, whose values should take priority, and what should happen if there is a failure to reach an agreement and/or an offender does not comply with the agreed-upon resolution/outcome (Duff 2001; Strang 2002; Shapland, Robinson and Sorsby 2011). Daly (2016) states that addressing conceptual clarity is essential to ensure a realistic expectation of what can and what cannot be achieved through acts of restorative justice. O'Mahony and Doak (2017) concur with these views, stressing that, for restorative justice to be utilised successfully as a criminal justice mechanism, it is vitally important to establish such basic criteria such as the role that stakeholders are to play, as well as an appreciation of the limitations with restorative approaches and how to be prepared to navigate these within practice.

For Daly (2003, 2016), the gap between that which is claimed to transpire in theory and what is being performed in practice under the heading restorative justice is widening. In terms of the intended and actual effects of restorative justice, Shapland, Robinson and Sorsby (2011) assert that there are considerable dangers with restorative justice due to the existing gaps between theory and practice. For, as Braithwaite (2000) and Canton (2017) note, acts of restorative justice are predicated on informality, as the resources required and/or the wishes of the parties involved to 'make good' are not universal. Yet, to O'Mahony and Doak (2017), restorative justice is hindered to a significant extent by its very premise to not instruct victims, offenders, and communities on what is to be restored and how, but instead requiring them to embrace innovation to ascertain what matters to them (See: Braithwaite 1999; Crawford and Newburn 2003). Crawford (2002), Roche (2003), and Cook (2006) concur, stressing that informal justice has the potential to discriminate, and can lead to severe outcomes. It has been argued that, with minimal instruction, there are no means of seeking to prevent restorative justice practices becoming a method for victims and communities to manipulate in order to 'get tough' on offenders (Levrant et al. 1999; Roach 2000; Ashworth 2002). Shapland, Robinson and Sorsby (2011) agree, arguing that any act of restorative justice is not absolved from selfish motives, anger, revenge, and power imbalances. Daly (2000), on the other hand, notes that restorative justice can, and often does, lead to outcomes

which are unpleasant for the offender. Duff (1992) stresses that acts of restorative justice are, therefore, not to be considered alternatives to punishment, but rather alternative punishments.

Restorative justice approaches propose that victims, offenders, and the wider community are all key stakeholders with equal weighting (See: Roche 2003; Williams 2005; McCold 2008; Brooks 2012; Zehr 2015). However, Zehr and Mika (2003) assert that the needs, values, and desired outcomes of victims are required to act as a starting point in processes of restorative justice. They contend that it is the obligation of the offender(s), and not the victim(s) or wider community, to be empathetic, sincere and, above all, 'make things right'. Braithwaite (2012) agrees, arguing that it is the offender(s) alone who must repent and change their immoral behaviour. However, Cunneen and Goldson (2015) side with Duff (1992), Shapland, Robinson and Sorsby (2011) and Daly (2000), claiming that the involvement of victims and communities in restorative justice ultimately acts as a method of seeking harm towards an offender. Crawford and Newburn (2003) warn that, if the motivations of victims and community members to become involved in restorative justice processes are neither legitimate nor based upon mutuality, then the feasibility of restorative justice is severely compromised. For, as Wright (1999, 2013) and Canton (2017) contest, rather than reducing recidivism, the practice of restorative justice can encourage defiance and resentment to grow through its capacity to allow victims and communities to enforce shame upon the offender. Similarly, if victims and communities are unwilling to accept an offender's spoken or written apology, nor any offer of material restitution for the harm and suffering they have endured due to an offence, an offender is more likely to re-offend (See: Duff 2001; McCullough 2008; Shapland, Robinson and Sorsby 2011; Canton 2017). Offenders will be less likely to positively engage and change their behaviour if they feel alienated and marginalised by a hostile community (Crawford and Newburn 2003).

Canton (2017) points to evidence highlighting the less than promising capability of restorative justice practice to evoke enduring change in offenders. However, proponents of restorative justice would contest that reducing re-offending is not the ambition of, nor a key remit/criterion to measure, the worth or effectiveness of restorative justice (See: Christie 1977; Levrant et al. 1999; Braithwaite 2002; Goodey 2005; Robinson and Shapland 2008; Canton 2017). Ultimately, Levrant et al. (1999) and Goodey (2005) argue that, to expect victims and communities not to envision a future outcome/long-term goal to be reduced recidivism, is naïve. Moreover, as restorative justice does not specify how the offender will change/be improved as a consequence of being involved in practices, then only moderate

results at best can be achieved through this form of justice (Andrews and Bonta 2010; Cullen 2012). Zehr (2015) claims that any prospective reductions to re-offending through restorative justice are to be welcomed, yet any impact upon recidivism is to be considered a by-product of the practice. Canton (2017) argues that any cessation in an individual's offending cannot be truly attributed to participation in restorative justice practice. This is because those offenders who participate in restorative justice are 'untypical' in that, to participate, they accept they have done wrong and/or admitted to committing an offence(s) (Canton 2017). As such, they have already begun a process of 'making good' and are embarked upon a journey of desistance (See: Robinson and Shapland 2008; Maruna and LeBel 2010; McNeill 2012; Wright 2013; Canton 2017). Other authors concur, stating that if any viable success is to be attained through restorative justice, an admission of guilt and responsibility by the offender for the crime, harm, and suffering they have caused is already required (Braithwaite 2012; Brooks 2012).

However, those critical of restorative justice practices argue that, irrespective of an offender's admission of guilt and motivation to continue 'making good', a restorative meeting or conference of a few hours between victim(s), community, and offender(s) cannot serve as a panacea for all ills (See: Shapland, Robinson and Sorsby 2011; Rossner 2013; O'Mahony and Doak 2017). Bottoms (2003) states that addressing the deep-seated reasons why an individual offends, building upon their motivation to change, and facilitating necessary change through victim and communal support, cannot be achieved during a single act of restorative justice. Likewise, Crawford and Newburn (2003) claim that the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners is compromised by restorative justice initiatives that limit the involvement of 'outside' statutory agencies, which possess the resources to remedy the extensive structural problems experienced by these individuals and cannot easily be remedied by a 'one-off' meeting. Daly (2003) asserts that restorative justice is thus not an applicable response to all harmful behaviours, conflicts, or offences, and is more of an ideal than a reality. Parliament has been persistently clear (See: Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014) that the most appropriate application of restorative interventions is with low-risk offenders. However, proponents of restorative justice such as Strang (2002) argue that restorative justice should and can be utilised as a mainstream response to those offenders considered high risk. O'Mahony and Doak (2017), on the other hand, state that this only serves to demonstrate the limited understanding and appreciation of the limitations of restorative justice. Shapland and Hall (2007) highlight how making amends for the significant physical and/or psychological harms

caused by a violent and/or sexual offence poses considerable difficulty. This is especially the case if the victim is reluctant to attend due to an unwillingness to forgive, fears of the prospective power imbalance during the meeting or conference, or the potential for further violence (Hoyle and Rosenblatt 2016). In the case of high-risk offenders, attaining resolution to the serious offences they commit requires resources that are limited amongst local communities (See: McAlinden 2008; O'Mahony and Doak 2017).

McAlinden (2008) warns that it should not be assumed that the capacity to restore relationships between victims, communities, and low-risk offenders is 'easier' than with those identified as high risk. This is because each individual community is marked by different qualities and quantities of resources and trust to 'intervene successfully' in restorative justice processes (Crawford and Newburn 2003). Restoring the community(ies) affected by crime, and ascertaining when restoration has been realised, is made even more difficult when there are numerous notions of what constitutes a community (See: Etzioni 1995; Crawford 1999; Ashworth 2002; Benhabib 2002; Brooks 2012). Goodey (2005) states that restorative justice advocates have little regard for understanding and conveying what community means, with minimal acknowledgement that a community can be a collective of individuals who deem crime and disorder to be the norm. Akin to Daly (2003), Goodey (2005) argues that restorative justice advocates are endorsing and pursuing a symbolic rather than practical pursuit. Restorative justice can only work when there already exists a stable community motivated and capable of participating, yet restorative justice's purpose is to build and revive eroded and fragmented communities (Goodey 2005). Therefore, if social inequalities between stakeholders are uneven to begin with, then there will be added difficulty in restoring relationships, which is often too great an ask for restorative justice to achieve (Goodey 2005). Furthermore, there is little to suggest that restorative justice practice mobilises and sustains community interest and participation to address wrongdoing; neither does it attend to the aftermath of an offence (See: Rosenbaum 1988; Bottoms 2003; Crawford and Newburn 2003). When there exists minimal social cohesion and collective willingness to intervene and work for the common good of the community, restorative justice cannot seek to exist (Sampson and Raudenbush 1999; Sampson 2004).

It is for such reasons that restorative justice does not appear as a viable method of encouraging and facilitating communities to become involved in processes of desistance. Yet, proponents such as Braithwaite (1998) believe restorative justice to be 'the' prevailing reform to have transpired within criminal justice over the past two decades. Goodey (2005) argues

that restorative justice in practice does not represent a desired paradigm shift in criminal justice. This is because acts of restorative justice often fail to address and tackle wider social factors, but lead to reinforcing existing structural inequalities that foster crime (See: Rose and Clear 1998; Crawford 1999; Roche 2003; Shapland et al. 2006). Ultimately, it can be argued that, if individuals in a community were already interconnected through strong and stable relationships, were respectful and treated each other equally, then injustices would not transpire (Goodey 2005; Zehr 2015; O'Mahony and Doak 2017). The practice of restorative justice merely serves to emphasise the necessity to attribute greater focus on understanding how best to motivate and facilitate community engagement in processes of desistance, prior to increasing the availability of opportunities for communal involvement and expecting these roles to be fulfilled.

Transforming Rehabilitation – the resolution to recidivism

In 2013, a new programme of criminal justice reforms, unlike anything that had been attempted previously within the criminal justice sphere, sought to revolutionise rehabilitation by building upon the success and failures of past attempts to 'break the cycle' of re-offending. 'Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform' (TR) had the principal aim of reducing rates of recidivism by ex-prisoners, through altering the rehabilitative approaches taken to their supervision and management in the community post-release (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). TR contests that rehabilitative approaches are better served if delivered by local partners, utilising local services, to address local needs (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). Local intelligence and expertise was considered vital in order to provide a tailored package of support services appropriate to addressing the potential pathways back into offending, that the area the ex-prisoner would be entering presented (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). This involved a reorganisation of the penal landscape through the introduction of re-settlement prisons via the Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014 (Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014). Some 70 of the 123 prisons were re-designed as re-settlement prisons (GOV.UK 2014a). Re-settlement prisons are seen as the potential catalyst of an offender's journey towards desistance, by initiating an integrated approach to service delivery that assigns renewed focus on enabling prisoners to work towards their rehabilitation from the moment they are imprisoned (HMI Prisons, HMI Probation and Ofsted 2014). In theory, the nationwide implementation of a 'Through the Gate' (TTG) programme of rehabilitative services would

result in prisoners receiving a tailored package of supervision and rehabilitative support that would, for the first time, continue for 12 months post-release (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b; Taylor et al. 2017). At the start of their sentence, TTG ensures that a re-settlement plan is prepared on prisoners, which serves as a template for addressing their immediate needs, by setting into motion how their re-offending can be reduced (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b; Taylor et al. 2017). Housing prisoners in re-settlement prisons near to the locale, communities, and networks that they were previously associated with has sought to enable frontline staff outside the prison to begin laying the foundations at the earliest opportunity for the prisoner's return (Codd 2007; Brunton-Smith and McCarthy 2016).

Marketisation was seen as the vehicle to deliver effective post-release statutory supervision and thereby reduce re-offending among short-term prisoners (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). This was considered especially important given that TR reforms extended statutory supervision and rehabilitation to offenders serving sentences of 12 months or less and who had previously received neither supervision nor support following release (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). With this annual addition of approximately 45,000 formerly incarcerated individuals requiring supervision and rehabilitative support, tapping into and getting 'the best' out of the public, private, and VCS at a local and national level was deemed pivotal (Ministry of Justice 2015). Consequentially, TR has incited changes not least to what services are delivered, but also who is responsible for their delivery. The previous 35 self-governing Probation Trusts in England and Wales were immediately replaced by a new landscape of probation services featuring 7 areas in which ex-prisoners are managed by the newly created NPS, and 21 areas by CRCs (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). The NPS is responsible for the management of ex-prisoners identified as posing a higher risk of re-offending. CRCs are responsible for managing ex-prisoners identified as presenting a low to medium risk of re-offending (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b).

The emphasis on marketisation has sought to attract a strong and sustainable pool of diverse and innovative providers vying to deliver contracts in this new penal marketplace (See: Corcoran 2008, 2011; Ministry of Justice 2013a, b, c; Annison, Burke and Senior 2014; Ludlow 2014). Successful contract providers are paid in accordance with their performance at reducing the binary rate (proportion of re-offenders) and the frequency rate (the median number of re-offences per re-offender) of re-offending by the cohort of ex-prisoners under their management (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b, 2018a, b, c). To heighten the capacity of reducing both these rates of re-offending, the NPS and CRCs employ a multi-agency

approach to offender management (See: Hilder and Kemshall 2013; Ministry of Justice 2013a, b; Evans 2016; Roberts 2018). This involves working in partnership with a range of statutory and localised public, private, and VCS organisations to provide and deliver TTG provisions (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). As such, it is hoped that the NPS and CRCs will be able to build upon and sustain the strengths already being achieved in reducing re-offending by organisations throughout these sectors (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). In particular, the role of penal VCS organisations is seen as crucial in embedding formerly incarcerated individuals into communities (Marples 2013; Ministry of Justice 2013a, b; Maguire 2016). TR reforms recommend that contract providers include a greater representation of organisations from the VCS to deliver frontline rehabilitative services (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b; Maguire 2016). This is due in part to their perceived dynamism in supporting ex-prisoners, and their emphasis on addressing individuals' broader 'life management' issues (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). In addition, it is hoped to draw upon and acquire the localised expertise and intelligence of these rehabilitative services that are not necessarily accessible to statutory agencies (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b; Maguire 2016).

The importance the government attributed to ensuring the VCS was involved in TR can be evidenced further by its commitment to ensuring that even small to medium-sized VCS organisations could bid for contracts (Ministry of Justice 2012, 2013a, b). Yet, as Milbourne and Murray (2014) as well as Maguire (2016) note, it was well known that larger national charities were prone to aggressively bidding for funding, which would have been previously earmarked for smaller and local charities. This has excluded, and thus neglected, the potential innovative methods of rehabilitative support provided to ex-prisoners by organisations because of their lack of financial resources (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). TR sought to ensure that sub-contracting arrangements would be viable to smaller VCS organisations (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). Consequentially 75% of the 300 subcontractors that were successful in their bids were indeed VCS organisations (GOV.UK 2014b; Clinks 2015). With a large private sector company at the fore of the supply chain such as Sodexo, Purple Futures, and Working Links, it is those at the second and third tiers that are comprised of VCS organisations (Maguire 2016). Thus, there was a necessity for these companies to develop supply chains because they did not have the expertise in offender management themselves. Yet, the true extent of CRC supply chains is unknown, as there exist no obligations for prime tier contract providers to publish the proportion of VCS involvement within their supply chains (Ministry of Justice 2012, 2013a, b). Moreover, those that are successful in winning

contracts are not required in practice to be held accountable for the inclusion of localised VCS organisations that public sector commissioners providing contracts hope for and that they proposed would transpire in practice when submitting their winning bids (Ministry of Justice 2012, 2013a, b). As Maguire (2016) argues, the lack of accountability expected of prime supply chain providers is only one example of how the implementation of TR would lead in practice to greater risks than value for the VCS. This led to redefining the VCS's role in offender management with its "financial, managerial and organisational challenges [thus increasing the risks significantly to] the independence, reputation, traditional values, community links, innovative working practices and client relations of a substantial section of the voluntary sector" (Maguire 2016:64).

Transforming Rehabilitation – the unintended consequences discovered through empiricism

Despite placing the VCS at the forefront of offender management, in practice the experiences of penal VCS organisations under TR reforms have not been encouraging. Clinks, the National Council for Voluntary Organisations (NCVO), the University of Birmingham's Third Sector Research Centre (TSRC), and the Open University's Centre for Voluntary Sector Leadership conducted a series of joint surveys with penal VCS organisations (See: Clinks 2015, 2016, 2018). The aims were to capture the penal VCS's experiences in the first 36 months of the TR reforms and the effect this had upon the services they delivered, their organisational structure, and those they support (Clinks 2015, 2016, 2018).

The third (and final) of these surveys was conducted in late 2017 and captured the views of respondents that were representative of 132 VCS organisations actively involved in delivering rehabilitative services (Clinks 2018). The findings of this study are detailed in the report 'Under Represented, Under Pressure, Under Resourced: The Voluntary Sector in Transforming Rehabilitation' (Clinks 2018).

In the report, 59% of respondents surveyed stated that the changes brought about by TR had negatively or very negatively affected their VCS organisations' service users (Clinks 2018). This compared with 15% of respondents who stated that changes had affected positively or very positively their VCS organisations' service users (Clinks 2018). The overwhelming perception from respondents surveyed was that the transition from probation trusts to CRC and NPS structures has been, and remains, one of uncertainty and confusion (Clinks 2018). Irrespective of 36 months transpiring since the implementation of TR reforms, there

continues to be uncertainty amongst respondents of their role in offender management (Clinks 2018). Respondents also stated how a lack of adequate investment had resulted in there being a 'narrowing' or 'watering down' of services in order to conserve resources, whilst meeting the heightened number of clients (Clinks 2018). This has severely affected the quality of service provision for those ex-prisoners with multiple needs (Clinks 2018). For instance, the survey demonstrated that, throughout a number of VCS organisations, a previously flexible person-centred approach of one-to-one support has been replaced through TR reforms by group work and a 'tick-box' driven mentality that prioritises appealing contracts over clients (Clinks 2018). Respondents reported that, alongside wider reductions to the funding of public services, they were uncertain whether users of their services would refrain from re-offending (Clinks 2018).

The report by Clinks (2018) also reported that, for the majority of the respondents surveyed, it was believed that the TR reforms had weakened the relationships, partnerships, and communications between agencies involved in offender management (Clinks 2018). Of the respondents surveyed, 43% stated that their VCS organisation's relationships, partnerships, and communications with local and wider statutory agencies had either worsened a little or a lot over the 36 months of TR reforms (Clinks 2018). A lesser percentage of respondents, 17%, claimed that their VCS organisation's relationships, partnerships, and communications with local and wider statutory agencies had either improved a little or a lot (Clinks 2018). Those respondents who believed there had been a deterioration noted that the new approach and structure to the supervision and management of offenders has not resulted in collaboration, but uncertainty, disagreement, and divisions amongst stakeholders over how to 'best' deliver services (Clinks 2018). Specifically, concerns were expressed regarding how available resources are distributed, the disproportionate levels of commitment and responsibilities by agencies to support clients, and the unwillingness by some agencies to share and disclose information about clients to enable a joined-up response of support to transpire (Clinks 2018). In addition, 53% of respondents believed that their VCS organisations were frequently exploited to meet targets, due to the limited capacity for fellow stakeholders to engage locally (Clinks 2018). Without reciprocal support or recognition for their 'over-stretched' efforts, this has served to weaken morale amongst VCS organisations and has led to reductions in communications with fellow stakeholders (Clinks 2018).

Respondents also highlighted how TR reforms had affected their VCS organisation's relationships, partnerships, and communications with fellow VCS organisations (Clinks

2018). Whilst 18% stated that this had either improved a little or a lot, 37% of respondents stated that their VCS organisation's relationships, partnerships, and communications with fellow VCS organisations had either worsened a little or a lot over the first 12 months of TR reforms (Clinks 2018). The explanations provided by respondents who indicated a deterioration had taken place centred upon how the renewed emphasis on contestability in the delivery of offender management has served to increase competition amongst the VCS (Clinks 2018). With VCS organisations competing against one another for access to funding and service users, respondents stated that a 'toxic environment' has developed amongst a formerly unified and supportive sector (Clinks 2018). Moreover, respondents highlighted that the sustainability and existence of those VCS organisations reliant upon funding from public donations and/or charitable trusts/foundations have been compromised by TR reforms (Clinks 2018), with 41% of respondents stating that they have experienced either a small or a large decrease in their ability to access funding to deliver offender services (Clinks 2018).

VCS organisations have found it increasingly difficult to justify funding from these sources, when there are now VCS organisations that are commissioned to deliver the services that they had once previously delivered (Clinks 2018). Consequently, some respondents stated that their VCS organisations had either previously contemplated or were currently rebranding from being a penal VCS organisation to a VCS organisation, with entirely new aims and categories of service user not affiliated to criminal justice (Clinks 2018). Categorised as 'mission drift', VCS organisations have increasingly become driven in these challenging economic conditions by the pursuit of winning contracts to ensure their survival, with less focus on the pursuit of their original social mission (Jones 2007; Davies 2011; Cornforth 2014; Hyndman 2017; Henderson and Lambert 2018). In 'going where the money is', VCS organisations have succumbed to placing too great a focus on the goals and targets of their external funders (Bennett and Savani 2011; Corcoran 2011; Benson 2014), thereby forfeiting and undermining their traditional values and practices, as well as the well-being of their service users (Thompson and Williams 2014; Maguire 2016). Furthermore, Maguire (2016) argues that contestability, and resulting features in practice such as mission drift, can have a detrimental effect on the likelihood of individuals being motivated to volunteer at organisations that are now driven by profit rather than philanthropic values.

HM Inspectorate of Probation recently produced 'Probation Supply Chains: A Thematic Inspection', which outlined the realities of the involvement of and challenges experienced by the VCS in delivering rehabilitation (HMI Probation 2018). The report contains the findings

of a thematic review of 8 CRCs, including information supplied by all 21 CRCs. The report identifies the extent to which the provision of services is available for those under probation supervision, and examines how subcontracting between CRCs and VCS organisations has transpired in practice. The report also found that the transformative reforms to probation have failed in their aim of ensuring that VCS organisations would play a leading role in providing offenders with specialised support to aide their processes of desistance (Ministry of Justice 2012, 2013a, b; HMI Probation 2018). In fact, the report suggested that the VCS is involved less now in probation services than ever before (HMI Probation 2018), with supply chains inadequately stocked to deliver an all-encompassing quality of service to the cohorts of offenders under their supervision (HMI Probation 2018). In reality, the scale of VCS representation in current supply chains is far less in comparison with the importance ascribed by TR of their role in offender management (Ministry of Justice 2012, 2013a, b). Moreover, in conducting the review, HMI Probation uncovered that a proportion of VCS organisations in supply chains, through the course of contracts, had had their involvement discontinued by prime tier providers (HMI Probation 2018). Prime tier providers were keen to withhold financial resources from second and third-tier suppliers in order to increase their organisations' own financial stability, thereby compromising the level and quality of support and supervision experienced by offenders (HMI Probation 2018).

The recommendations made by HMI Probation's 'Probation Supply Chains: A Thematic Inspection' report reemphasised the belief they had in the strength of the VCS as a key player in the desistance process. HMI Probation was keen to reconfigure previous protocol, by recommending that CRCs have greater transparency and accountability moving forward to ensure that contracts are provided on assurances that VCS organisations will be represented in the supply chain (HMI Probation 2018). This, in turn, would serve to increase the capacities of developing and delivering quality-rich localised services to meet the needs of the cohort of individuals under supervision (HMI Probation 2018). The recommendation of a national framework, that would act to promote local joint commissioning arrangements, would additionally serve to meet the needs of offenders under supervision and enable resources to be targeted efficiently and effectively (HMI Probation 2018). However, HMI Probation commended the positive effect that the current efforts by tier two and tier three service providers were having, especially when they provided services that were beyond the pre-agreed expectations outlined in their initial contracts. It was also keen to provide greater support to reduce the risks of exploitation currently experienced by these often small,

localised, and financially fragile VCS organisations involved in the production and distribution of services (HMI Probation 2018). HMI Probation concluded, through its review of CRCs, that innovation by VCS organisations was being stifled due to the challenges faced by VCS organisations regarding their sustainability and operational capacity (HMI Probation 2018).

The final report by the House of Commons Justice Select Committee's eight-month inquiry into TR has also provided a damning indictment of the effectiveness and viability of the implementation of the programme's reforms (See: House of Commons 2018c). It claims that TR reforms have failed to either improve the supervision and management of released prisoners, or reduced their likelihood of re-offending (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b; House of Commons 2018c), as such a range of concerns and recommendations were made by the Justice Select Committee in their report (House of Commons 2018c). As regards the VCS, the Justice Select Committee's report mirrored the concerns raised by respondents in the joint reports by Clinks, the NCVO, the University of Birmingham's TSRC, and the Open University's Centre for Voluntary Sector Leadership, as well as HMI Probation's thematic review of Probation supply chains (See: Clinks 2015, 2016, 2018; HMI Probation 2018). The Justice Select Committee also found that the VCS had less involvement in offender management following TR reforms than it had prior to its implementation and had failed to 'open up' the probation market (House of Commons 2018c). There were targets for annual increases to VCS involvement in service delivery not being achieved (House of Commons 2018c), and this has resulted in reductions to the quality and array of localised and specialist services currently available. Moreover, the Justice Select Committee noted that, when VCS organisations are represented in service delivery, they are more likely to be larger nationally established VCS organisations, irrespective of their capacity to 'successfully' deliver services (House of Commons 2018b, c). The Justice Select Committee recommended that future contract providers should be incentivised to involve smaller localised grassroots charities in their delivery (House of Commons 2018b, c). This would then prioritise innovation and success above a larger VCS organisation's ability to require less funding support from their contract provider (House of Commons 2018b, c).

Despite TR seeking to utilise payment by results as a means to incentivise contract providers to design and deliver innovative rehabilitate services to reduce re-offending, the current contractual requirements to reduce re-offending in practice only equates to a small proportion of available payment (House of Commons 2018a, b, c). Consequently, the Justice Select

Committee found that the intention of those delivering contracts has not always been to directly provide services, but instead signpost ex-prisoners to other organisations (House of Commons 2018a, c). This is because, despite the varying and complex needs of ex-prisoners, there is little additional financial gain to be made by those delivering contracts in terms of whether those they are managing are ‘successful’ at engaging with the services provided to them (Interserve 2015; House of Commons 2018a, b, c). The recently released proven re-offending data, the first set of such data since the implementation of TR, evidences the minimal emphasis taken by CRCs to promote desistance (See: Ministry of Justice 2018a). Whilst 18 CRCs have achieved a reduction in the binary rate of re-offending amongst offenders they manage, only two CRCs also successfully reduced the frequency rate of re-offending (House of Commons 2018c; Ministry of Justice 2018a). However, the Justice Select Committee recognised in their report that the capacity for those delivering services to attend to all the needs of ex-prisoners has been compromised by accompanying governmental policy (House of Commons 2018c). One such example is that, although homelessness and the likelihood to re-offend have long since been strongly linked (See: Social Exclusion Unit 2002), the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 enables local councils to deem former prisoners as intentionally homeless, which impedes their capacity to obtain statutory accommodation provisions (Homelessness Reduction Act 2017).

Due to the failures they identified, the Justice Select Committee remained unconvinced that TR reforms in their current guise would ever deliver ‘success’ (House of Commons 2018c). The Committee signalled the need for parties to converge in discourse and action to remedy re-offending (House of Commons 2018c). They also recommended that the Ministry of Justice undertake a review of current TR reforms, and begin planning and piloting a new model of necessary reforms (House of Commons 2018c). In response to the findings outlined in the report by the Justice Select Committee, the Ministry of Justice has since confirmed that existing CRC contracts are to be terminated two years early, in 2020 (GOV.UK 2018c). These are to be replaced with 10 new contracts for tender, which are to be structured in accordance with the recommendations by the Justice Select Committee, and thus make better use of offending data and payment for services delivered (GOV.UK 2018c). Even in the wake of such damning criticism of TR, it is, at the time of writing, unclear whether the Ministry of Justice will begin planning and piloting an entirely new model of criminal justice reforms.

Conclusion

This chapter has been able to highlight how advancements within desistance-orientated policies have sought to solidify the role of the ‘community’ as key in the ‘successful’ re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners. By championing localism, efforts have been focused on utilising the native intelligence, expertise, and resources of communities to find targeted solutions to addressing and tackling entrenched social problems (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2013a, b). Devolving powers and responsibilities from formal and statutory bodies to the community has attempted to promote an increased sense of ownership and responsibility amongst residents throughout their neighbourhoods. Yet, the endeavour of the ‘Rehabilitation Revolution’ to utilise communities at the forefront of service delivery underplayed how, in reality, they are not all the uniformed, unified, and unbiased environments, well stocked and versed in playing a role in processes of desistance. Inadvertently, through the course of highlighting the significance of communities in processes of desistance, the State has brought to light the challenges of engaging and mobilising those whom it identifies can best reduce rates of recidivism. This particularly refers to those communities located in areas with fragile infrastructures and prone to experiencing multiple levels of deprivation, which only serve as additional factors inhibiting upon a community’s motivation and capacity to play a role.

There has existed minimal exploration by the State into understanding why, how, and when members of society feel motivated and capable of performing a role in processes of desistance, in addition to limited dialogue exploring why members of society feel motivated by a sense of responsibility to engage with the positions presented to them. The aversion by the State to broach these questions has meant that it has acted counter-intuitively to the rollout of available opportunities, most notably within the VCS, for the public to become involved at the front line of service delivery (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). More worrying still has been that, in the State’s haste to radically reform rehabilitative legislation and ‘open up’ the VCS to assist in the delivery of post-release supervision and TTG rehabilitative services, TR has brought about changes which have imposed greater harm than good upon this sector. These reforms have ultimately largely served to negatively affect the social mission, sustainability, and operational capacities of numerous penal VCS organisations (Clinks 2018; HMI Probation 2018; House of Commons 2018c), with increasing evidence of the failings of VCS organisations to live up the heavy weight of expectations placed upon them to take the lead in the delivery of offender management. This study in speaking directly

to a range of individuals currently involved in the real-time delivery of processes of desistance. It seeks to develop knowledge and understanding on how best to motivate and facilitate the engagement and maintenance of prospective, as well as current stakeholders in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners.

Chapter 4 – The management of ex-prisoners in practice: A case study of Knowsley

Introduction

This chapter provides an understanding of how criminal justice and social policies are enacted in practice within the Metropolitan Borough of Knowsley. Discussions begin by detailing the socioeconomic demographics of Knowsley, and how the levels of multiple deprivation experienced within this locale highlight the challenges of encouraging and mobilising communities to ‘do more’ to address and tackle what is a hotbed for crime and anti-social behaviour. Attention will focus on the response taken collectively by Knowsley’s Community Safety Partnership (CSP) and Merseyside’s PCC in their current and future plans regarding how best to address and tackle crime and anti-social behaviour, prevent victimisation, and support ex-prisoners to desist. Emphasis will be placed on highlighting how a tiered approach to offender management of prevention, early intervention, and enforcement is delivered in practice. In Knowsley, a concerted movement has taken place in practice from a paternalistic model of service provision to a co-operative model. It will be emphasised how the belief of Knowsley’s CSP and Merseyside’s PCC is that maintaining a ‘safer’ Knowsley is centred on a multi-agency response to offender management. Yet, consideration will be given to illustrating the fact that, despite some success in the supervision and rehabilitation of ex-prisoners in Knowsley, both Knowsley’s CSP and Merseyside’s PCC stress that, to maintain success, a greater positive and proactive involvement by Knowsley’s residents in delivering rehabilitative services is required. This chapter concludes by addressing how some communities throughout Knowsley possess neither the motivations nor the capacities to play a role in the supervision and rehabilitation of ex-prisoners.

Knowsley: home to deprivation

The Metropolitan Borough of Knowsley, where approximately 146,450 people reside, is the second most deprived local authority of the 326 local authorities throughout England (See: Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016; MacDonald 2017), with 45.9% of neighbourhoods in Knowsley falling within the most deprived 10% of neighbourhoods

nationally (Office for National Statistics 2015c). Kirkby, North Huyton, and Stockbridge Village are the three areas of Knowsley with the greatest frequency of neighbourhoods experiencing multiple levels of deprivation (Knowsley MBC 2016). However, so widespread are the levels of deprivation throughout the borough that all neighbourhoods are considered as highly deprived on five or more of the following seven areas: income deprivation; employment deprivation; education, skills and training deprivation; health deprivation and disability; crime; barriers to housing and services; and living environment deprivation (See: Office for National Statistics 2015c). Most pronounced in Knowsley are the areas of income deprivation, employment deprivation, and barriers to housing and services (Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016). Knowsley is also identified as both the most income and employment-deprived local authority in England (See: Office for National Statistics 2015c; MacDonald 2017). To be recognised as the local authority with the highest levels of income and employment deprivation, the neighbourhoods throughout Knowsley experience high rates of unemployment, worklessness/dependency on income-based support, and available job opportunities which are low skilled and consequently low paying (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 2013; Office for National Statistics 2015c; MacDonald 2017).

Approximately 60,800 residents of Knowsley are employed, which equates to 71.5% of residents who are of working age (Office for National Statistics 2018). However, 3,200 or 4.5% of Knowsley residents are currently unemployed, a figure higher than the national unemployment rate of 4.2% (Office for National Statistics 2018). Similarly, the percentage of Knowsley residents in receipt of income-based support (15.4%) exceeds that of the national average (8.4%) (Department for Work and Pensions 2018). Levels of worklessness in Knowsley can be characterised by a local population with minimal qualifications and skills, and a shortage of local job opportunities to meet this demand, with the social mobility of Knowsley residents continuing to be affected by the quality of education provision in the borough (ResPublica 2016). Of particular concern have been the longstanding failures of inadequacy with the educational performance of Knowsley's secondary schools (See: ResPublica 2016). In 2017, Knowsley's secondary schools were collectively identified as performing well below average (See: GOV.UK 2018a). Reflective of the educational performance of secondary education in Knowsley, in 2017 this borough was recognised as the lowest performing in England for pupils attaining five GCSEs grade 5/C or above (ResPublica 2016; GOV.UK 2018a, b). In 2016/17, the average percentage of pupils in each

Knowsley secondary school achieving this benchmark was 7.40%, compared to the national average of 21.30% (GOV.UK 2018a, b).

For those residents of Knowsley who are successful in obtaining employment, the prevailing sectors that they are employed within are manufacturing, health and social care, and retail (See: Knowsley Chamber 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016; MacDonald 2017). However, despite the availability of jobs/roles available in the approximately 3,700 businesses based in Knowsley, 99.2% of businesses are small to medium in size and predominantly offering employees part-time and/or short-fixed contract jobs/roles (See: Knowsley Chamber 2016; Knowsley MBC 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016; MacDonald 2017). Furthermore, MacDonald (2017) argues that, despite the number of businesses operating in Knowsley, there remains a deficit in the availability of jobs, with one position for every six residents of Knowsley that are of working age. In addition, not all the jobs/roles available in Knowsley are applicable to the skill sets and qualifications held by the majority of the residents of Knowsley that are of working age (Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2014). Consequently, Knowsley experiences a higher daily outflow of residents commuting to the surrounding boroughs encompassing Merseyside and areas of the North West (65.4%), with the daily inflow of commuters from these same surrounding areas (34.6%) employed principally within jobs in Knowsley requiring higher skill sets and qualifications (See: Knowsley MBC 2016; MacDonald 2017). Earnings data for Knowsley highlight that residents earn on average approximately £377 p/w, which is £44 p/w less than the national average of £421 (Knowsley JSNA 2016; MacDonald 2017). Moreover, in not being able to take advantage of the available high skills and higher paying jobs available in the borough, residents earn £74 p/w less than those who commute from surrounding boroughs to take advantage of these job opportunities (See: Hurrell 2013; Knowsley JSNA 2016; Knowsley MBC 2016; MacDonald 2017). However, as Knowsley MBC (2016) notes, creating job opportunities, specifically higher paid but low-skilled roles, would not prevent higher qualified individuals from applying for these same positions.

The barriers to accessing housing and accommodation support for residents of Knowsley are causally impeded by income deprivation and employment deprivation (Knowsley MBC 2016), with Knowsley's housing market noticeably unbalanced compared to national averages (See: Knowsley MBC 2015, 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016). Due to higher than average rates of unemployment and worklessness in Knowsley, coupled with those residents who are employed being in predominantly low-skilled and low-paying jobs (See:

Hurrell 2013; Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development 2013; Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2014; Knowsley Chamber 2016; Knowsley MBC 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016; MacDonald 2017; Department for Work and Pensions 2018; Office for National Statistics 2018), there are a far greater number of properties in Knowsley that are socially rented to meet the demands of its residents (Knowsley MBC 2016). In total, there are 16,333 socially rented properties in Knowsley equating to 27% of all properties in the borough, a percentage that is higher than both the North West and national averages of 18% (Knowsley MBC 2016). Moreover, the average house prices in Knowsley (£111,600) are substantially lower than the North West (£146,800) and national (£211,900) averages (See: Knowsley MBC 2015, 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016). Levels of income and employment deprivation constitute considerable difficulty to home ownership for the greater proportion of Knowsley residents (See: Hurrell 2013; Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2014; Knowsley MBC 2015, 2016; Knowsley Chamber 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016; MacDonald 2017), resulting in 27.6% of Knowsley's population living in income-deprived households and 23.3% of working-age adults in Knowsley currently experiencing employment deprivation (Office for National Statistics 2015c). As a consequence of Knowsley's residents living predominantly in unstable accommodation due to higher than national average rates of unemployment and worklessness in Knowsley (See: Knowsley MBC 2015, 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016; Department for Work and Pensions 2018; Office for National Statistics 2018), residents are far more susceptible to homelessness with approximately 1,900 households in Knowsley annually seeking advice from Knowsley Council for housing crisis-related problems (Knowsley MBC 2015). Whilst the majority of households' housing crisis problems are resolved and lead to residents remaining in their current abode, Knowsley Council nevertheless annually identifies 10% of applications from residents as being statutory homeless and in priority need of being secured permanent accommodation (Knowsley MBC 2015).

With such high levels of multiple deprivation experienced throughout the neighbourhoods of Knowsley, the occurrence of crime in the area is enhanced, notably as residents of Knowsley are deprived in two aspects (accommodation, and education, training, and employment) which are known to be associated with enhancing an individual's likelihood to (re-)offend (See: Social Exclusion Unit 2002). Evidence from The Knowsley Partnership (2017) highlights how, following a 38% decline of overall crime experienced in Knowsley between 2007 and 2017, this decade-long reduction is to end with projected rises for the foreseeable

future. The attributing factors for the anticipated increase in overall crime have been the escalation in anti-social behaviour, as well as violence and sexual offences during the past 12 months in Knowsley (Home Office 2018a). Between June 2017 and May 2018, there were 4,558 recorded incidents of anti-social behaviour equating to 28.11% of all recorded crime in Knowsley, with 3,822 recorded incidents of violence and sexual offences during this same period totalling 23.58% of all recorded crime in Knowsley (Home Office 2018a).

The lived response to delivering and maintaining a 'safer' Knowsley

To address the recent increases and projected rise in incidents of crime and anti-social behaviour experienced in Knowsley (HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018; Home Office 2018a), Knowsley Council published 'Community Safety Plan: Strategic Priorities 2017-2020' outlining the structured response by Knowsley's CSP of its current and future plans to address crime and anti-social behaviour, protect the vulnerable victims and communities of Knowsley, and support returning ex-offenders to change their behaviour (The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Knowsley CSP is comprised of the statutory partners of Merseyside police service, Merseyside's PCC, Merseyside fire and rescue service, Merseyside CRC, the NPS, Knowsley Council, and Knowsley's health and well-being board (The Knowsley Partnership 2017). This is in addition to a host of local public, private, and VCS organisations, as well as the involvement of residents from Knowsley (The Knowsley Partnership 2017). However, whilst all agencies involved in Knowsley's CSP are important in the pursuit of creating and maintaining a safer Knowsley, it can be claimed that the role of Merseyside's PCC in collaborating with Knowsley Council to develop and finance the community safety plan is of special significance (The Knowsley Partnership 2017). For, in Knowsley it is Merseyside's PCC who principally oversees and is accountable for how crime and community safety issues are addressed and 'tackled', and how victims of crime are supported (See: Merseyside PCC 2014a; Knowsley MBC 2018a). Moreover, it was Merseyside PCC who, in 2017, awarded Knowsley Council £188,000 to assist in achieving the priorities outlined in the 'Community Safety Plan: Strategic Priorities 2017-2020' (Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Therefore, Knowsley's success in addressing crime and anti-social behaviour, protecting its vulnerable victims and communities, and supporting ex-offenders to change their behaviour, is predicated at every

stage upon the motivations and capacity of Merseyside's PCC to perform their role as a facilitator and overseer (The Knowsley Partnership 2017).

1) Addressing the rise of crime and anti-social behaviour in Knowsley

As noted previously in the chapter, crimes in Knowsley of a violent and sexual nature against the person have become increasingly prevalent (Home Office 2018a). Conversely, increases in the fear of crime and/or anti-social behaviour throughout communities of Knowsley have risen in line with such recent empirical data illustrating current and projected future rises in recorded crime in Knowsley (Home Office 2018a). Residents have increasingly begun to voice to positions of authority, particularly local members of Parliament and their PCC, a heightened concern of becoming susceptible to victimisation (Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Protecting individuals and communities collectively from the threats, harms, and risks associated with crime and anti-social behaviour continues to be a staple priority of the Merseyside police service (Merseyside PCC 2017). Merseyside police services' new operating model introduced in 2017, 'Community First', attempts to alleviate communal fears by emphasising a renewed focus moving forward of responding to the differing needs of communities at the forefront of practice (Merseyside PCC 2017). Through engaging and listening to the concerns of communities throughout Merseyside, Merseyside's PCC have prioritised in their 'Merseyside Police and Crime Plan: 2017-2021' to deliver a greater visible, accessible, and responsive policing presence in each community (Merseyside PCC 2017), which is to be aided, by 2021, with the development of new community police stations throughout Merseyside, in addition to co-locating police teams where applicable with the agencies of regional CSPs and localised VCS organisations (Merseyside PCC 2017).

Knowsley CSP's and Merseyside PCC's 'Community Safety Plan: Strategic Priorities 2017-2020' and Merseyside PCC's 'Merseyside Police and Crime Plan: 2017-2021' seek to attend to communities' needs by championing crime reduction (Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Neither of these plans hesitate to stress that, for crime and anti-social behaviour to be addressed successfully, this cannot be achieved without contributions from the communities requesting protection from the threats, harms, or risks associated with crime and anti-social behaviour (See: Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Both plans emphasise how ongoing austerity measures have served to affect the delivery of Knowsley CSP's 'tiered approach' to offender management, which combines

prevention, early intervention, and enforcement (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). There continue to be reductions in frontline policing including staffing reductions and an overall diminishing of resources available to the other agencies that comprise Knowsley CSP (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018; Merseyside PCC 2018), which have implicated upon their individual and collective capacity to both prevent crime and anti-social behaviour, and promote community safety (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018; Merseyside PCC 2018). For instance, Merseyside police service between the years 2011/12 and 2016/17 experienced an £84m reduction to its police budget, equating to a loss of over 1,500 police officers and staff members (Merseyside PCC 2017). In 2017/18, Merseyside's annual police budget was again reduced with Merseyside's PCC allocated approximately £308m to distribute amongst the five local authorities of Knowsley, Liverpool, Sefton, St. Helens, and the Wirral, which encompass Merseyside (Merseyside PCC 2017, 2018). Due to the reduced police budget, Merseyside police service experienced a 2.5% decline in the number of police officers between March 2017 and March 2018 (Hargreaves, Husband and Linehan 2018), indicative of the reductions to frontline police officers throughout England and Wales which has reduced, year on year since 2010, from 123,384 to 103,837 officers in 2018 (Hargreaves, Husband and Linehan 2018; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018).

Knowsley CSP asserts that, in order for its agencies to maintain a local presence and deliver services to communities, the residents of Knowsley require encouragement and empowerment to 'do more' (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017), sentiments that were shared recently by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services (HMICFRS) in 'State of Policing: The Annual Assessment of Policing in England and Wales 2017' (HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018). In the report, HMICFRS emphasised that, if communities throughout England and Wales refrain from engaging and assisting in the prevention and early intervention of crime, and equally withhold or restrict support from members of society who need it (HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018), then crime and disorder will escalate and lead to those in need of support becoming victims or offenders (Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018). The movement away entirely from a paternalistic model of service provision to a co-operative model has served to allow practitioners from Knowsley CSP to utilise their

time and reduced resources to their fullest potential (The Knowsley Partnership 2017). There have been a series of measures imposed in practice within Knowsley which have aimed to increase community involvement in prevention and early intervention. For example, launched in 2008, Knowsley's community messaging service has enabled the residents of Knowsley to receive text messages, emails, and voicemails on crime and community safety specific to their neighbourhood from Merseyside police service (Ringmaster 2018). In addition, residents are encouraged to reply to messages and disseminate intelligence anonymously about criminal activities in their neighbourhoods so that a greater understanding and knowledge of how to address crimes can be developed (Merseyside PCC 2017; Ringmaster 2018). The service also enables two-way communication between residents and appropriate Knowsley CSP agencies about social, environmental, and economic issues and activities which can serve to build a profile of what issues need to be addressed to reduce the appeal of crime (Merseyside PCC 2017; Ringmaster 2018). Due to the successes of Knowsley's community messaging service, Merseyside PCC in 2016 created their own version of this service called Merseynow, and this early intervention and crime prevention tool is now available to all inhabitants throughout Merseyside (Merseynow 2018).

Community and victim champions are a further example of how Knowsley CSP has attempted to empower residents to become actively involved in the early intervention and prevention of crime (See: Improvement and Development Agency 2010; Merseyside PCC 2014f). Whilst working co-operatively with Knowsley CSP to extract knowledge and intelligence on how practitioners can work most effectively and efficiently (Improvement and Development Agency 2010; Merseyside PCC 2014f), these local individuals, either elected or volunteers, are able to reach a wider audience of existing social networks, through informal rather than traditional methods, to both extract and dispense information on behalf of Knowsley CSP. The outcome has led to Knowsley CSP developing tailored services for communities that residents have been able to deliver themselves, thereby promoting their well-being and preventing crime and anti-social behaviour (The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Neighbourhood Watch, the UK's largest VCS organisation, is an existing method of crime prevention that Knowsley CSP and Merseyside PCC have also encouraged individuals to become involved within (Merseyside PCC 2014e; Neighbourhood Watch Network 2016). Merseyside's Neighbourhood Watch reduces the potential for victimisation and fear of crime by promoting neighbourhoods to work in partnership with the police service in order to create and maintain safer areas to live (Merseyside PCC 2014e; Neighbourhood Watch Network

2016). Through neighbourhoods communicating with each other and their local police service, neighbours as members of a local Neighbourhood Watch can have a voice in how to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour (Merseyside PCC 2014e; Neighbourhood Watch Network 2016). There are approximately 2,000 Neighbourhood Watch schemes throughout Merseyside, which have led to fostering community spirit and helped to build and sustain trust and confidence in the police service (Neighbourhood Watch Network 2016).

The importance that Merseyside PCC ascribes to instilling voluntary and community empowerment in offender management does not cease with motivating individuals to play an active role. Merseyside PCC recognises that communities motivated to ‘do more’ require the capacity to fulfil their vision and maintain their involvement (Merseyside PCC 2014d). One means by which Merseyside PCC has sought annually since 2015/16 to strengthen penal VCS organisations in Merseyside and, in turn, make communities safer has been through its crime prevention fund (Merseyside PCC 2014d; Community Foundation 2018). The crime prevention fund is made available by Merseyside PCC for charities, community groups, and social enterprises to apply for to support their efforts in deterring individuals from committing crime and anti-social behaviour (Merseyside PCC 2014d; Community Foundation 2018). The crime prevention fund is applicable to initiatives that focus on primary prevention, secondary prevention, and/or tertiary prevention (See: Merseyside PCC 2014d; Community Foundation 2018). In 2017/18, a share of £135,000 was made available and, of those community organisations that applied for funding, 13 were successful (Merseyside PCC 2014d). In total, the crime prevention fund has supported 32 community organisations throughout Merseyside since 2015/16 (Merseyside PCC 2014d).

However, the difficulty in appealing to ‘The Big Society’ in a location such as Knowsley is because it is a prime example of how encouraging community participation in processes of desistance is made increasingly difficult when residents in such deprived areas are lacking in social capital themselves (Zellerer and Cannon 2002; House of Commons 2011; Defty 2014; Gelsthorpe and Dominey 2016). It is challenging in practice to expect deprived communities to provide those released from prison with social capital, yet the series of measures imposed within Knowsley, which have aimed to increase community involvement in prevention and early intervention, continue to demonstrate the failure to implement efforts to enhance the motivations and capacities of all individuals within communities to engage (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Rather, the tendency has been to appeal and cater to those already motivated to begin involvement in processes of

desistance and/or ensuring the involvement of those currently active thereby remain within their roles (See: Tyler 1990; McCulloch 2015; Fox 2016; Canton 2017). Despite the area of Knowsley appearing as a prime example of the types of social exclusion ‘The Big Society’ agenda sought to address and tackle (Norman 2010; House of Commons 2011; Gelsthorpe and Dominey 2016), to capitalise on local intelligence and expertise in order to attend to social problems requires motivated and capable communities to provide targeted and successful solutions (Zellerer and Cannon 2002).

2) Protecting the vulnerable victims and communities of Knowsley

If victims of, and vulnerable individuals susceptible to, crime and anti-social behaviour are to continue receiving support in Knowsley throughout the course of the next 24 months and beyond, Knowsley’s ‘Community Safety Plan: Strategic Priorities 2017-2020’ asserts that the role of Merseyside’s PCC is key in fulfilling this second strategic priority (The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Although the involvement of PCCs in providing support services for victims is not a new occurrence (Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014), with PCCs first given the responsibility of providing victims of crime and anti-social behaviour with support services under the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (GOV.UK 2013; Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014; Merseyside PCC 2017). Prior to this time, the majority of support services provided to victims was at a national level by the government (GOV.UK 2013; Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014), whereby the intention of transferring power to PCCs was that their involvement would seek to ensure support services moving forward could be provided at a local level (GOV.UK 2013; Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014). In Knowsley, ‘putting victims first’, through ensuring that a package of specialist and tailored support and advice is available locally to victims and vulnerable individuals susceptible to victimisation, came to the fore in practice within 2015 with the introduction of Victim Care Merseyside (Merseyside PCC 2014g; Victim Care Merseyside 2015a). Developed by Merseyside PCC in conjunction with local VCS organisations, Victim Care Merseyside has enhanced the quality, availability, and accessibility of localised support from organisations for those affected by and vulnerable to crime and anti-social behaviour (See: Merseyside PCC 2014g; Victim Care Merseyside 2015a). Through its referral system, Victim Care Merseyside has initiated a streamlined and

joined-up service that responds to victims with applicable support and advice from VCS organisations beginning the moment they report a crime (Merseyside PCC 2014g). To date, Victim Care Merseyside's victim referral system has provided personalised support to approximately 19,000 individuals (Merseyside PCC 2014g).

Since 2015, Victim Care Merseyside has also focused on delivering the statutory measures of Community Remedy and Community Trigger as set out by the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014). Community Remedy is a form of community resolution with this out-of-court disposal predicated upon restorative justice principles (Merseyside PCC 2014b; Victim Care Merseyside 2015c), enabling victims of 'low-level' crime and anti-social behaviour the opportunity to have a voice in how offenders should make amends for their behaviour and actions (Merseyside PCC 2014a, b). Each Community Remedy requires a punitive, reparative, and rehabilitative element which must be attainable or remedied by the offender in accordance with the resources at their and Knowsley CSP's disposal (Merseyside PCC 2014b; Victim Care Merseyside 2015c). In Knowsley between June 2017 and May 2018, of the 611 offenders dealt with by the police, 243 offenders were involved in a Community Remedy (Merseyside PCC 2014b; Victim Care Merseyside 2015c; Home Office 2018a). However, in Knowsley, incidents of crime are not on every occasion neatly remedied and result in restoring community order. The Community Trigger serves to enable individuals the opportunity to demand Knowsley CSP to (re-)take action regarding persistent acts of anti-social behaviour and hate crime that may have not been responded to and/or resolved (Merseyside PCC 2014c; Victim Care Merseyside 2015b; Home Office 2018b; Knowsley MBC 2018b). Community Triggers promote Knowsley CSP to review how agencies respond to complaints and, if deemed inadequate, recommendations are made to agencies on how to respond to similar complaints if they arise (See: Merseyside PCC 2014c; Victim Care Merseyside 2015b; Knowsley MBC 2018a, b).

The emphasis that Knowsley has and continues to assign on 'putting victims first' to re-establish feelings of safety and security throughout communities is important (See: Merseyside PCC 2014a, g, 2017; Victim Care Merseyside 2015a; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). When members of a community feel safe and secure, this can lead to enhancements in the confidence, familiarity, stability, and cohesion amongst all its members (Knowsley JSNA 2016). These benefits, which can result from feeling safe and secure, in turn have the potential to improve the mental, emotional, social, spiritual, and physical health, well-being,

and quality of life of an individual (Knowsley JSNA 2016). This is significant, because crime is less likely to be committed by and occur in communities composed of individuals who are happy, healthy, and stable (Knowsley JSNA 2016). Developing strategies that aspire to build a community's safety is beneficial to those who reside there, as well as those who visit, volunteer, and/or work in that locale (See: Knowsley JSNA 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). However, Knowsley CSP recognises that creating and maintaining safe and secure communities for all residents, visitors, volunteers, and practitioners in Knowsley is a volatile process (The Knowsley Partnership 2015). This is because of, but not exclusive to, the disproportionate representation of ethnicities and religious beliefs amongst the population of Knowsley compared to regional and national averages. For instance, in Knowsley, 97.3% of the population is white, compared to the North West average of 90.2%, and the national average of 85.9% (Knowsley MBC 2012; Office for National Statistics 2015a, b). However, 2.7% of Knowsley's population identifies as being from a black, Asian or minority ethnic (BAME) group, which is lower compared to both the North West average of 9.8%, and the national average of 14.1% (Knowsley MBC 2012; Office for National Statistics 2015a, b). In regard to religious beliefs, Knowsley is the local authority with the largest proportion of individuals identifying as Christian, being 80.9% compared to the North West average of 74%, and the national average of 59.3% (Knowsley MBC 2012; Office for National Statistics 2015a, b). Moreover, those individuals in Knowsley who identify collectively as either Buddhist, Hindu, Jewish, Muslim, or Sikh, equate to 0.6% of the population, in comparison to 7% within the North West, and a national average of 9% (Knowsley MBC 2012; Office for National Statistics 2015a, b).

Although the empirical data highlighting Knowsley as a racial and religiously imbalanced region does not guarantee conflict to occur, statistics evidencing the occurrence of hate crimes in Knowsley highlight how the probability of victimisation is enhanced for non-Christian and non-white residents, visitors, volunteers, and practitioners in this region (Merseyside PCC 2018, Merseyside Police 2018). Alongside the aforementioned actual and prospective rises in anti-social behaviour, as well as violent and sexual offences within Knowsley (Home Office 2018b), incidences of hate crime have also risen year on year in Knowsley since 2006 (See: Knowsley MBC 2012; Office for National Statistics 2015a, b; The Knowsley Partnership 2015). In particular, hate crimes motivated by the race and religion of the victim have been prevalent, whereby, of the 264 hate crimes reported in Knowsley between March 2016 and March 2017, 155 or 58.7% were racially motivated, and

9 or 3.4% were religiously motivated (The Knowsley Partnership 2015; Merseyside Police 2018). The rises in hate crime experienced by Knowsley are also indicative of England and Wales. For example, between 2014/15 and 2016/17 there was a 46% increase in hate crimes motivated by race, and a 123% increase in hate crime motivated by religion (See: Knowsley MBC 2012; Office for National Statistics 2015a, b; The Knowsley Partnership 2015; Home Office 2018b; Merseyside Police 2018). Being conscious of incidents of hate crime in Knowsley is significant, because it affirms that the motivation of individuals to support the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners in Knowsley can be predicated on the ethnicity and religion of the ex-prisoner. However, Knowsley CPS's 'Community Safety Plan: Strategic Priorities 2017-2020' assigns no emphasis on the rises in hate crime experienced within the borough (The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Yet, Knowsley CPS does state that a 'safer' Knowsley for all residents cannot seek to exist without assigning a priority to empowering ex-prisoners to be motivated to make positive changes to their behaviour and thinking (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2015, 2017; Merseyside PCC 2017).

3) Supporting formerly incarcerated individuals in Knowsley to change their behaviour

In accordance with the Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014, as part of the encompassing TR agenda, ex-prisoners are supervised and supported to desist, depending upon the severity of the risk they are identified as posing to society post-release (Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014).

The supervision and rehabilitation of Low–Medium risk individuals

In Knowsley, the Merseyside CRC is the lead agency involved in the 12-month supervision and rehabilitation of individuals considered to pose a low–medium risk of re-offending following their release (Interserve 2015). The private sector company Purple Futures is currently responsible for overall service delivery at Merseyside CRC (Interserve 2015). Purple Futures believes that a partnership between public, private, and VCS organisations is necessary to provide the rehabilitative support required to transform the lives of those under supervision (Interserve 2015). This narrative follows that of Knowsley CSP in its belief in how to best build and maintain a safer Knowsley (The Knowsley Partnership 2017). At

Merseyside CRC, all three sectors play a collaborative role in supporting the transformation of ex-prisoners by helping to deliver TTG programmes and services. TTG at Merseyside CRC assigns importance to addressing the needs of those supervised in accordance with the seven pathways in and out of offending first identified by the Social Exclusion Unit (Social Exclusion Unit 2002). To address each individual's needs within these parameters, Purple Futures commissioned a small array of organisations throughout these sectors to deliver the TTG provisions at Merseyside CRC (Interserve 2015). However, due to both the explicit requirements of the individuals supervised and the potential barriers of multiple deprivation acting upon their re-integration and re-settlement relevant to Knowsley (Merseyside CRC 2018f), there are now two lead organisations at Merseyside CRC: P3 and Shelter (P3 2018a, b; Shelter 2018).

The inclusion of P3, 'people, potential, possibilities', is an indication by Merseyside CRC that social exclusion remains a prevalent barrier for the ex-prisoners that they supervise (P3 2018a, b). P3 is a VCS organisation that seeks to improve the lives of socially excluded and vulnerable individuals by providing opportunities to lead stable and sustainable lifestyles through improving well-being (P3 2018a, b). To promote the capacity of the offenders under their supervision to 'successfully' re-enter society, the TTG accredited programmes and activities that Merseyside CRC implement affix responsibility on offenders to 'make good' for their actions by becoming 'better citizens' (Merseyside CRC 2018d, f). TTG programmes and activities encompass group work and one-to-one meetings with their assigned probation case manager, helping mediate their re-integration and re-settlement by challenging offenders to envision their behaviour from the perspective of individuals (in-)directly affected by their offending (Merseyside CRC 2018d, e, f). This approach of promoting desistance by encouraging supervisees to pursue their active citizenship through becoming accountable for their behaviour is identified as the interchange model (Merseyside CRC 2018b). The focus by Merseyside CRC's TTG services upon improving the thinking skills and attitudes of ex-prisoners has shown empirically to improve their quality of life, well-being, and reduce recidivism (P3 2018a, b). In 2017, P3 supported 1,065 individuals throughout the five CRCs that were involved in providing TTG services, with 97% of 'clients' reporting a reduction in their offending behaviour because of their involvement with P3 (P3 2018a).

Although the involvement of the VCS organisation P3 in the supervision of low–medium risk individuals in Knowsley has led to some success in reducing their re-offending (P3 2018a, b), the appointment of Shelter, a VCS organisation that campaigns to tackle the causes and

consequences of homelessness, can be argued to be of greater significance (Shelter 2018). Shelter's involvement denotes a considerable focus by Merseyside CRC on its need to assign priority, with one pathway in and out of offending in particular, namely accommodation (Merseyside CRC 2018d, f). Entering stable accommodation on release from custody has been long since considered as a factor in reducing the risk of re-offending (See: Social Exclusion Unit 2002), with the importance of stable accommodation for an ex-prisoner's capacity to desist from crime continuing to be demonstrated since this time (See: Homeless Link 2011; Williams, Poyser and Hopkins 2012; Shelter 2018). For Merseyside CRC and the ex-prisoners being re-integrated and re-settled into the area of Knowsley, homelessness is a prevalent issue that affects offenders and non-offenders alike (See: Knowsley MBC 2015). As noted earlier in the chapter, the housing market of Knowsley is unbalanced with a limited availability of social housing (Knowsley MBC 2015, 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016).

The intentions of the TR agenda are to enforce significant reforms to the supervision and management of offenders and improvements to existing TTG provisions, with the aim to reduce persistently high rates of re-offending (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). However, the availability of permanent and stable accommodation for ex-prisoners has continued to remain uncertain, with available accommodation routinely poor in quality and serving to negatively impact upon their desistance from re-offending (See: House of Commons 2016a, b; National Audit Office 2016). Consequentially, in 2016 the HM Inspectorate of Probation and HM Inspectorate of Prisons joint report 'An Inspection of Through the Gate Resettlement Services for Short-Term Prisoners' evidenced that there is a growing proclivity for CRCs to secure temporary accommodation for those ex-prisoners they supervise, because temporary accommodation is in greater abundance in comparison to permanent accommodation (HMI Probation and HMI Prisons 2016). Homelessness remains an option for all ex-prisoners because there is currently no expectations enforced upon CRCs to provide those they supervise with accommodation (Commons Hansard Debates 2017). CRCs are incentivised due to the system of payment by results to 'successfully' address the accommodation needs of the ex-prisoners they supervise (HMI Probation and HMI Prisons 2016; Wilson 2017). However, success is not judged upon securing stable nor permanent accommodation for service users, but rather CRC performance is measured (and subsequent payment triggered) upon assisting them to complete homelessness applications to local housing authorities (See: HMI Probation and HMI Prisons 2016, 2017; National Audit Office 2016; Commons Hansard Debates 2017).

The practice of securing stable and permanent accommodation therefore comes to be a reflection of the motivations and the capacity of practitioners and affiliated voluntary personnel at CRCs to support those under their supervision (Commons Hansard Debates 2017). Yet, neither enhancing the motivations nor the capacities of those actively involved in promoting the desistance of ex-prisoners has transpired in regard to addressing the barrier of accommodation (See: HMI Probation and HMI Prisons 2016, 2017; National Audit Office 2016; Commons Hansard Debates 2017; Wilson 2017). Therefore, although TR reforms have increased the focus on rehabilitative services (National Audit Office 2016), advances in housing legislation have achieved little to ensure local housing authorities provide support to former incarcerated prisoners seeking to re-integrate and re-settle in communities (Wilson 2017). The Housing Act 1996 allowed local housing authorities to impose blanket bans on all ex-offenders from being allowed to apply for social housing (Housing Act 1996). Such measures were amended with the introduction of the Homelessness Act 2002, which led to local housing authorities having a duty to judge each ex-offender on their own merits (Homelessness Act 2002; Office of the Deputy PM 2002). The ex-offender's suitability to be housed in a precise locale would be decided by a housing authority in accordance with the category of offence the ex-offender committed that led to their imprisonment (Homelessness Act 2002; Office of the Deputy PM 2002). The provisions in the Homelessness Act 2002 were disregarded with the implementation of the Localism Act 2011, which reinstated the ability for local housing authorities to ignore applications from ex-offenders (Homelessness Act 2002; Office of the Deputy PM 2002; Localism Act 2011). These provisions remained until the Homeless Reduction Act 2017 and its aim of re-aligning the efforts of local housing authorities on preventing homelessness (Homelessness Reduction Act 2017). The Homeless Reduction Act 2017 places a duty upon criminal justice agencies to notify local housing authorities if they encounter an individual who they believe is at risk of homelessness (Homelessness Reduction Act 2017). However, local housing authorities remain under no duty to provide ex-prisoners with secure and permanent accommodation, only to inform and advise these individuals of their options given their past criminal conviction(s) (Homelessness Reduction Act 2017; Wilson 2017). Therefore, despite the individual originally posing as a low-medium risk of re-offending, this risk can be exacerbated due to the difficulties experienced by Merseyside CRC in navigating legislation that affects their ability to provide support.

The supervision and rehabilitation of High-risk individuals

In Knowsley, ex-prisoners considered persistent, problematic, and high risk, are placed under the intensive supervision and joint management of Knowsley's IOM team (Ministry of Justice 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018c, e). The categories of individual that Knowsley's IOM team serves are Prolific Priority Offenders (PPO), offenders with Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA), offenders subject to Drug Intervention Programmes (DIP), and those previously categorised low–medium risk who have continued to re-offend repeatedly (Ministry of Justice 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018b, c, e, f). Knowsley's IOM team provides a 'strategic umbrella' of local resources to reduce the incidence of re-offending posed by these categories of individuals (See: Ministry of Justice 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018b, c, e, f). The local partner agencies comprising Knowsley's IOM team encompass the public, private, as well as VCS (Ministry of Justice 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). These agencies are as follows: Merseyside police service, the NPS, Knowsley Council, HM Prison Service, drug, alcohol, and mental health service providers, First Ark housing services, penal VCS organisation Mentor Achieve Learn Support (MALS) that specialises in peer mentoring, and Jobcentre Plus (MALS Merseyside 2017b). Knowsley's IOM team's cross-agency response to the heightened threat of re-offending posed by those it supervises is predicated on the successful collaboration and common understanding amongst its agencies, as well as all agencies being clear of their roles and responsibilities in the pursuit of reducing re-offending and victimisation (Ministry of Justice 2015). The capacity for Knowsley's IOM team to provide this cross-agency response is strengthened by how there is no government-required model for IOMs to abide by in regard to their structure and leadership (See: Barrett et al. 2015; Ministry of Justice 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018b, c, e, f). Therefore, IOMs have leniency in how they formulate themselves (which agencies should be involved) and operate (their governance, leadership, and accountability structure) (Barrett et al. 2015; Ministry of Justice 2015). This has served to promote the ability of IOMs to be reflective of and responsible to the local environment in which each functions (Barrett et al. 2015; Ministry of Justice 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015).

The local profile of crime and threats to re-offending from those considered high risk in Knowsley have been repeatedly identified by Knowsley's IOM team (See: MALS Merseyside 2017b; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017), resulting in the necessity to address two pathways in particular: attitudes, thinking and behaviour, and

education, training and employment. Nationally, the services delivered by organisations in supply chains have struggled to attend to these two key gaps in provisions (See: HMI Probation 2018). The Knowsley IOM team has succeeded in responding to, devising, and delivering interventions and support to attend to these specific gaps in meeting localised offender circumstances, benefiting greatly from the integration of the VCS (Barrett et al. 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017b; Merseyside PCC 2017). The inclusion of MALS, a primarily self-funded VCS organisation based in Knowsley that seeks to reduce re-offending through providing peer mentoring services to ex-prisoners, has attributed value to Knowsley's IOM team (MALS Merseyside 2017a, b). Employing a liberative approach to desistance, MALS aim to provide an original response to altering the attitudes, thinking, and behaviour of its mentees through communication and encouragement for them to 'make good' (MALS Merseyside 2017a, b), having delivered and returned successes through both their Life-Change Programme (LCP) and peer mentoring services (See: Barrett et al. 2015).

The LCP operates with cohorts of prisoners in both HMP Liverpool and HMP Kennet (Barrett et al. 2015). Taking place over a six-week period, the LCP invites prisoners to participate in sessions one to two days a week (Barrett et al. 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017a, b). The sessions of the LCP are designed by MALS with the needs of prisoners taken into consideration. They take place close to the prisoner's release date with the intention to help the prisoner to become motivated to make behavioural changes and positive life choices (Barrett et al. 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017a, b). By focusing on exit strategies for prisoners, LCP sessions emphasise goal setting, discussing values and beliefs, improving communication and teamwork skills, considering an individual's impact of offending behaviour and actions on victims, as well as developing skills for enhancing employability (See: Barrett et al. 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017a, b). Whilst there are programmes available in custody for prisoners to engage with, in addition to the LCP (Barrett et al. 2015), the LCP has garnered additional interest from prisoners because it is delivered in part by a formerly incarcerated individual (MALS Merseyside 2017a, b). Testimonies from those who have experienced the LCP (See: Barrett et al. 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017a, b) reference how sessions delivered by an individual with shared experiences and perspectives to their own appear more worthwhile, as they can provide first-hand insight of the challenges to be expected post-release and how to overcome them.

The peer-mentoring services provided by MALS seek to support high-risk individuals as they transition from custody into Knowsley (MALS Merseyside 2017a, b, c). Beginning in prison

six to eight months before their release date, a member of MALS will meet with a prisoner who is scheduled to be supervised and managed by Knowsley's IOM team (MALS Merseyside 2017a, b). Akin to the LCP, the access permitted to members of MALS to begin interactions with prisoners in custody would not be possible without multi-agency collaboration (MALS Merseyside 2017a, b, c). Meeting pre-release is key for peer mentoring services to build trust between MALS and the prospective mentee, establish an understanding of their needs pre-release, and pre-assign an appropriate mentor (Barrett et al. 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017a, b). When released from custody, mentees are provided emotional and practical support by MALS and are expected to have a minimum of two face-to-face mentoring sessions a month with their designated mentor to monitor their progress (MALS Merseyside 2017b). A mentee's involvement in mentoring ceases when they believe they no longer require support and/or MALS make the decision to withdraw support (MALS Merseyside 2017b, c). Barrett et al. (2015) explain that, for mentoring interventions to reach the stage where MALS and mentees believe their re-offending has ceased, requires patience. Moreover, there is also the requirement for all other agencies that comprise Knowsley's IOM team to work in partnership to manage offenders, and to support and signpost mentees to practical services that they express to their mentors would improve their motivation and capacity to desist (Ministry of Justice 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017a, b).

Due to the importance ascribed to empowering and maintaining community involvement in providing support to ex-prisoners in Knowsley (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018), it is considered important that the localised desistance support provided by Knowsley's IOM agencies to address ex-prisoners' pathways into offending does not exceed the advice and supportive services available to disadvantaged residents of Knowsley, thus risk glorifying offending (Ministry of Justice 2015). Consequently, the support available from Knowsley's IOM team is grounded upon a 'carrot and stick' approach, whereby the constant threat of 'swift justice' exists for those individuals who fail to engage and address responsibility for their previous actions and/or re-offend (Ministry of Justice 2015).

Mentoring is (not) for you

It has been emphasised repeatedly (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017) that the capacity to reduce the potential recidivism by ex-prisoners is strengthened in Knowsley through the positive involvement of the communities that these individuals intend to (re-)integrate and (re-)settle into. As Dwyer (2003) and Canton (2011) assert that crime is an indication that there exists something inherently wrong within a community that can only be responded to by its members. Beckett-Wilson (2014) agrees, believing that the role of the community should be considered less as the location where re-integration and re-settlement occurs, but rather as a vital component in the ‘successfulness’ of an ex-prisoner’s desistance, with those individuals who comprise a community holding the power to restrict and exclude an ex-prisoner’s (re-)entry (Faulkner and Burnett 2012). Etzioni (2000) explains that the community, therefore, serves as the mechanism to (re-)construct the moral compass of ex-prisoners. Yet, this is predicated on a reciprocal relationship between the community and the ex-prisoner (See: Avineri and De-Shalit 1992; Kymlicka 1992; Etzioni 2000), with community members providing support, encouragement, and opportunities for ex-prisoners to ‘make good’, and ex-prisoners embracing and engaging with the motivations and resources provided by the community to help them desist (See: Avineri and De-Shalit 1992; Kymlicka 1992; Etzioni 2000).

Etzioni (2000) states that, if a relationship is established and maintained, communities seek to gain a collective efficacy. However Dwyer (2003) stresses caution, claiming that difficulty exists in encouraging the involvement of communities in the desistance process of ex-prisoners, even when and where viable opportunities exist. This is mainly because a person’s motivation to engage positively in processes of desistance is predicated upon their trust in former prisoners to desist and cease from re-offending, as the trust that communities are forged and maintained upon is compromised through acts of crime (Dwyer 2003). Dwyer (2003) asserts that it can thus be a difficult and lengthy process to restore the trust that communities have in ex-prisoners to desist from crime, with no guarantees that trust will be restored. Principally, each member of a community holds certain expectations of, and/or criteria to be fulfilled by, the former prisoner before this can transpire (See: Avineri and De-Shalit 1992; Van Gunsteren 1994; Raynor and Robinson 2009). Literature details (See: Avineri and De-Shalit 1992; Van Gunsteren 1994; Putnam 2000; Raynor and Robinson 2009; Beckett-Wilson 2014; McNeill 2016) how rebuilding trust in former prisoners is envisioned

as a challenge for law-abiding members of communities because of their lack of understanding for why an individual would decide to (re-)offend.

However, the willingness to trust ex-prisoners to desist from re-offending is enhanced amongst law-abiding members of communities located in disadvantaged areas (See: Van Gunsteren 1994; Putnam 2000; Raynor and Robinson 2009; McNeill 2016). This is because there is a heightened understanding and realisation among individuals within disadvantaged communities akin to Knowsley as to why an individual would decide to (re-)offend, due to the shared disadvantages experienced amongst residents (See: Avineri and De-Shalit 1992; Putnam 2000; Raynor and Robinson 2009; Kang 2015; McNeill 2016). Kang (2015) states that individuals from communities located in disadvantaged areas are more likely to engage in comparison with individuals from communities within affluent areas in acts of volunteerism where the recipient is an (ex-)offender. Kang (2015) reaffirms that the motivations for involvement in penal VCS organisations by individuals from disadvantaged areas can be expressed as an affinity and acknowledgement that they themselves could have ‘flirted’ with offending (Kang 2015). It has been shown (See: Rosenbaum 1987; Skogan 1990; Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Clary, Snyder and Stukas 1996; Kang 2015) that there is a heightened proclivity for residents in disadvantaged areas to utilise participation in VCS organisations as a tool to seize and enact local control, management, and support for ex-prisoners. Yet, because an individual feels a motivation or affinity to support ex-prisoners to desist, it does not equate that they are or will be ‘good’ at assisting them to cease re-offending (Clary, Snyder and Stukas 1996).

Despite this previous contention by Clary, Snyder and Stukas (1996), empowering individuals to play a role in offender management, particularly via the VCS, has become a priority in Knowsley. Haski-Leventhal (2009) believes that every person currently possesses the capacity to volunteer and perform a role within a penal VCS organisation. However, others argue (See: Clary et al. 1998; Silverberg et al. 1999; Yeung 2004; Houle, Sagarin and Kaplan 2005; Rehberg 2005; Offstein, Chory and Childers Jr 2015) that the decision to engage in acts of volunteerism is a distinctively personal endeavour requiring careful thought and consideration. The motivations that influence a person’s decision to volunteer in assisting ex-prisoners to ‘successfully’ re-integrate and re-settle following their release from custody vary (See: Schervish 1997; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Hustinx, Cnaan and Handy 2010; Rochester, Paine and Howlett 2010; Britto, Van Slyke and Francis 2011; Hustinx and Meijs 2011; Studer and Von Schnurbein 2013; Offstein, Chory and Childers Jr 2015). However,

historically, and at its theoretical core, volunteerism is an altruistic and selfless endeavour grounded on an individual's sympathy with and empathy to an entity(ies) 'in need' (See: Phillips 1982; Batson, Ahmad and Tsang 2002; Rehberg 2005; Ronel 2006; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Wilhelm and Bekkers 2010; Ronel, Frid and Timor 2013; Corcoran and Grotz 2016; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). According to Offstein, Chory and Childers Jr (2015), those who choose to volunteer for a penal VCS organisation with ex-prisoners as its clientele/service users are required to wilfully relinquish their time to offer their knowledge, experiences, and companionship to (in)directly serve and benefit the welfare of the ex-prisoner. Thus, it has been evidenced (See: Curtis 1971; Kang 2015) that those members of society who are more inclined to volunteer are older in age, have a strong affiliation to faith/religion, and are better situated in their socioeconomic status. Curtis (1971) and Kang (2015) note that this demographic of society possesses the capacity to provide time to the act of volunteering, without this role impeding negatively upon other aspects of their daily life and well-being.

The observation to be made is that, in volunteerism, there is a considerable emphasis on the willingness and availability of the volunteer (Wilson 2000; Haski-Leventhal and Bargal 2008). Haski-Leventhal (2009) states that, although many potential volunteers overlook the requirement to be emotionally available and the general commitments necessary, it can be expected that these facets of volunteering and the level of personal resources required do not become apparent until the act of volunteering has already begun. It is for this reason, as argued by Durose et al. (2016) that, whilst, an individual may be motivated to volunteer for altruistic reasons, only some individuals possess the emotional stability to listen and respond to the personal narratives of those who seek their support. Haski-Leventhal (2009) and Durose et al. (2016) are able to reveal that, whilst altruism and compassion are considered as the principal motivations for an individual to volunteer, this does not infer that all benevolent individuals make 'good' volunteers. Individuals also require the necessary abilities to perform their explicit voluntary role dependent upon who requires their service (See: Knoke 1986; Clary, Snyder and Stukas 1996; Hwang, Grabb and Curtis 2005; Sundeen, Raskoff and Garcia 2007). Possessing the 'free' time and willingness to help those 'in need' can, therefore, not be deemed as requirements to volunteer (Haski-Leventhal 2009; Durose et al. 2016).

Lund and Juujärvi (2018) and others (See: Chinman and Wandersman 1999; Silverberg et al. 1999; Handy et al. 2000; Musick and Wilson 2008; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Manetti et al. 2015) claim that the ability to glean a range of heterogeneous intrinsic

and extrinsic benefits as a volunteer is an increasing motivation for some individuals to become involved in volunteerism. Through the act of volunteering, individuals can acquire and improve capital such as personal and professional skills, physical and mental health, their social network, future career opportunities, as well as personal satisfaction, confidence and overall well-being (See: Clary, Snyder and Stukas 1996; Putnam 2000; Wilson and Musick 2000; Thoits and Hewitt 2001; Casiday et al. 2008; Musick and Wilson 2008; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Haldane 2014; Manetti et al. 2015; Lund and Juujärvi 2018; Maccagnan et al. 2018). Yet, whilst individuals may be motivated to become involved in volunteerism for their own self-interests, Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy (2011) note that it is beneficial for individuals to be ‘good’ at volunteering. Their efficacy to acquire a greater quality and quantity of the benefits associated with volunteering is predicated on both their longevity as a volunteer and their success at performing their role (Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011). Thus, it is regarded (See: Haski-Leventhal 2009; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Richardson et al. 2014; Buck 2018) that being altruistic and compassionate towards enhancing the well-being of mentees appears not to be a necessary requirement in order to volunteer at a penal VCS organisation.

Theoretically, the motivations for an individual’s decision to volunteer may not appear to be influential on their role as a volunteer and their performance in this position. However, in practice, as seen through the eyes of those in receipt of support, there is considerable abhorrence directed towards volunteers who are motivated by self-interest rather than philanthropy (Ronel et al. 2009; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). To mentees, a compassionate mentor is viewed as an individual who is sincere and trustworthy (Armstrong 2014; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). Corcoran and Grotz (2016) claim that this is of especial importance for an ex-prisoner who is seeking support to ‘successfully’ re-integrate and re-settle with the hope to desist. Hoogervorst et al. (2016) note that higher levels of trust between mentor and mentee allow for the development of a stronger emotional relationship between the two parties. This is considered (See: Baier 1986; Spitz and MacKinnon 1993; Pettit 1995; Elshaug and Metzger 2001; Armstrong 2014; Hoogervorst et al. 2016) more likely to lead to the mentee disclosing their personal strengths and weaknesses, as well as what serves to promote and hinder their desistance. As a result, this serves to enable the mentee to be guided to acquire the necessary tools and opportunities they require to desist (Baier 1986; Spitz and MacKinnon 1993; Pettit 1995; Elshaug and Metzger 2001; Armstrong 2014; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). Armstrong (2014) and Hoogervorst et al. (2016) claim that

the potential for an ex-prisoner's progression towards cessation from re-offending is far less likely to occur when they are supported by an individual motivated to volunteer by personal gain and/or are in a paid capacity. The above authors claim evidence (See: Armstrong 2014; Hoogervorst et al. 2016) highlighting that ex-prisoners will subsequently withdraw from seeking support from the positive and holistic option of the VCS and, alternatively, turn to former criminogenic networks or isolate themselves from society, which is detrimental to their capability to desist.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided a focused insight into how the risk of re-offending by ex-prisoners is managed in practice within the Metropolitan Borough of Knowsley. It was evidenced that the multiple and high levels of deprivation experienced throughout the neighbourhoods of Knowsley are a significant barrier to accomplishing reductions to rates of recidivism, with longstanding trends most notably in the areas of income deprivation, employment deprivation, and inaccessibility to affordable housing (Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016). This limits not least the prospective abilities of ex-prisoners to access and navigate pathways out of re-offending, but also affects the motivations and capabilities of the communities within Knowsley to play a role in helping them to support this journey. Considerable difficulties exist in empowering residents of Knowsley to take a greater positive and proactive engagement in the lives of ex-prisoners, when they are in competition with ex-prisoners in securing the limited employment prospects and accommodation within the area. There also exists distinct parallels, whereby there is the same multiple-agency working involved in the early intervention, prevention, and management of formerly incarcerated individuals. Likewise, support is offered for non-offending residents to access capital in order to overcome their own social mobility, as they attempt to overcome the multiple levels of deprivation that engulf their well-being and quality of life.

This chapter highlighted that, in a location whereby levels of multiple deprivation are experienced by all residents, the motivation to support ex-prisoners cannot be expected by the State if individuals do not possess the capacity to play a role, especially when there is currently a disconnect between responsibility and meaning. It is only when individuals are competent in their role in the desistance process of ex-prisoners, and capable of performing this role, that they will be more inclined to engage positively. However, it serves as no

guarantee that empowering and mobilising communities to play a role will result in their involvement (Canton 2017). In Knowsley, it would appear that enriching the infrastructure of the area would not least curtail prospective rises in crime by expanding the availability of resources, but also give communities a renewed sense of togetherness, with residents hopefully working towards maintaining the investments that have been made. However, in times of austerity, the likelihood of such radical transformations to locations, irrespective of the deprivation experienced, are unlikely to transpire (Watt 2010; Hayton 2012; Morgan 2012). This, therefore, leads us to reassert why the State has acted to champion localism and devolution as solutions to community ills.

Chapter 5 – Methodology

Introduction

This chapter documents the methodological approach used to deliver on the ambitions of the study. It starts by identifying the key research questions that guide the interest in scrutinising the role of members of the community in the desistance processes of recently incarcerated individuals. Much of the desistance literature has, to date, focused its attention on the experiences of ex-prisoners themselves as they leave prison, re-integrating and re-settling within their family and community. The objective of this study is different in that the concern is with how the wider communities of criminal justice practitioners, voluntary sector partners, and groups of local people contemplate the role they can play in supporting the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners. The chapter will document the originality of these research questions and how the study can help shape new thinking in this area.

The chapter will then outline the methods used to help generate data. The selection of Knowsley as a site for the research was a conscious and planned choice, as it is in locations like Knowsley, which experience significant levels of deprivation, that critically analysing the impact of criminal and social policies initiatives are brought into sharpest focus. The discussion will identify the targeted agenda for research that stratified three sample populations to engage to help build a spectrum of community participants. From volunteers motivated to support ex-prisoners, through professionals with a formal responsibility to manage recently released prisoners, and into a series of naturally forming community groups, the approach to sampling was designed to engage with the full range of ex-prisoners that the public can expect to encounter. The discussion will reflect on the effectiveness of these methods in building data.

Research that involves discussing an individual's motivations to volunteer and/or support ex-prisoners is emotive and sensitive. There is a need to be mindful of the harm that can be caused by talking about the activities of offenders and of the impact criminal behaviour has had on an individual's circumstances. Similarly, discussing criminal activity with groups of people may generate undue fear and anxiety. For professionals passing judgement on current policy directorates, or on the efficacy of a partner's abilities to reduce re-offending, is challenging too. For these reasons, this chapter will also reflect on the political and ethical

dimensions of the research process and consider the learning for future research projects in this field that arise out of the study.

Research objectives

The intention of this research study is to gain knowledge and understanding of the roles that people have in the desistance process of ex-prisoners and to explore community members' awareness of the impact of their involvement in these processes on an ex-prisoner's ability to cease re-offending. Previous chapters of this thesis have explained how, whilst the conceptualisation of the role of the community has been poorly addressed, this has not stifled the political impetus of successive governments to embed the mobilisation of communities at the forefront of offender management and service delivery. Through signature criminal justice policy initiatives like the 'Rehabilitation Revolution', greater powers and responsibility have been devolved to communities with the intention of allowing them to respond, devise, and deliver localised interventions and support to best (re-)settle and (re-)integrate ex-prisoners (See: Home Office 2004; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2012, 2013a, b, 2015, 2018c; House of Commons 2011; Grimwood and Berman 2012; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014; Cabinet Office 2015). However, very often there has been only loose guidance on the expected role communities are to play, fuelling uncertainty on what can and should be done to reduce recidivism. A particular shortcoming has been the capacity to account for how and why people residing in locations prone to experiencing high and multiple levels of deprivation and crime would be motivated enough, and capable of, addressing and attending to the problems experienced by ex-prisoners entering their communities. At a time when these communities are themselves experiencing challenges to their own mental, emotional, social, spiritual, and physical health, and well-being and quality of life, they seem unlikely drivers for delivering new policy initiatives.

By grounding itself in Knowsley, a Metropolitan Borough of Merseyside that suffers from often extreme levels of deprivation, this study explores just how fraught the enacting of rehabilitation and re-settlement policies are. Residents of Knowsley have to contend with multiple levels of deprivation and high crime rates throughout its neighbourhoods, which serve to emphasise in reality the difficulties for communities to support ex-prisoners' desistance (Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016; MacDonald 2017; Home Office 2018a). It is a setting where policies designed to reduce re-offending are most

needed and where – if the ambitions of the political language of successive legislators is to be followed – there is the greatest need for the community to be mobilised in order to support the successful re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners.

To help fully explore the dynamics at work in the delivery of policy in practice, the study identified ‘the publics’ that prisoners can expect to engage with on their release from custody. These groups – formal/informal structures, professional/voluntary and proactive and ambivalent – are not only crucial to shaping ex-prisoners’ experiences upon release, but are increasingly being responsibilised through policy to contribute to efforts to reduce re-offending. To explore the basis for why people choose to play a role, and why some do not, it was necessary to include people representative of the spectrum of involvement that a person can have in processes of desistance, including the differing degrees of readiness, willingness and abilities that individuals have in supporting ex-prisoners to re-integrate and re-settle. Social actors from the (in-)formal structures throughout an ex-prisoner’s journey of desistance from re-offending were purposively approached. This resulted in speaking to three groups, specifically: those people who perform a role voluntary, those who are paid to play a role, and lay participants from communities who, irrespective of whether they want to play a positive and proactive role, are identified as a pivotal part of the landscape to which ex-prisoners are released into.

The first group comprises volunteer peer mentors, who consciously provide their time and resources to actively supporting ex-prisoners on their release from prison, through offering therapeutic counsel, companionship, and assistance with facilitating access to services to promote desistance. This study, therefore, gained access to MALS, an established penal VCS organisation in Knowsley specialising in peer mentoring (MALS Merseyside 2017a). Speaking with volunteer mentors, the study sought to understand their role, motivations, and capacities for becoming involved in supporting ex-prisoners as they traverse attempts to desist re-offending post-release.

The second group comprises criminal justice professionals, who represent the local partner agencies involved in Knowsley’s IOM team tasked with reducing the incidence of re-offending posed by ex-prisoners identified as persistent, problematic, and high risk (Ministry of Justice 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018c, e, f). Encompassing the public, private, as well as VCS, Knowsley’s IOM team includes the Merseyside police service, the NPS, Knowsley Council, HM Prison Service, drug, alcohol, and mental health

service providers, First Ark housing services, MALS, and Jobcentre Plus (Ministry of Justice 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017a, b). The professionals in these fields were contacted to explore their assessment of the scope for members of society to complement, support, and extend the work their organisations undertake with recently released prisoners.

The third group included lay members from communities throughout the area of Knowsley, who, however passive they may be, have differing motivations and capacities in shaping the environment to which ex-prisoners will return. In giving thought to the social spaces that community groupings and ex-prisoners may potentially engage and share as they make attempts to (re-)integrate and (re-)settle upon their path towards desistance, this study reached out to community centres, local interest groups, parishes, tenants' forums, and residents' groups throughout Knowsley. Discussions with this multiplicity of lay participants from Knowsley aimed to establish how they conceptualised their roles in the desistance process of ex-prisoners, including their motivations and capacities for supporting ex-prisoners to (re-)integrate and (re-)settle into their communities.

This study believed that it was the people themselves representing these three sub-groupings who were best to determine whether they consider themselves ready, willing and able to play a role in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners (Silverman 2000).

Research questions

The value of research questions is comparable to the answers a study attains, as the quantity and quality of knowledge generated by a study is through the strength of the research questions which it is grounded upon (Flick 1998; Kelly 1998). Careful consideration was taken to ensure that the research questions of this study were relevant, researchable, clear, and innovative, with the explicit intent of addressing the gaps in knowledge and understanding for why people become involved in processes of desistance, serving as their inspiration (Marx 1997). It was fundamental that the research questions queried existing theoretical knowledge and, in doing so, contributed new contemporary thought so as to offer a greater depth to current understanding held by a range of audiences (Kelly 1998). Previous scholarship has stopped short of conceptualising the roles members of society could play in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners, nor whether they are motivated and capable of becoming involved (Kelly 1998). The ambition of this study was to construct research

questions that served to guide a focused exploration on identifying the models/modes of engaging and facilitating members of society to play a role in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners. The following are the three key research questions that guided this study; they are explanatory in nature, given their aim to generate knowledge and understanding from the different contingents in society involved in processes of desistance:

- 1) What role could society play in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?
- 2) What motivates members of society to become involved in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?
- 3) What capacity do members of society have to engage in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?

The operationalisation of these questions in practice needed to engage with individuals around the direct experiences they have had with supporting people who have been released from custody back into the community. The questions needed to explore the extent to which their involvement with ex-prisoners has been professional, voluntary, or potentially a blend between the two in how relationships of support can be framed. The three distinct sample groups of professionals, volunteer, and public were broad enough to allow individuals to position themselves clearly in one field. A further challenge is to explore motivations for providing support, whether that be through professional obligation, personal intent, or direct experience. The questions also needed to be mindful that a person's motivation for becoming involved in processes of desistance may differ once they become actively involved in playing a role, as their motivations may begin as self-seeking, but throughout the course of their involvement develop into being altruistically driven. Motivations can thus be underpinned by previous personal experience with ex-prisoners, which is either upheld through their current engagement or altered. The sense that individuals feel an inert drive to volunteer or compelled to volunteer through a wider sense of obligation to their community were themes that were considered during the design of the research questions.

Despite having clarity on how responses by participants during the course of this study would be operationalised (Punch 1998), the research questions were not static, and remained open to additional rephrasing as greater insight was obtained from participants based on what they considered significant (Clough and Nutbrown 2002). Harnessing openness to reformulate the research questions was necessary. This study placed considerable emphasis on obtaining the voices of those individuals deemed crucial in reducing recidivism and the questions they

believed required answering. To address fully the research and operationalised questions of this study, the selection of an appropriate research design or action plan was significant.

Underpinning values to the research

Conducting social research is subject to a researcher's judgement on the nature of the relationship between theory and social research. Inductive reasoning views theory as that which emerges following the collection and analysis of data, and underpinned the methodological choices of this research study (Kelly 1998; Bryman 2001; Gray 2004). Examining pre-existing theoretical explanations of desistance did not fuel a compulsion to denounce the lines of inquiry and knowledge that those explanations provide. Rather, this study sought to obtain understanding and meaning to add to the existing stock of theoretical knowledge to provide solutions to current gaps (Bryman 2001) as it became clear that there exists no current theoretical understanding on the roles, motivations, and capacities of people in processes of desistance (See: Chapter Two). Crotty (1998 cited in Gray 2004:19) states that, when generating knowledge to add into the existing domain of theoretical enquiry, this knowledge of the social world should be worthwhile and legitimate. It was for this reason that both epistemological and ontological considerations were influential upon the overarching research strategy adopted (Crotty, 1998 cited in Gray 2004:19).

In considering what was acceptable knowledge (epistemology), this study asserted the belief that the subjects of the social world and the natural sciences are no different and, as such, the epistemological position selected to guide this study's acquisition of knowledge was critical realism (Bryman 2001). Attempting to establish whether people are motivated and capable of performing a role in an ex-prisoner's process of desistance requires both the gathering of facts and a deeper understanding of the structures and mechanisms underlying these determinations (Sayer 1984; Bryman 2001). That, only through practical and theoretical work can viable suggestions be made on how to enhance a person's readiness, willingness, and capabilities to perform a role (Bryman 2001; Denscombe 2010). In adopting a critical realist position, there was an acceptance that generative mechanisms can impose change in the status quo of what is already understood about society's involvement in processes of desistance (Bryman 2001; Denscombe 2010). Even though these generative mechanisms were neither directly observable nor measurable, and often hypothetical accounts or events (Bryman 2001), they demonstrate how an individual applies context to the social world around them,

and rationalises their thoughts upon their own and others' involvement in processes of desistance (Bryman 2001).

The emphasis that this study attributed on gaining knowledge, understanding, and meaning of the social world is demonstrated further through the ontological position of constructionism, upon which the study was guided. It was carried out with a belief that social reality is not a definitive construct, but rather in a state of continuous revision through the interactions of social actors (Sarantakos 1993; Bryman 2001; Creswell 2009; Denscombe 2010). The language, labels, and categories expressed by mentors, practitioners, and lay members of Knowsley communities allowed for a greater understanding of how they engage with, and supply meaning to, the social world around them (Gergen, 1999 cited in Sarantakos 1993:37; Bryman 2001), given the contention that people are not static entities constrained by social reality, but who are readily able to formulate and influence their own structures of reality (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Gergen 1985; Bryman 2001; Gray 2004). The constructivist ontology applied to this study considered those social actors directly involved in the establishment and revision of the communities, cultures, and civic order of the social world that ex-prisoners return to following their release. In conjunction with the multiple-case study design selected to guide the processes of executing the collection and analysis of data (Stake 1995; Bryman 2001; Gorard 2013), it permitted for the capability of an in-depth understanding of how these different groupings of social actors, involved (in)formally in processes of desistance, construct their social realities and what these realities entail (Bromley, 1986 cited in Sarantakos 1993:211; Sarantakos 1993; Punch 1998; Kumar 1999; Gilbert 2008; Denscombe 2010). With the multiple-case study design allowing for the intensive and detailed examination of mentors, practitioners, and community lay members, including the sites from where they were sampled (Punch 1998; De Vaus 2001; Bryman 2001; Creswell 2009; Tight 2010). Understandably, a limitation of the multiple-case study design is the inability to generalise the cases observed to the wider population (Bryman 2001). However, as will be reiterated at later stages throughout the chapter, this study did not stipulate any generalisations to cases beyond those studied.

Why Knowsley?

This study purposefully focused on cases representative of Knowsley, Merseyside, England, and thereby provided detailed understanding of each case and the interactional dynamics

across these cases (Punch 1998; Kumar 1999). The objects of interest were not the locations that participants derived from per se, but the individuals associated with each locale. However, although not the primary point of interest, these sites certainly were significant in formulating the answers that participants provided (Punch 1998). Although the precise sites that participants were associated with may not have been targeted specifically, it was necessary for them to be representative of the sub-groupings that this study purposefully sought to engage with. It was an intentional decision that all participants of this study worked and/or resided in Knowsley, one of the most highly deprived neighbourhoods in England (Office for National Statistics 2015c).

In 2010, Knowsley was identified as the fourth most deprived local authority in England; it was adjudged to be highly deprived on five or more of seven domains: income deprivation, employment deprivation, health deprivation and disability, education skills and training deprivation, barriers to housing and services, living environment deprivation, and crime (Office for National Statistics 2015c). In 2015, Knowsley became the second most deprived local authority throughout England (Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016; MacDonald 2017), with 45.9% of neighbourhoods in Knowsley falling within the most deprived ten per cent of neighbourhoods nationally (Office for National Statistics 2015c). Despite Knowsley representing the smallest borough of Merseyside, a 33-square-mile radius (Office for National Statistics 2015c), there are approximately 146,450 residents inhabiting this area (Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016). There is an overwhelmingly white British (97.3%) and Christian (80.9%) population vying for the same access to service provisions as formerly incarcerated individuals (Knowsley MBC 2012; Office for National Statistics 2015a, b). Not least can the limited quantity of resources curtail the potential social mobility of those who inhabit Knowsley. However, the inadequate quality of service provisions has been shown to have a detrimental effect throughout the neighbourhoods of Knowsley.

For instance, the educational performances of Knowsley's secondary schools have shown pronounced failures of inadequacy (See: ResPublica 2016). In 2017, Knowsley was recognised as the lowest performing borough in England for pupils attaining five GCSEs at grade 5/C or above (ResPublica 2016; GOV.UK 2018a, b), with this trend set to continue following Knowsley's secondary schools in 2018 collectively identified as performing well below average (See: GOV.UK 2018a, b). Such a longstanding skills gap acts as a barrier to employment, with Knowsley having a particularly high rate of children and teenagers not in

employment, education or training (NEET) at 8.2% compared to the national average of 5.8% (Knowsley MBC 2014). Yet, in regards to the local economic opportunities available in Knowsley, 99.2% of businesses are small to medium, predominantly offering employees only part-time and/or short-fixed contract jobs/roles (See: Knowsley Chamber 2016; Knowsley MBC 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016). There exists a considerable deficit in the availability of jobs, with one position for every six residents of Knowsley (MacDonald 2017). Moreover, due to the limited skill sets and qualifications held by the majority of the residents of Knowsley, they are routinely employed in low-paying job roles (See: Hurrell 2013; Joseph Rowntree Foundation 2014; Knowsley Chamber 2016; Knowsley MBC 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016; MacDonald 2017; Department for Work and Pensions 2018; Office for National Statistics 2018). The earnings data for Knowsley highlights that residents earn on average approximately £377 p/w, which is £44 p/w less than the national average of £421 (Knowsley JSNA 2015b, 2016; MacDonald 2017). Reflective of the salaries earned by those employed in Knowsley, there are far more properties in Knowsley that are socially rented to meet the demands of its residents (Knowsley MBC 2016). In total, there are 16,333 socially rented properties in Knowsley, equating to 27% of all properties in the borough (Knowsley MBC 2016). This percentage is higher than both the North West and national averages of 18% (Knowsley MBC 2016).

These levels of deprivation visible in Knowsley can act as pathways into (re-)offending. Between the years 2017/18, there were in excess of 15,000 reported crimes, an increase on the 12 months previous (Home Office 2018a). The crimes reported to police were heavily victim based. Between June 2017 and May 2018, there were 4,558 recorded incidents of anti-social behaviour, equating to 28.11% of all recorded crime in Knowsley (Home Office 2018a), with 3,822 recorded incidents of violence and sexual offences during this same period, totalling 23.58% of all recorded crime in Knowsley (Home Office 2018b). The outcome of the crimes reported to police resulted in 536 offenders dealt with at court (Home Office 2018a), of which 106 offenders, or 19.7%, were sent to custody or received a suspended prison sentence (Home Office 2018a). It would not be uncommon to assume and suggest that Knowsley, as an area of deprivation and high crime rates, would view the challenges of supporting ex-prisoners to desist as being especially fraught (Office for National Statistics 2015c). By speaking directly to those members of society (in)directly involved in the lives of prisoners post-release, it was sought to establish an understanding of the role they play. By becoming embedded in this specific location, a rich and detailed

examination could be made of the lived experiences of those who support ex-prisoners, particularly when they themselves are experiencing high and multiple levels of deprivation and limited access to capital.

Sampling approaches

The sampling approach that was used to acquire research participants was purposive, and directly influenced by the research questions underpinning the research study (Sarantakos 1993). Purposive sampling is the greatest sampling strategy to use when attempting to target participants most likely to yield the richest in-depth data about a particular vague and under-researched subject area (Sarantakos 1993; Flick 1998; Punch 1998; Tonkiss 1998; Bryman 2001). The type of purposive sampling utilised, namely typical case sampling, involved selecting participants to discover insight into their and society's preparedness, motivations, and capacities to play a role in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners (Eisenhardt 1989; Denscombe 1998; Flick 1998; Tonkiss 1998; Silverman 2000; Gray 2004; Creswell 2009). In identifying cases to sample, it was crucial that there was a representative and meaningful selection of individuals who demonstrated the varying levels of (in-)direct involvement in processes of desistance (Sarantakos 1993; Flick 1998; Tonkiss 1998; Silverman 2000; O'Leary 2005; Creswell 2009). Therefore, the locations throughout Knowsley purposefully chosen as sites to engage participants reflected their ability to represent the various methods of engagement a member of society can have with an ex-prisoner as they attempt to re-integrate and re-settle into communities post-release (Flick 1998; Punch 1998; Tonkiss 1998; Bryman 2001).

Key to note is that, as a non-probability sampling approach was utilised, given the precise focus upon Knowsley as the site where all participants were selected, the findings of this study cannot be claimed to be generalised, although it was not the intention of this study (Yin 2003). Instead, this study sought to enhance the probability of people sampled to be representative of the social world, attained through employing a purposive sampling approach that was sequential (Teddlie and Yu 2007). By having sampling that was sequential, no limits were placed during the data collection on the number of participants required for each sample (Bryman 2001; Teddlie and Yu 2007), allowing for the potential for limitless themes to emerge from conducting semi-structured interviews and focus groups with participants (Bryman 2001). To be dismissive to the additional sampling of prospective individuals

associated with these new and previously unanticipated lines of enquiry, which could have arose and led to the acquisition of additional data would have been redundant (Hood 2007). Even so, three criteria were applied to a participant's involvement within this study, with each person informed of the exclusionary criteria prior to their involvement via their participant information sheets (See: Appendix A, B and C). First, all individuals were required to be aged 18 or over. Second, mentors and practitioners were required to have been in their current organisational role for a minimum period of six and 12 months, respectively. Third, lay participants from the communities of Knowsley were not allowed to have previously served a custodial sentence and/or be previously or currently engaged in a voluntary or paid capacity with convicted offenders. Individuals who fulfilled these criteria were eligible to participate, and what follows is the sampling process that took place for each sample grouping.

Sample group one: Volunteer mentors from MALS

This sought to understand and establish the meaning behind why members of society decide to become and remain engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to re-integrate and re-settle. This sample grouping, as volunteer mentors, focused on acquiring those individuals currently involved in processes of desistance. Doing so also served to ascertain the challenges and advantages associated with possessing an active role in the desistance process of ex-prisoners via the VCS, from the voices of those individuals with lived experiences of this sector. This included whether mentors believed a VCS organisation is a viable site for members of society to positively engage with ex-prisoners, as well as acquiring their insight into how (if any) their readiness, willingness, and capabilities to play a positive role are enhanced through their involvement at a VCS organisation, and why. At the time that the data collection phase of the study began, MALS was one of three VCS organisations located in Knowsley engaged in providing mentoring services to those recently released from prison. It was a conscious decision to target and approach MALS in order to acquire a sample of mentors. Unlike the two fellow penal VCS organisations who could have been approached, it was the relationship and experience that MALS possessed, as a result of their involvement as a member of Knowsley's IOM team, that identified it as having the potential to reveal additional worthwhile data. In particular, this research study had already identified practitioners

encompassing the public and private sector agencies who featured in the IOM team to be the sites that participants for the purposes of sample group two would be sampled.

In order to establish whether MALS would be open to serve as a site to acquire prospective mentors for sample one, emails were sent which included a brief background of the researcher, the purpose of conducting the research study, as well as an electronic copy of a participant information sheet and consent form (See: Appendix A, D and E). MALS demonstrated an interest in being involved and, following additional telephone and email correspondence, a meeting was arranged with a senior manager at their premises. This event was significant as it indicated the first stage of 'entering the field'. There was considerable added pressure surrounding this foremost experience of the study, as the prospect of being able to gain access to the mentors sought for sample group one remained uncertain. There had been no prior discussions about this meeting on how many participants were potentially available to be interviewed, or when the phase of data collection would (or could) begin. This meeting presented the first opportunity to begin forging a trusting relationship with MALS and its staff. Building a good rapport, trusting relationship, and embracing confidence in the professionalism of the research study was imperative (O'Leary 2005). Arriving at the premises of MALS on time, as well as being eager to listen and prepared to answer queries of the senior manager, were relatively small but crucial acts that served to begin this process from the outset. The meeting provided the opportunity to ratify the aims of the research, to agree what would be required of participants if they decided to participate, and to discuss the potential risks that could emanate from their involvement. There was also an expectation to establish at the meeting a definitive time frame of when the semi-structured interviews would begin, and the size of the sample that potential mentors would be drawn from. However, the gatekeeper supplied minimal information on the latter.

At the same time, the gatekeeper utilised the meeting to provide insight into the history and everyday practices of MALS. Particular emphasis was afforded to conversation being assigned to the financial insecurities of MALS and its difficulties in recruiting volunteer mentors from the surrounding area. It was highlighted repeatedly that MALS featured a relatively small workforce in comparison to the quantity of mentees requiring support. As such, MALS was hindered by not having the resources to allocate a current volunteer to update its current ICT software in order to transfer the personal profiles of all its current mentees from paper form to digital format. This situation was seized as an opportunity to work together with MALS to build a rapport, and hopefully lead to the potential to engage

with volunteer mentors in due course. This involved two days a week for five consecutive weeks, of travelling to the MALS premises to perform the task of updating their ICT systems, and manually entering the personal profiles of all current mentees. The gatekeeper rewarded this voluntary act with a list of seven mentors and their completed consent forms, as well as dates and times when mentors were available to be interviewed. Although it is unknown whether a decision to overlook the opportunity to aid MALS would have resulted in gaining access to a sample of mentors, it was clear that voluntarily offering to assist MALS acted to instil a level of trust and confidence in the relationship between gatekeeper and researcher. Over the course of three weeks, all seven semi-structured interviews were conducted (See: Appendix F). These took place in a safe and secure room at the premises of MALS, with each mentor being interviewed once, and this comprising their entire involvement in the research study.

Sample group two: Practitioners from Knowsley's IOM team

The public and private sector organisations that serve as active members of Knowsley's IOM team were identified as sites to sample practitioners for the second sample grouping. The process of making initial contact with these organisations located throughout the Metropolitan Borough of Knowsley was conducted strategically, as there were no assurances of being able to contact and obtain a representation of all, nor some of those identified. To improve the potential of contacting and amassing a sample representative of all the organisations identified within Knowsley's IOM team, the organisations whose location permitted the ability to be approached in person were targeted first. Those locales throughout Knowsley that were approached were numerous drugs and alcohol services, housing trust associations, Jobcentres, and police stations. The advantage of employing such a direct approach served to minimise the time taken to receive a correspondence (if any). It also allowed, at a minimum, the opportunity to obtain clarity on who within the organisation to approach and their contact details. In each instance of making initial contact with these organisations, it was important to be clear, concise, and courteous in order to increase the potential of being provided with contact details of the individual(s) in the relevant department to assist in reaching a sampling pool of practitioners.

This direct approach proved successful as each organisation approached resulted in obtaining contact details to further the study. Emails and telephone calls were made to gauge and

establish the general interest of whether practitioners at these organisations were open to participating (See: Appendix G). It was key during these conversations to provide a sufficient amount of quality information relayed amongst senior and managerial figures, in order for them to make an informed decision on whether to allow a sample to be sought. Organisations approved access and provided a list of the names, job titles, and contact details of their practitioners. Practitioners were purposively sampled from these lists, with a focus upon selecting a broad spectrum of roles and/or positions within each organisation. Sixteen practitioners were selected and an email was sent to each which included a brief background of the researcher, the purpose of conducting the research study, as well as an electronic copy of a participant information sheet and consent form (See: Appendix B, G and H). Dates and times were arranged with all seven practitioners, who responded stating their choice to be interviewed at the premises of their organisation for purposes of convenience.

A snowball sampling technique was then used where the practitioners who had been interviewed provided the contact details of individuals they considered to have the experience relevant to addressing the key research questions of the study (Coleman 1958; May 1993; Eland-Goossensen et al. 1997; Seale 1998; Bryman 2001). The initial pool of seven interviewed practitioners expanded to the contact details of a further 20 practitioners representative of the broad spectrum of roles and/or positions within the remaining organisations of interest provided by the participants. The trust, confidence, and relationship forged in the semi-structured interviews conducted, coupled with the participant's interest in the study, increased the snowball sampling. This method proved particularly helpful in identifying and accessing representatives from smaller, more marginal non-statutory partners. Each of these 20 practitioners were sent an email, which again included a brief background of the researcher, the purpose of conducting the research study, as well as an electronic copy of a participant information sheet and consent form (See: Appendix B, G and H). Correspondence was received from nine practitioners providing their consent to participate. Dates and times of interviews were arranged with all nine participants, who also replied outlining their wish to be interviewed at the premises of their organisation.

Taking a period of five months to complete, a total of 16 semi-structured interviews were conducted with representation from all Knowsley IOM partner agencies; police, probation, prison service, local authority, drug, alcohol, and mental health service providers, housing services, and family cohesion initiatives (See: Appendix I). All practitioners were

interviewed once and all were experienced practitioners actively involved in the management and supervision of recently incarcerated individuals in Knowsley.

Sample group three: Lay members from communities throughout Knowsley

This sample was composed of lay members from communities throughout the Metropolitan Borough of Knowsley who possessed the ‘everyday’ capabilities to interact with ex-prisoners, be this knowingly or unconsciously. These individuals provided a representation of the informal, passive, and organic roles a person from society can play in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners. It was decided, in accordance with relevant methodological literature (See: Eisenhardt 1989; Stewart and Shamdasani 1990; Frey and Fontana 1993; Knodel 1993; Bryman 2001; Gomm 2004; Gray 2004; O’Leary 2005), that eight to 12 focus groups ranging in sizes of four to eight participants would be both attainable and plentiful in order to acquire relevant data to address the key research questions underlying the study. To obtain a representative sample of lay members throughout the communities of Knowsley to participate, an array of locale where pre-existing groupings and networks can readily meet were identified. These sites were purposively identified through the manual searching of relevant internet websites, which could identify and provide the locations of community centres, local interest groups, parishes, tenants’ forums, and residents’ groups throughout the neighbourhoods of Knowsley. Given the scale of the locations identified, it was impractical to visit each location in person, despite the advantage that this would have served to minimise the time taken to receive a correspondence (if any). Alternatively, all community centres and local interest groups were visited in person and flyers outlining a synopsis of the study, criteria necessary to participate, and details for potential participants to contact if they wished to take part, were distributed (See: Appendix J). All parishes, tenants’ forums, and residents’ groups identified were contacted via telephone, email, and/or post so as to provide a brief background of the researcher, the purpose of conducting the research study, as well as to send copies of a participant information sheet and consent form (See: Appendix C, K and L). In total, correspondence was received from 50 individuals detailing their consent to participating in the study. These 50 individuals were contacted in order to determine and arrange a mutual date, time, and location to conduct their focus groups.

In regard to the locations that each focus group was conducted, the site was where each person had been purposively sampled. At least one individual from each focus group had

identified through correspondence that they were able to gain physical access to said locations. It was arranged with this person beforehand that, on the date of their respected focus group, they would meet 15 minutes earlier at the location with the researcher. This was to ensure that the room in which the focus group would take place could be 'laid out' accordingly prior to the arrival of the remaining focus group members. Overall, 11 locations spawned the involvement of the 50 members of society. Fortuitously, each of these locations resulted neatly in the formation of 11 focus groups in sizes previously identified that it was necessary to ensure a comfortable setting could be created in which to facilitate discussions by all involved (Yin 2003), with the smallest focus group containing four people, and the largest focus group containing seven people. Research participants from sample three took part in a focus group once, and this reflected their total involvement in the research study. It took a period of five months in order to conduct all 11 focus groups with the 50 participants from this sample (See: Appendix M).

Methodological tools

The decision to utilise qualitative methodological tools for data collection centred upon their strength in the pursuit of knowledge of the social world directly from those subjects influenced by and within this environment. This was in keeping with the research study's aim of gaining knowledge and understanding of the roles people can play in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners, directly from the spectrum of individuals representative of the roles played in practice: volunteer mentors, practitioners, and social networks of lay participants. Qualitative research methods permitted these participants to disclose what they see, hear, and feel in the environment around them, as well as their interpretations of, and associated meanings with, their surrounding environment. To allow the individuals of this study the opportunity to provide their perspectives of the social world, the qualitative research methods of semi-structured interviews and focus groups were utilised.

- Semi-structured interviews

Volunteer mentors from MALS and practitioners representative of the organisations encompassing Knowsley's IOM were interviewed. The appeal of semi-structured interviews was the power that they offered mentors and practitioners (May 1993; Miller and Glassner

1997; Fontana and Frey 2000), as this methodological tool provided each mentor and practitioner with a platform to provide their understanding and interpretation of the social world, and reinforced to them that their narrative upon the social world was worthy of consideration (May 1993; Miller and Glassner 1997; Flick 1998; Cohen and Manion, 2000 cited in Gray 2004:383; Fontana and Frey 2000; Bryman 2001). Moreover, the reduced adherence to structure and flexibility afforded by semi-structured interviews encouraged each mentor and practitioner to provide insight into what they believed was relevant and important (May 1993; Miller and Glassner 1997; Flick 1998; Bryman 2001; Mason 2002). This study routinely departed from the prepared interview guide to obtain richer and detailed answers, based on the lines of enquiry raised by mentors and practitioners during their interviews (May 1993; Rubin and Rubin 1995; Denscombe 1998; Kumar 1999; Bryman 2001; Clough and Nutbrown 2002; Mason 2002; Gray 2004). As a result, the positional context of each mentor and practitioner interviewed shaped the answers to the questions posed.

Despite the flexibility of the questions asked, there existed the necessity for the preparation and inclusion of an interview guide (See: Appendix N and O). This contained questions that specified a clear research focus, which served to strengthen the ability to collect data relevant to addressing the three key research questions. It could not be overlooked how, despite the advantageous appeal of interviews at presenting mentors and practitioners with the opportunity to provide their understanding and interpretation of how the social world influences their readiness, willingness, and abilities to play a role in processes of desistance, some were reserved and less reluctant to disclose this information (Thompson and Bornat 1978; Bryman 2001). Of the few occasions when mentors and practitioners would be hesitant to provide detailed answers, particularly arising at the beginning of their interviews, the interview guide sought to satisfy that attempts were made to acquire an answer that addressed the study's three key research questions (Bryman 2001). When these same individuals became more trusting and willing to engage as their interviews progressed, questions on the interview guide, in which less detailed answers had been provided, were revisited. Yet, despite an adherence to addressing the three key research questions of this study, the research remained open throughout to modify existing or creating new research questions accordingly based upon the data supplied by mentors and practitioners (Bryman 2001). The inclusion of an interview guide served, therefore, for the most part as a baseline to evolve as and when unexpected themes of interest worthy of pursuing arose during interviews. It also served as a

reminder of key questions or themes not yet discussed, or where greater depth could be sought.

The prepared interview guides utilised for mentors and practitioners (See: Appendix N and O) featured open-ended questions that were neither leading nor included unnecessary and vague language to confuse or discourage the participants from answering (Bryman 2001; Creswell 2009). Whilst it was necessary to demonstrate a command of knowledge about the subject area, and an awareness of terminology that mentors and practitioners may use, it would have been incorrect to assume that each mentor and participant were well versed on all themes associated with their role (Bryman 2001). Questions that were directed towards mentors and practitioners were, therefore, clear, concise, and balanced (Rubin and Rubin 1995; Bryman 2001; Gray 2004). It was important not to be overreaching in the pursuit of answers that would fill the void in theoretical knowledge and understanding that this research study sought to achieve. Each semi-structured interview was viewed as an opportunity to provide a platform for those individuals identified most influential in an ex-prisoner's process of desistance, to individually explain what they believe their role is, should be, and/or can be, and why. The reception from mentors and practitioners was overwhelmingly positive about the opportunity to converse on a non-judgemental platform about the benefits and difficulties associated with their role, especially during the time of transformations to rehabilitation (See: Chapter Three). There was a distinct sensibility expressed by mentors and practitioners that the semi-structured interviews were welcomed and well received. Several mentors and practitioners verbally noted that it served as a therapeutic experience for them to disclose their feelings on the challenges experienced in the pursuit of promoting an ex-prisoner's cessation from offending, with several stating that they felt a sense of liberation in being able to 'finally' voice the challenges involved in performing their roles in practice.

With an interview guide serving as a foundation, each semi-structured interview began with introductory questions (Bryman 2001). These questions sought to determine an understanding of the timeframe that mentors and practitioners had been at each of their respective organisations, as well as an explanation of their role. In doing so, mentors and practitioners would routinely ask whether they should provide their personal interpretation of the roles they play, or the view that their organisation would conceive their roles to be. It was such clarification that mentors and practitioners sought which neatly led into asking follow-up and probing questions to establish their understanding and meaning attributable to the three key research questions of the study (Bryman 2001). Although it was a host of direct and indirect

questions which were the predominate feature of the semi-structured interviews (Bryman 2001), these types of questions focused upon acquiring not least mentors' and practitioners' opinions on the desistance process of ex-prisoners, but also what they believed were the opinions of other key stakeholders upon this same topic. In the search for the answers to address the three key research questions underpinning the study, it was important to listen and be attentive as this was reflected in the quality of the data obtained (See: McCracken 1988; Punch 1998). The semi-structured interviews were, therefore, not conducted in haste, as to remain focused and able to digest the data obtained and restructure questions and lines of enquiry accordingly; no more than two were conducted in a day. Similarly, each semi-structured interview lasted approximately 60 minutes (Stewart and Shamdasani 1990).

- Focus groups

The rationale in conducting focus groups with lay members of the communities within Knowsley centred on examining how social groupings construct meaning (Sayre, 2001 cited in Gray 2004:490). Emphasis was assigned upon what social groups believed were the community's roles in processes of desistance, including how and why they have reached this determination on what these roles should be. Focus groups allowed the ability to discover data on the opinions of lay members regarding desistance, as well as the range of understanding and interpretation for why and how they had reached these constructions of thought (Tonkiss 1998; Bryman 2001). Additionally, through this natural process of discussion and interaction with members of their community, the focus group potentially allowed for each layperson's viewpoint and what they perceive as significant to be challenged by fellow lay people (May 1993; Wilkinson 1998; Bryman 2001). The focus group method thus served as an expression of how lay members of communities in Knowsley are influenced by and influential in the social world, and how these actions take place in reality through interaction (Byrne 1998; Bryman 2001; Sayre, 2001 cited in Gray 2004:490; Creswell 2009). It also served to force all participants of the focus groups to question and potentially revise their own beliefs with this gained understanding and interpretation (May 1993; Kitzinger 1994; Bryman 2001).

A common observation was that not all beliefs expressed by community members throughout focus groups were grounded upon accurate knowledge, and/or widely recognised as morally acceptable in relation to principles of law. Yet, on these frequent occasions when an

individual would express inaccurate knowledge, this nevertheless influenced fellow lay members to agree with them (Lindlof and Taylor 2002). Convincing fellow lay members was also observed to be influenced based upon the character traits of the individual presenting and delivering this ‘knowledge’ (Lindlof and Taylor 2002). Such social interactions take place each day in the social world and constantly reconfigure the civic order, and it was therefore important to recreate this environment to obtain rich, deep, and relevant data (Tonkiss 1998; Bryman 2001; Gray 2004). Each focus group, therefore, presented a microcosm of the social world and provided data that led to answering the three key research questions guiding the study, including answers to questions not considered in the pre-data collection phase of the study. In regard to the questions that were asked in each focus group, a topic guide was prepared (See: Appendix P) that featured relatively few open-ended questions, but more of a range of themes that were to be covered. These clear, concise, and balanced open-ended questions served as ‘icebreakers’ to encourage discussions (Bryman 2001). When individuals in each focus group began conversing, there was flexibility in allowing them to continue and introduce what they envisioned as significant (Rubin and Rubin 1995; Kumar 1999; Bryman 2001; Gray 2004), with this study remaining open to modifying existing or creating new research questions upon the data supplied by participants (Bryman 2001). Even so, the preparation and inclusion of a topic guide was necessary as it served as a prompt/reminder of relevant themes yet to be discussed for the times when people did digress and began discussing subject matter irrelevant to the focus of the research (Bryman 2001; Freeman 2006).

It is important not to overlook the impact that the role and level of moderator involvement had upon the quality and quantity of the data that was generated (Tonkiss 1998; Puchta and Potter 2004). Focus groups as a research instrument have a potentially volatile nature (Bryman 2001). There was, thus, a marked responsibility to get the balance of moderator involvement correct, as too little or too great can have a negative impact. After careful consideration, it was deemed best that the moderator’s voice be heard the least (Wilkinson 1999), for the intention was that all participants contribute and that their participation be on a relatively reasonable equal footing (Bryman 2001; Freeman 2006). Therefore, it was important to select and conduct each focus groups in a familiar locale and ‘safe’ environment that served to promote not least the rate of response, but also engagement in discussions (Puchta and Potter 2004). The moderator’s involvement was essentially to control the flow of discussion, with participant information sheets (See: Appendix C) purposively detailing what

was expected of each individual's conduct during their focus group prior to their involvement (Frey and Fontana 1993; Knodel 1993; Bryman 2001). During focus groups, no situations arose that required individuals to either be warned or ejected for use of expletive and/or discriminatory language, or for inciting and/or using violence. Even so, when engaging people around challenging topics, people became argumentative in some incidents. The decisions taken to defuse these situations will be expanded upon later in the chapter: 'Engaging people around challenging topics'.

In comparison, fewer incidences involved an overzealous speaker. However, on those occasions when this did occur, it was when debate during focus groups turned to whether communities could be 'doing more' than at present to support the re-settlement and re-integration of ex-prisoners. Based on their views and passionate sentiment upon this contemporary criminal justice issue, certain individuals tended to dominate discussions. It was necessary to limit overtly prominent individuals so that fellow focus group participants did not feel discouraged from contributing (Bryman 2001). Interjecting to ask other participants as to whether they would like to add to comments made, and whether they agreed or disagreed and why, was the tactic used. Whilst it was a risk in curtailing the voices of certain individuals, it was essential to do so in order to obtain a wider representation of views, and to strengthen the potential for the voices of those reticent individuals unwilling to challenge the views of fellow focus group members to be heard.

Each focus group concluded with sincere thanks to participants for their attendance, and the opportunity was afforded for them to ask questions and/or raise queries that had not been addressed and answered through the course of the focus group. It is important to note that, in order to remain focused, digest the data obtained, and restructure questions and lines of enquiry accordingly, focus groups were conducted diligently with no more than one conducted per day. Likewise, the duration of each focus group was kept to approximately 90 minutes in length (Stewart and Shamdasani 1990).

Political and Ethical dilemmas

Ethical and political issues governed each decision-making stage of the research study, with both principles an expression of the role that values play during the course of an investigation (May 1993; Sarantakos 1993; Silverman 2000; Bryman 2001). Acknowledging the importance of the role that ethical and political issues play in conducting social research, this

study adopted a universalist stance. Underpinned by the stipulation that it is morally reprehensible to transgress ethical and political concerns for the purposes of conducting research, the universalist stance serves to safeguard the researcher(s) and research participant(s) throughout the course of a study (Bryman 2001). This research study readily adopted a universalist stance; yet, to do otherwise would have been in contravention of the ethical guidelines set forth by the research ethics committee at Liverpool John Moores University (LJMU), which stipulates that all research adopt a universalist stance. Despite being a self-funded research study, there is an affiliation to LJMU through the researcher as a PhD candidate of this academic establishment. As such, there existed the potential for LJMU to be affected negatively if the research conducted was carried out unethically (Bryman 2001; Clough and Nutbrown 2002; Gibson and Brown 2009). This political consideration, therefore, did not affect the research outlined within this thesis, which would have otherwise adopted the stance of universalism. In regard to the ethical principles influential upon social research, these divide into four distinctive yet overlapping areas: whether there is the potential for harm, lack of informed consent, invasions to privacy, and deception (Bryman 2001). There were four notable occasions when conducting this research study that ethical principles featured prominently, as will now be discussed.

- Operating within the time/age of Transforming Rehabilitation (TR)

There was a considerable political dimension to the study due to the decision to conduct the research at a moment of unprecedented changes to legislature, which have transformed rehabilitative practices and led to the devolution of power and responsibility on a micro level (See: Chapters Three and Four). Moreover, any research that involves a participant's representative of the public, private, and VCS discussing the role and effectiveness of society is to feature political aspects. This is particularly when there were mentors from MALS, a penal VCS organisation reliant on short-term funding cycles to secure their operational capacity, as well as professionals from organisations involved in the supervision and management of high risk ex-prisoners via Knowsley's IOM team. As a researcher, it was necessary to be careful not to become a political pawn. This was because, by speaking to mentors from MALS, it was clear from their voices of the challenges that they and the organisation were currently experiencing due to the negative relationships they had with their supply-chain provider, and fellow members of Knowsley's IOM team. When conversing with

practitioners in their semi-structured interviews, it was therefore imperative not to side with mentors, but to lead discussions in the search of pressuring practitioners to promote and support MALS, as some of these practitioners were chief executives and commissioners directly involved in the distribution of financial support throughout the agencies of Knowsley's IOM team. It was important to refrain from entering discussions which sought to heighten the potential for participants to become withdrawn during phases of data collection, thereby compromising the quality and quantity of available data to be obtained.

- Maintaining boundaries during observations of MALS

As discussed previously, securing access to a sample of mentors from MALS involved an indeterminate period spent at the premises updating their current ICT software, and manually transferring the personal profiles of all their current mentees from paper form to digital format. Apprehensions about being permitted access to the personal data of mentees were raised with the gatekeeper for MALS. Despite self-assurance that such information would not be mishandled and utilised for personal gain, there nevertheless existed an uneasiness about being able to view a mentee's personal data without their consent. However, the gatekeeper did not consider an individual with no affiliation to MALS having access to this information as unethical. Rather, it was perceived by the gatekeeper as an excuse to refrain from assisting MALS while mentors were sought. In volunteering to perform this task and becoming immersed in the MALS occupational culture, further ethical and political dilemmas ensued. There was an ever-present pressure to uphold the ethical integrity of the study and abide by the universalist stance adopted. However, in doing so, it served to continuously inhibit the potential to acquire participation from mentors.

These dilemmas revolved in principle around the office space allocated to input the personal information of mentees, as this space was shared with MALS staff. Therefore, what began through initial interactions with this individual as cordial conversations, with them seeking to enquire about the researcher's age, number of siblings, location where they grew up, and hobbies/interests and so forth. This on occasion felt like attempts on their part to impose pressure, to influence and alter how the research was conducted from what was originally conceived, which would have resulted in deceiving the participants (Bryman 2001). There was no funding attached to the research and the project was not concerned with an evaluation of the efficacy of the organisation's work. However, there were occasions when curiosity

about the research ambitions from some representatives from the host organisations had the potential to undermine assurances made to other participants. A staff member explicitly enquired about the range of questions and themes that were to be included in the interview guide and strongly suggested the inclusion of certain questions to ask mentors, the purpose of which sought to ascertain mentors' least favourable aspects of the organisation. The intention here was clear, as the individual concerned stated that they would speak to each individual personally regarding their answers to these questions, citing that they would, therefore, require the transcripts of each interview and the accompanying name of the mentor interviewed. It was explained that they could not be provided with a copy of the interview guide, nor be permitted to include or omit questions. It was also explained to them how they could not be provided with the transcripts of other participants' semi-structured interviews.

When conducting research in the field, it is necessary and important to engage with host organisations to facilitate the research taking place. However, it was important that there was no 'research bargaining' and the ethical principles overseeing this research study were upheld, even if it had the potential to fragment relationships that had been established previously (Bryman 2001). To supply the transcripts or allow undue influence on the fieldwork would have refuted the universalist stance adopted (Ryen 1997; Bryman 2001). It is also important to note that changes to the study would have resulted in deceiving mentors, as they would have been making a decision to consent and participate in research that was represented differently to that outlined in the participant information sheets supplied to them (Sarantakos 1993; Bryman 2001; Denscombe 2010). Despite the difficult decision taken in refusing to abide with the request made here, this did not impact on being provided with a sample of mentors, nor did the staff member themselves decline to be interviewed.

- Engaging people around challenging topics

In conducting focus groups, there were some occasions when participants would become engaged in confrontational discussions due to the subject matter of the research study. Those challenging topics that incited the most confrontation amongst participants within their focus group were regarding ex-prisoners' 'rights' to community resources, methods of increasing public participation in processes of desistance, and whether people should be paid to play a role in processes of desistance. Just as it served as a risk in deciding to limit the voices of people who served to dominate focus group discussions, stopping overtly argumentative

debates between people was also a difficult choice. Yet, in those incidences when two or more individuals became argumentative, or would repeatedly speak at the same time, attempts would be made to resolve this by reminding individuals to respect each other's views. However, if individuals persisted, the decision would be made to ensure that, for the remainder of the focus group, individuals were to raise their hand if they wished to speak. This process did work as intended as a mechanism for curtailing arguments, whilst maintaining worthwhile discussion for the remainder of the focus group. Arguments not least had the tendency to dissuade other people from contributing in discussions, but it was necessary to be vigilant to the harm that could be experienced by a person, be it physical, mental, or a combination of these (Bailey, 1978 cited in Kumar 1999:286; Sarantakos 1993).

To further minimise the occurrence of harm experienced by participants during their involvement in the focus group setting, each participant's anonymity and confidentiality were enhanced by the use of pseudonyms, with all individuals provided with a nametag on which to write their chosen pseudonym. All participants were instructed via their participant information sheets, and reinstructed prior to their focus group, to address themselves and fellow focus group participants by using their preferred name. Moreover, as a condition to participate, individuals were required to consent that they would refrain from sharing that which was discussed with non-participants outside the focus group (See: Appendix C). However, although those willing to participate waived their confidentiality to fellow participants within their focus group, there were no identifiable means of ensuring that focus group participants refrained from disclosing what was discussed in their focus group with non-participants (Gomm 2004). Therefore, the choice to restrict the occurrence of people becoming involved in argumentative debate during focus groups may have impeded the potential to acquire additional data. Yet, reducing the rate of potential harm that could have transpired following the completion of the focus group was considered a far greater consideration.

Due to the universalist stance that was readily adopted, there was a responsibility to reduce the harm that could be caused to participants through discussing challenging topics. However, this is not to say that disagreements amongst people were discouraged entirely. Those discussions that were civil and involved people constructively debating topics in a calm tone, which enabled individuals to interject and contribute, were quite revealing and enhanced the data acquired (Kitzinger 1994). However, it was important to be vigilant of situations when harm could be experienced. It is impossible to anticipate, identify, and prepare for each

situation that harm is likely to occur, as harm is a subjective term and experienced differently dependent upon the participant (Byrne 1998). It was for this reason that the participant information sheets provided to all focus group participants (See: Appendix C) informed them in clear and concise language that it was their decision, and their decision alone, whether they chose to participate (Ali and Kelly 1998). The participant information sheets also notified them that, if they decided to withdraw from the research at any time, they were free to do so, they were not required to specify a reason for doing so, and no negative consequences would result from the decision they chose (Sarantakos 1993; Byrne 1998; Denscombe 2010; Flynn and Goldsmith 2013).

- Professional on professional, volunteer on volunteer

There was potential for mentors and practitioners, during their semi-structured interviews, to be critical and call into question the professionalism of fellow colleagues and/or the organisation they are affiliated. Therefore, minimising any invasion of privacy and reducing the potential for harm was an important consideration once more. However, as has been evidenced previously, maintaining the confidentiality of participants in qualitative research requires far more care in comparison to the relative ease necessary for anonymising quantitative data (Ali and Kelly 1998; Bryman 2001). Yet, it was essential given that there were several occasions when, during the course of conducting semi-structured interviews, mentors and practitioners would name and disclose information about an individual or organisation that would portray them in a negative light. Coincidentally, in each incidence, the person or organisation discussed negatively was a fellow participant or organisation from which participants had been sampled. Whether the mentor or practitioner disclosing this information during their semi-structured interview was truthful in their claims was considered irrelevant for purposes of ethics. However, the information they were supplying nevertheless possessed the potential to cause harm for themselves and the individual and/or organisation they were identifying. To allow mentors and practitioners to speak candidly about what they deemed significant without fear of reprisals, the decision was therefore taken to assign pseudonyms to all research participants involved in this study so that they could not be directly identified in future dissemination of the completed thesis (Flick 1998). All individuals were assured prior to their involvement in the study via their participant information sheets (See: Appendix A, B, and C) that the use of pseudonyms would be used to

promote their anonymity and confidentiality (Robson and McCartan 1993). However, assigning a pseudonym for each participant is not always sufficient to prevent harm that could be experienced resulting from the data they choose to supply. To further safeguard people's identities, the organisations and social networks to which they were associated with, and representative of, were also allocated pseudonyms (Alderson 1998; Flick 1998).

To reiterate, enhancing a person's confidentiality was therefore not only to promote their capacity to divulge information for the purposes of this study, but also to safeguard their likelihood of experiencing harm during and post data collection. This was achieved by the use of pseudonyms, and ensuring that general notes, recordings, and transcribed data were stored separately from participants' consent forms, which could identify them as the individual that provided the source of data. In attempting to uphold the integrity of the ethical principles underpinning this study, the data disclosed by each mentor and practitioner during their semi-structured interviews was not shared with fellow participants, regardless of whether this data called into question their professionalism. It was important to 'exit the field' following the phase of data collection smoothly, as little would have been gained and far more lost if participants had been purposefully deceived and their data disclosed with fellow participants. The decision to purposefully deceive participants can indeed impact future research ventures (Erikson 1967; Bryman 2001; Ryen 2004). It was therefore an important responsibility to not 'spoil' the field, but instead to leave the door open for future research interests based upon the relationships and networks forged, including accessibility for fellow academics (Ryen 2004).

Data analysis

Qualitative research can produce a wealth of rich data, yet the desirability to collect this data can overshadow the difficulties in attaching analytic significance (Rutterford 1998). With the analytic processes and codification of qualitative data far less well established compared to the unambiguous nature of the rules for analysing quantitative data (Bryman 2001), the identification and significance of themes found in the data collected was not a consideration that came to the fore after its collection concluded. To maximise the potential quality and integrity of the data gathered, each semi-structured interview and focus group was analysed immediately after they were completed (Krueger and Casey 1988; Gray 2004). This practice of initial coding involved reading through general notes and partially scribed transcripts taken

during each semi-structured interview and focus group conducted (Krueger and Casey 1988). This allowed for a consideration of what appeared significant amongst that observed and the terminology and tone expressed by participants (Kitzinger 1995; Bryman 2001; Rabiee 2004). Beginning a process of initial coding as early as possible enhanced the capability to become familiar with and understand better the context, intensity, and frequency of the data, to assist with future thematic analysis (Punch 1998; Bryman 2001; Rabiee 2004). Codes at this initial stage were simple, yet precise, with data organised and labelled neatly into various categories to discover further those considered most significant (Flick 1998; Punch 1998). Categories were grounded on, but not exclusive to, the aims, objectives and research questions guiding the study, those being studied, and relevant existing theoretical literature (Flick 1998; Punch 1998; Bryman 2001).

When the phase of data collection had concluded, the process of transcribing and assigning codes to the full quota of data began. In addition to the notes made during each semi-structured interview and focus group, all research participants consented to having their involvement recorded via Dictaphone (May 1993; Byrne 1998; Bryman 2001; Gray 2004; Marshall and Rossman 2006). To minimise the possibility of potentially significant data being lost, all semi-structured interview and focus group recordings were manually transcribed verbatim (Bryman 2001). The choice to transcribe manually all 23 hours of semi-structured interview data, and 16 and a half hours of focus group data, was made with the intention to engage thoroughly with the data collected. The advantage of manually transcribing the audio recordings enabled familiarity with the data, allowing for a greater identification and awareness of the comparisons amongst different participants' accounts (May 1993; Bryman 2001), more so than if computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software had been implemented (May 1993; Bryman 2001). Upon completing the transcription of the audio recordings, each transcript was read and the method of initial coding used. Codes were assigned to almost each sentence of every transcript, with focus once more on conveying what the data represented, correlations to relevant existing literature, and whether the data directly presented answers to the three key research questions overseeing the study (Flick 1998; Punch 1998; Bryman 2001).

Following the phase of initial coding, the process of focus coding began, with emphasis on the initial codes that appeared most revealing and analytically significant to the purposes of addressing the study's key research questions (Bryman 2001). When re-exploring the codes developed during the initial coding phase, a proportion were discarded, with new codes

generated both independently and through a combination of existing codes (Bryman 2001). The movement from the generation of these selective and analytical codes to an understanding and conceptualisation of the data came through a third phase of coding, namely theoretical coding (Bryman 2001). This phase of coding was equally significant, with ideas and concepts from pre-existing theoretical literature applied due to their relevancy, and as a means of sensitising concepts and developing the progress toward answering the study's key research questions (Bryman 2001). Additionally, conducting this theoretical phase of coding reduced the fragmentation of data and the loss of context in what was conveyed by participants, and the impact of the social setting upon their responses (Bryman 2001). Re-reading and re-examining the transcripts of the semi-structured interviews and focus groups allowed for greater awareness of the theoretical ideas and linkages amongst the data (Flick 1998; Braun and Clarke 2006). This final phase of coding was, therefore, necessary to conduct before the data collected could be analysed. Having familiarity with the data's relationships to theoretical concepts was necessary to thematically analyse and identify themes, so that the justifications and implications for their importance could be interpreted (Bryman 2001; Gomm 2004; Braun and Clarke 2006).

Thematic analysis was the approach chosen, with the process of generating thematic codes involving a consideration of, and adherence to, numerous criteria (Bryman 2001). The most common criteria employed for establishing a theme was the identification of recurring patterns in the data (Punch 1998; Braun and Clarke 2006), with repetitions in the data being identified as a theme if they were relevant to one or more of the three key research questions, scope of the research more generally, or (in)direct reference to relevant research literature and theory (Flick 1998; Bryman 2001). Commonalities and contrasts in the data were regarded as further criteria in establishing themes. Similarities and differences were sought in the understanding and meanings that mentors, practitioners, and lay members of communities within Knowsley attributed to a topic, as well as how these understandings and meanings differed or compared amongst participants in each sample grouping. Focus on linguistic expression was a further notable criterion adhered to in the search and formatting of themes. Throughout the data, there was a host of indicators relevant to this criterion, such as how people inferred causality in their dialogue through use of the words 'because' and 'since' (Bryman 2001), as well as the ways in which metaphors were incorporated by individuals as a means of demonstrating thought. Also included was the differing local, organisational, and (in)formal terminology used by participants to describe and attach meaning to the same topic

(Bryman 2001). The precise themes generated through this process of thematic analysis for each sample grouping of this study will be the focus of discussions in the succeeding analysis chapters.

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the methodological choices taken in the pursuit of furthering our understanding of the public's conceptualisation of their role in supporting the desistance processes of ex-prisoners. The discussion started by identifying the three key research questions that shape the study. The targeting of three specific publics whom ex-prisoners can expect to engage on their release was explained and the discussion explored as to why it was necessary and desirable to build a spectrum of interested parties, from those who feel motivated to support, those professionally obliged to support ex-prisoners, and then those who represent the wider community. The choice of location, Knowsley, as an area experiencing heightened disadvantage, was explained and, together, the geography and stratified sampling strategy helped construct a sense of the social landscape ex-prisoners in Knowsley would return to.

The chapter has also provided an insight into the challenges of conducting research into this sensitive topic at this sensitive time. The discussion of offending behaviour and of a topic that frames a 'responsibility' for the public to support ex-prisoners has the capacity to stimulate discussion and reaction. The management of focus groups needs to be sensitive to this dynamic and facilitate discussions that are able to use the strength of feeling created, but in ways that are not harmful or threatening to others present. This study, taking place as it has during a period of austerity and the administering of the TR reform programme, has encountered criminal justice professionals and VCS representatives at a time of great uncertainty where concerns around funding and change abound. The discussion of professionals passing judgement on other professional partners' efficacy in reducing re-offending, and of the research to indicate any level of evaluation and judgement, was very real and impacted on the research. This climate introduced a political dimension to the research that will be identified and worked through in the research data to be presented.

Chapter 6 – Voluntary and community sector involvement in processes of desistance: The experiences of mentors at MALS

Introduction

This chapter provides an analysis of the interviews involving staff and volunteer mentors at MALS, a VCS organisation based in Knowsley. MALS is one of three independent VCS organisations within this area offering a mentoring service to formerly incarcerated individuals identified as a low–high risk of re-offending. Mentoring is considered a viable practical and emotional tool, which can serve as a ‘bridge’ for ex-prisoners as they seek to ‘successfully’ re-integrate and re-settle into community life following custody. Through one-to-one communication, mentors do not only seek to encourage ex-prisoners to contemplate altering their attitudes, thinking, and behaviour. For mentoring is also an occasion that provides those ex-prisoners willing to ‘make good’ with the opportunities to access accommodation, education, training and employment, as well as post-release support for drugs and alcohol dependencies.

The semi-structured interviews conducted with mentors from MALS explored their personal understanding of the role they play in the rehabilitation of ex-prisoners, their motivations for becoming involved in mentoring, and their capacity to ‘successfully’ mentor. These discussions were particularly significant as they were taking place against the backdrop of recent reforms to the delivery of rehabilitative services, as introduced by the TR agenda. TR has seen change to the supervision and management of formerly incarcerated individuals post-release. This has, through marketisation, led to increasing the opportunities and availability of financial support for VCS organisations to be at the forefront of service delivery. These reforms sought to revolutionise the operational capacity of penal VCS organisations such as MALS, who, throughout its decade-long existence, had previously been reliant upon sporadic sources of funding from public donations, supplemented by limited access to financial support from charitable trusts and The Big Lottery Fund. However, whilst mentors at MALS discussed the fact that TR reforms have had a considerable influence on their motivations and capacity to mentor, this influence has been unexpectedly detrimental.

Formed in June 2010, the VCS organisation MALS presents an example of the increased opportunities for members of communities to become empowered in shaping and delivering public services, which the State via the notion of ‘The Big Society’ sought to encourage (See: House of Commons 2011; Defty 2014). The organisation was established in a year when the government of the time was renewing its commitment to building a stronger civil society through efforts to modernise commissioning and improve the quality and efficiency of public services (See: Cabinet Office 2010; HM Government 2010; House of Commons 2011; Defty 2014; Gelsthorpe and Dominey 2016). The VCS was viewed as instrumental in enabling the transferral of power from central government into the hands of local communities to be realised (Cabinet Office 2010; HM Government 2010). Penal VCS organisations such as MALS, through their focus on providing ex-prisoners (either upon referral or personal request) with mentoring services to aide their transition from custody to the community, embolden local people to take the lead in addressing and tackling their own social problems. Crime, and its reoccurrence, was one of these social problems that the State was keen to stress that communities should seek to resolve and ‘make right’ (See: Canton 2011). Yet, despite the effort to stimulate volunteerism through devolving powers to communities, the detail in terms of what individuals could and could not do was absent (Atkinson 2012; Avis 2016). No outline criteria necessary for becoming involved in volunteering was offered, and there seemed to be too simplistic an understanding of how the approachability, cultures, and capabilities of VCS organisations differ in practice (See: Broadbridge and Parsons 2003; Parsons and Broadbridge 2004; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Hill and Stevens 2011; Smith and Laurie 2011).

Historically, volunteerism is an altruistic and selfless undertaking that appeals to individuals who are empathetic and sympathetic to other individuals (See: Phillips 1982; Batson, Ahmad and Tsang 2002; Rehberg 2005; Ronel 2006; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Wilhelm and Bekkers 2010; Ronel, Frid and Timor 2013; Corcoran and Grotz 2016; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). Similarly, the growing evidence base of literature upon mentoring details that, what have become considered as the characteristics of a ‘good’ mentor, are selflessness, compassion, honesty, sincerity, and emotional availability (See: Sundeen, Raskoff and Garcia 2007; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Ronel et al. 2009; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Durose et al. 2016; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). Evidence has shown that, in mentoring, high levels of trust are particularly valued by mentees, whereby high levels of trust between mentor and mentee allow stronger emotional relationships to develop (Corcoran and Grotz 2016;

Hoogervorst et al. 2016). Mentees are therefore more forthcoming in revealing their life histories and what they believe is required to enhance their motivations and capacities to desist from re-offending (Baier 1986; Spitz and MacKinnon 1993; Pettit 1995; Elshaug and Metzger 2001; Armstrong 2014; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). In turn, the role of the mentor, to offer encouragement and signpost their mentee to appropriate services that can provide them with the tools to promote their motivations and capacities to desist, is enriched (Baier 1986; Spitz and MacKinnon 1993; Pettit 1995; Elshaug and Metzger 2001; Armstrong 2014; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). When mentors are motivated to volunteer by personal gain and not philanthropy, the levels of trust required to stimulate mentees to engage are weakened (See: Ronel et al. 2009; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). Evidence dictates that ex-prisoners are increasingly inclined to withdraw from the holistic services of the VCS, and alternatively lean upon support offered by former criminogenic networks, which serves to negatively affect their motivations and capacities to desist (Hoogervorst et al. 2016).

The subtle hierarchies and subjectivities within mentoring

Articulating the qualities of ‘good’ and ‘better’ mentors

There are admittedly positive broad characteristics and personal traits that contribute to being a good mentor, such as being empathetic, patient, and a good listener. However, within the mentoring of ex-prisoners there are often more narrowly defined skill sets that are required and these can – according to more experienced peer mentors – take time to learn and require new volunteer mentors to develop their understandings of new cultures of working. This can lead to the development of structures that are dependent on experience that lay mentors, especially when in organisations like MALS, there are a blend of paid dedicated mentoring staff – such as MALS’s lead mentors, Sue and Owen – working alongside volunteers:

“You should not be looking to be paid to volunteer, that is just not the way it goes. So it’s hard then for new mentors to adjust when they arrive and see the place fronted by Owen and Sue, and later find out they are being paid to work here. It can be tough to learn that this is a business, and mentoring is not just about providing a shoulder for someone to cry on. There is so much more that goes on behind the scenes.” (Bill – Volunteer)

As Bill attests, only through their experience in practice of the lived realities of mentoring and the penal VCS do mentors at MALS come to recognise and accept the authority that Sue, Owen and other MALS senior management possess, which merely exemplifies the growing professionalisation of the penal VCS (See: Broadbridge and Parsons 2003; Parsons and Broadbridge 2004; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Hill and Stevens 2011; Smith and Laurie 2011):

“Once you settle in and become aware that MALS, and mentoring as a whole, involves a lot of levers to be pulled and buttons to be pressed in order to work, you just get why there are people like Owen and Sue who should be paid... It’s just part and parcel of how it goes, as there are so many people needing our help, and not enough people or money to go round. So they get paid and run the show because they know that side of the business, and if it wasn’t for them no one could mentor, and no offenders would be helped.” (Bill – Volunteer)

Therefore, at MALS, current mentors did not consider there to be a distinction in the capabilities of paid and volunteer mentors (Ronel et al. 2009; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). Rather, mentors at MALS mutually identified Sue and Owen as ‘good’ mentors motivated by benevolence. Their employment at MALS is justified for the work they perform in addition to their role as a mentor. Owen himself explained that being a paid mentor has subtle, yet intrinsic, benefits, which serve to strengthen his capacity to be a ‘better’ mentor, by improving the quality of the service he is able to provide to his mentees:

“I’m working forty-five-hour weeks, that is some going... So I do more than my fair share round here to keep us afloat... Like hand on heart, the money I get lets me be a better mentor, and a better role model to the lags and the mentors here. If I weren’t getting paid, I couldn’t put the hours in, but that ain’t to say it’s the money that drives me... The money keeps me tied here so I can go out drumming up support, recruiting new mentors, meeting with as many mentees as I can... I am better at what I do because of it.” (Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

As Owen described, in his paid position at MALS he is able to dedicate an increased amount of time to the act of mentoring than he otherwise would be able to if he were required to work at another organisation to obtain an income. Consequently, this has enabled him to support

fellow paid mentor, Sue, to fulfil roles and responsibilities in addition to acting as a mentor. This has involved directing, managing, and supervising the marketing, finances, operations, and administration of MALS. Through such tasks, Owen states that he has enhanced his knowledge and understanding of the localised support that is available for his mentees. Moreover, Owen's capacity to dedicate an improved and consistent source of time has seen him become more involved with formal supervision structures like Knowsley's IOM team. MALS' engagement with partnership arrangement, like IOM, is considered by criminal justice partners to be key in its collective abilities of responding, devising, and delivering intervention, support, and supervision, to its localised cohort of persistent, problematic, and high-risk individuals (See: Barrett et al. 2015; Ministry of Justice 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017c; Merseyside PCC 2017; Merseyside CRC 2018c, d, e, f). Owen notes that, through his involvement with statutory partners, he has developed a network of personal relationships with those organisations directly involved in the re-integration and re-settlement of offenders, which he is able to utilise in order to provide support to his mentees, and share with fellow mentors:

“Like now that we are being funded to support the IOM, I am responsible for attending all the IOM meetings with the offenders who are referred to us by Probation. This is something our other mentors can't do, as they haven't got the time to invest. Being paid I can dedicate my time, and because of being involved, I've met all these different people from different agencies, and made some good links with them... I know before anyone else back at MALS what changes are being made to rehabilitation... I have on call all these people... they trust me.” (Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

Sue, despite her status as a mentor in a paid capacity, was a further example of how a paid mentor can also possess characteristics representative of a 'good' mentor (See: Sundeen, Raskoff and Garcia 2007; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Ronel et al. 2009; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011 Durose et al. 2016; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). Sue expressed how she routinely uses the money she pays herself to invest back into supporting mentees:

“I hate having to take money out the kitty, because it doesn’t bother me whether I am getting paid to do it or not... I would work for free, but MALS would not be what it is today if I couldn’t put all my time into running it. It really is a full-time job.... Often, whatever money I pay myself I spend back on the offenders. I mean, I had one fella living out of a caravan I bought for him and parked outside my house. We desperately could not get him a place to live, so I thought at least this was a way for a few months he had a roof over his head and he would be safe while he settled back into reality.” (Sue – MALS Senior Manager)

In establishing how mentors at MALS conceptualised a ‘good’ mentor, it is important to note that mentors were keen to stress that to be the ‘best’ mentor requires an additional set of qualities. For there was agreement amongst all mentors at MALS that being considered a ‘better’ mentor is determined by the combined wealth of your experience pre-mentoring, and time served as a mentor. By that regard, mentors at MALS identified Sue and Owen as the ‘best’ at mentoring amongst the current mentoring contingent at MALS. Mentors stated that the length of time an individual has been in the role of a mentor, and/or whether they have prior (in)direct experience of crime, is invaluable:

“With my current mentee, I haven’t heard off him in a while... I’ve got in contact with Owen a couple of times letting him know and asking what I should do next... Owen is almost your mentor, you know what I mean?... I think it takes a lot less time for Owen to build trust with some of these people than it does for me. He just gets it, and I wish I could relate to my mentees more so I could crack on a lot sooner and hit the ground running.” (Laura – Volunteer)

The experiences shared by Laura are particularly important in emphasising further the existence of a subtle hierarchy at MALS, in which a mentor’s worth is attributed to their pre-mentoring experience and time served as a mentor. Laura refrains from stating directly that Owen can consequently be considered as a ‘better’ mentor. In purposefully seeking guidance from Owen when encountering difficulties with her mentees, Laura perpetuates a difference in mentoring abilities, in which Owen can build trust with those they mentor with ease drawing on his experiences relating to his history as an ex-prisoner. Through seeking help

from Owen, and equally by Owen offering help to mentors such as Laura, this serves to maintain the existence of a hierarchy and an image that experience is attributable to being a ‘better’ mentor (Ronel et al. 2009; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Hoogervorst et al. 2016; Rowe, Irving and Soppitt 2018). Literature on peer mentoring (See: Gosling and Buck 2015; Buck 2017, 2018) supports Laura’s views that ex-prisoners have been repeatedly evidenced as being able to provide a positive influence on the desistance processes of current and former offenders. However, speaking directly with Owen served to unearth an alternative perspective in reality, which emphasised how he does not believe that his experience as an ex-prisoner denotes him as a ‘better’ mentor:

“It is difficult as people will come up to me and expect I have all the answers... But we need loads of different people round here, because look at the brainy ones who haven’t grafted. Like Laura, and we used to have Jen too, but Laura is from college and University so has something different to add. Being a young girl as well means she will be better mentoring with the girls her age. I can’t do that, so you can’t discriminate, you know? We just need to get people in here, and be like, you’re a mentor, you’re the same as me, get going.” (Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

Uncovering Owen’s insight into the pressure on ex-prisoners who become mentors, and the associated expectations and prominence placed upon them, is valuable. For the assertion by Owen is important in challenging the belief that ex-prisoners are motivated and capable of mentoring because of their first-hand experience (See: Gosling and Buck 2015; Buck 2017, 2018). Moreover, Owen’s words are relevant in considering the recruitment of prospective mentors to penal VCS organisations such as MALS. Owen detailed how, in attributing an association between experience and a heightened capacity to mentor, this can serve to influence organisations to be selective in whom they recruit to mentor. This potentially adds to the failures of tapping into and capitalising upon engaging the involvement of members of society who are motivated to become involved in mentoring, but who do not possess (in)direct experience (i.e. capacities). Furthermore, Owen asserted how, due to the lived realities of the different categories and demographics of ex-prisoner, they hope to mentor. MALS has adapted its focus on recruitment, to encompass selecting mentors with a range of demographics as to ‘better’ deliver a service to their mentees. Through their individual journeys as a mentor, there were indeed various motivations and individual abilities that

mentors at MALS were able to contribute to the overall mentoring capacities of MALS, as detailed in the next section.

Articulating the journey

Journey of the mentor

The mentoring cohort at MALS is a very mixed group drawn from very different backgrounds, featuring ex-prisoners, family and friends of individuals currently or previously involved in crime, as well as individuals with no (in)direct involvement with crime. All arrived at MALS with different motivations to help, as the literature has demonstrated for such organisations (See: Schervish 1997; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Hustinx, Cnaan and Handy 2010; Rochester, Paine and Howlett 2010; Britto, Van Slyke and Francis 2011; Hustinx and Meijs 2011; Studer and Von Schnurbein 2013; Offstein, Chory and Childers Jr 2015). However, irrespective of their differing life histories and motivations for beginning their journey as a mentor, each mentor's journey shared a common underlying theme whereby their decision for becoming involved did not represent a comprehensively planned engagement:

“Obviously when I got out and that, I never thought I would be getting involved. I didn't think I had anything to offer people being a convict and all.” (Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

“My mentoring all started because crime's been around me all my life... mainly my dad and my brother... I never planned on getting involved as a mentor, it is just something that ended up happening.” (Bill – Volunteer)

“Getting involved was down to pure interest, like it was never something I have always wanted to do. Like one day out the blue in the summer it was, I just showed up to get a feel for the place and put my name down. Because I mean I've done a Law degree and that, plus there's my brother and his troubled past to go off.” (Laura - Volunteer)

Current mentors at MALS evidenced how their involvement within processes of desistance via the VCS was not prompted through an instantaneous attraction to this increased opportunity to play a role, which had been anticipated by the State to transpire following the rollout of TR (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b; Maguire 2016). Mentors thereby demonstrated the sporadic nature of increasing VCS and communal involvement at the frontline of offender management and rehabilitative service delivery, for it cannot be anticipated when an individual will undertake such opportunities to engage in the frontline of service delivery, if they indeed choose to ever do so (Atkinson 2012; Hayton 2012; Avis 2016). In enabling mentors the outlet to share how and why they became engaged in processes of desistance, this has led to emphasising the necessity of understanding the motivations and capacities of an individual to play a role, as well as the dangers attributed with expecting opportunities for greater societal involvement in the desistance process of ex-prisoners to be readily fulfilled.

Mentors further demonstrated, when discussing their personal justifications for remaining engaged within processes of desistance, the necessity for enhancing knowledge and understanding upon how best to motivate and facilitate greater societal involvement in playing a role. Some detailed how the act of mentoring had, for them, served to reassess their previously held perceptions of offenders and, in particular, of the importance of service users as ex-prisoners building new identities. Through engaging with ex-prisoners first-hand, and obtaining an understanding of their life histories and the severity of their circumstances post-release, they revised attitudes and preconceived opinions they held of offenders prior to undertaking their role as a mentor (Immerwahr and Johnson 2002; McNeill 2006; Gray 2009; Burke and Collett 2010; Weaver and McNeill 2010):

“Even with the Uni background I still had my doubts over what these people fresh out of prison would be like... You really do feel sorry for them and don’t blame them but yourself, the minute you hear their stories... I mean, it changed my view, no doubt it would change other people too if they had a go.” (Laura – Volunteer)

“I have a bit of a cry even now in the car after I have seen my mentee. It just gets to you; you can’t help but feel sorry for them. It is completely different to what you hear in stories on the telly when it is coming straight from the horse’s mouth. Like my entire attitudes and outlook have changed.” (Rachel - Volunteer)

Through their involvement in acts of mentoring, and having observed their own and/or fellow mentors, perceptions of offenders positively alter. Mentors from MALS were in collective agreement that their journeys have been a rewarding experience, and that they were each motivated to remain as mentors for the near future. Mentoring was viewed as an effective approach in encouraging the motivations of lay participants from society to become engaged and remain within the desistance process of ex-prisoners. Mentors touched upon their own experiences to explain how, for themselves, this had been in part due to the emotions of pride, energy, and faith they have experienced on each occasion that they have witnessed their mentees cease re-offending. They described the pride in themselves for contributing towards such a feat, renewed energy to continue mentoring, as well as faith in their future mentees' ability to cease:

“If I know I have done something good for someone it makes me feel better, it makes me feel proud as a person. I am not self-seeking but when your mentee is doing good, you know when it happens, I go home and tell my partner, I will tell my son, my ma, my dad, my sister.” (Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

“There is no better feeling than seeing my mentee change. You dream for the moment... It restores my faith in the ability for anyone to overcome the problems in their life.” (Jean - Volunteer)

“I’ve seen the difference that mentoring has made, oh God I’ve still got people who are in contact with me from like fifteen years ago... It makes me so proud of myself... like it’s so rewarding and makes me want to get helping the next one.” (Sue – MALS Senior Manager)

Mentors detailed how mentoring can be utilised as a vehicle to embolden the motivations of lay participants from society to become and remain involved in processes of desistance. They were not naïve to the realities that this would involve individuals first overcoming their reluctance and/or trepidation to becoming involved in acts of mentoring in the first instance:

“Look, it’s some mighty task, but if you were to get more people into mentoring, then they would see it how it is. Like that (clicks fingers), people would be shell-shocked and change their opinions... They’re too scared though aren’t they... They know no different, and that is how it will stay unless they get involved and hear the truth.” (Jean – Volunteer)

Yet, mentors from MALS likewise reiterated that, if individuals can overcome their initial hesitation, then mentoring is a viable method for dispelling any preconceptions they may hold of ex-prisoners, and thereby sustain their involvement in processes of desistance (Haski-Leventhal 2009; Burke and Collett 2010; Weaver and McNeill 2010; Hill and Stevens 2011; Smith and Laurie 2011). As will be discussed in the next section, mentors also explained that there are gains to be made by both parties through the act of mentoring.

Giving and receiving

Acquiring and sharing of skills

Although there were a host of justifications and motivations provided by mentors at MALS for why they began their roles as mentors in the desistance process of ex-prisoners, some mentors expressed reasoning that served to challenge the philanthropic notions historically associated with volunteerism (See: Schervish 1997; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Hustinx, Cnaan and Handy 2010; Rochester, Paine and Howlett 2010; Britto, Van Slyke and Francis 2011; Hustinx and Meijjs 2011; Studer and Von Schnurbein 2013; Offstein, Chory and Childers Jr 2015). Owen and Rachel evidenced how the act of volunteering as a mentor can be utilised to acquire skills, sometimes to the detriment of mentees:

“If you work for MALS there are free courses you go on for training. So I have gained a lot of qualifications which I can put to my use in the future that would have cost me signing up for them on my own.”
(Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

“I am in college doing youth work so I wanted to get some experience working with offenders, so I got a volunteer job here. I thought it will put me in good stead when I am trying to get proper jobs and it isn’t costing me, so... why not hey (laughter). Like truthfully, I was told at college that I’d get further if I started now looking for experience at organisations that work with offenders.” (Rachel – Volunteer)

Despite the narratives of Owen and Rachel presenting direct opposition to the historically conceptualised notion of volunteering in literature, they do reflect the growing alternative position to viewing volunteerism as a means of acquiring and/or building upon pre-existing capital (Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Haldane 2014; Manetti et al. 2015; Lund and Juujärvi 2018; Maccagnan et al. 2018). In practice, promoting the capacity for individuals to acquire personal skills and attributes has, indeed, increasingly become a viable method of increasing and strengthening the numbers of individuals involved within the VCS, particularly through appealing to those currently not involved with volunteerism (See: NCVO 2016; TimeBank 2018). Mentors at MALS were in unison in their beliefs that it was morally acceptable for individuals to be motivated to mentor in the hope of accruing personal skills for use post-mentoring. They did not consider there to be dissimilarities in the mentoring abilities of individuals who seek to gain personally from mentoring, in comparison to those who are not. Rather, the consideration amongst mentors at MALS, such as Bill, was that the intentions of mentors to reap skills to enhance their attributes for future personal endeavours should be overlooked, if these particular individuals are considered ‘good’ at mentoring. Bill believed that the self-seeking actions of some mentors should not detract from the time these individuals are required to invest into mentoring if they are to accrue the personal skills they desire:

“People mentor because they want to get something out of it for themselves. Should they, no not really, but do they, yes, so you have to accept that. Because if they want to use mentoring as a stepping-stone then they have to be good. Plain and simple they have to be good, better than good, as in order to get as much as they can squeeze out of it... So it’s best just to let them mentor. Because we need mentors, and there are tons of people out there that we need to start capitalising on.” (Bill – Volunteer)

As Bill argued, there exists a readily available source of potential mentors that could be tapped into, individuals who are perhaps currently neither motivated to become involved in volunteering, nor aware of the role that they can play in processes of desistance. Yet, crucially, they possess skills and experiences that could be drawn upon in order to deliver a mentoring service to ex-prisoners. Current MALS mentor, Marge, is an example of such an individual who was unaware that sharing her life history as the mother to a young offender could serve as a positive source of support to mentees at MALS:

“Somebody just mentioned it to me, it was a police inspector actually that said why don’t you put something back into it. You know because of the experience, I had been through with my son and his spells on the inside... I was sitting thinking about it and thought why not, because I mean without sounding disrespectful, a lot of these Probation officers go to University and read it out of a book, so they don’t know what the real world is like. These professionals don’t know like how to be a mother hen, that mothering type.” (Marge – Volunteer)

Furthermore, Marge’s encouragement into mentoring at MALS by a police officer is also evidence of the broader cultural shift and reforms that have transpired to service delivery since the introduction of PCC and emphasis on co-commissioning (See: Ministry of Justice 2010a; Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014; Cabinet Office 2015). Principles of decentralisation and volunteerism continue to remain key components and are at the forefront of government plans since they became prioritised during ‘The Big Society’ agenda (Ministry of Justice 2010a; Norman 2010; Hancock, Mooney and Neal 2012; Defty 2014; Burke and Collett 2015; Gelsthorpe and Dominey 2016). TR reforms have also further served to ratify that, approaches to rehabilitation with offenders are better served when communities with their localised knowledge and intelligence are involved in service delivery (Etherington 2006; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2013a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). Marge now serves as an encouraging matriarchal figure to those formerly incarcerated individuals she mentors. Since undertaking her role as a mentor at MALS, she recognises her value lies in the fact that she is able to provide and convey a lived experience that prospective criminal justice professionals may otherwise not be able to do. Yet, whilst mentoring may provide personal gratification and appear as a role that everyone can readily

step into, it is also a challenging role that is fraught with obstacles, as will now be discussed in the following section.

Intersubjective relationships and change

Challenging expectations – articulating the conditions of effective support

Through discussing their own experiences, mentors at MALS were keen to denote the positive connotations associated with mentoring, emphasising in particular mentoring's ability to evoke the positive emotions of pride, energy, and faith, which motivate their continued involvement in supporting the ex-prisoners they mentor to desist from re-offending. It appeared that your experiences pre-mentoring led to distinguishing 'good' mentors from 'better' mentors. The narratives from the majority of the mentoring contingent at MALS signalled that any person was capable of performing the role of a mentor, as long as they were 'good' at the role. However, mentors such as Owen sought to evidence how it is important not to underplay the challenging expectations involved in articulating the conditions of effective support. For, in spite of his experiences as an offender, and time served as an ex-prisoner and mentor, which his fellow mentors at MALS viewed was of considerable value in his capacity to 'successfully' mentor, Owen highlighted the daily difficulties he personally encounters in navigating the delivery of effective support to his mentees, stating that he does not feel his capacity to mentor is aided as a result of being a formerly incarcerated individual. He struggles with the same challenges encountered by mentors who do not have (in-)direct experience of offending. He argues that this is because there is no established method of how 'best' to mentor (See: Barry 2000; Cawood and Wood 2014; Hucklesby and Wincup 2014; Walker and Bowen 2015; Stacer and Roberts 2018):

“Here’s the thing, people think it’s easy for me because of my own story, but to tell you the truth, I don’t know what’s the best way and what’s the wrong way. You just have to figure it out as you go, you know? Sure I’ve been in their shoes, but we’re all different aren’t we? I had the problems with drugs, but I may be dealing with someone who comes to me who hasn’t got a history of being on the gear. They might be young, they might be a woman, so I can relate to some things, but I haven’t got a magic wand.” (Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

Buck's (2017, 2018) recent work with peer mentors has identified the emotional labour and toil that individuals can feel when engaging service users, particularly when those service users come to rely so heavily upon the mentor to govern their interaction with criminal justice. Service users find that they identify more with peer mentors who have been ex-offenders and so are more inclined to open up and be honest with those peer mentors than other professionals involved in their supervision. Owen here is explaining how he has taken on the added pressure of being an ex-offender and experiences how the service users that MALS works with gravitating towards him. In addition to the service users, he is experiencing the pressure of having to support mentoring colleagues too, especially volunteers who see currency in his lived experience to help him:

"It's me who is in charge of their training, and teaching them the ropes. That though gets to me as well, as again I'm under pressure to teach them everything they know, as it's me who is responsible. Again though, all I do when I'm inducting them is what I think will help them mentor... I just tell them to use their own best judgement and that's it, because what else am I supposed to say? You learn on the job, and everyone will develop their own approach as they become more familiar with mentoring." (Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

However, the rather informal training styles used within the organisation did not appeal to all mentors, and actually there were those who felt that the lack of structure and the over emphasis on mentors to train mentors stifled their development and called into question their appetite for volunteering. Laura, for example, interpreted MALS's emphasis on its service users to 'make good' by taking responsibility and control of their own lives as a frugal attempt to reduce costs. She felt that mentoring could focus more on support to prepare mentees to re-integrate and re-settle, and to stimulate more positive engagement:

"There wasn't much training for the role, a few hour long get together in the first couple of weeks checking on your progress and then nothing, just a bit of form filling here and there... It didn't prepare me; to be honest, the support has never been there... You're basically told not to worry, because it all rests on your mentee wanting to change and make good, otherwise there is not much you can do." (Laura – Volunteer)

These differences are important and expose the challenges for small penal VCS organisations like MALS in how they operate. They are reliant on volunteers to help deliver services and they need the volunteers to align to their working practices and deliver on their ambitions. However, they do not have the capacity to suitably train individuals and share their philosophy and have to work with the constant threat that the volunteer may withdraw their labour. For mentors, they want to engage in support, but if they do not feel suitably supported or are uncertain about the arrangements that they have become part of then their appetite for engaging will wane. They may be sympathetic to the time and resource challenges on a small organisation like MALS to deliver services, but still feel there are ways to enhance policy and practice within an organisation. For both sides, there is a delicate balancing act to undertake.

The differences shared between Owen and Laura about how a VCS organisation can and should best deliver effective support to its volunteers evidences the communication challenges that can exist amongst even a small penal VCS organisation. Owen detailed how he has his own insecurities about how best to introduce and support mentors traversing the VCS landscape. Laura holds a number of opinions from her experiences in practice on how she considers mentors could be supported as they adapt to their new role. Moreover, the narratives of Owen and Laura evidence the difficulty in conceptualising the role mentors have within the desistance process. Together, they begin to expose the tensions that exist in respect of what constitutes ‘good’ mentoring.

The conditional and the unconditional – subjective approaches and attitudes to support

In articulating their journeys as a mentor, all volunteers spoke of how, through engaging directly with formerly incarcerated individuals, and experiencing a greater understanding of their life histories, this altered previously held negative attitudes and preconceived perceptions of offenders. This presented a challenge for volunteers in how they mentored. In the first instance, being exposed to the disadvantage and painfully pessimistic life chances of their mentees validated their ambition to help offer time and support. However, as volunteers, mentors had to exercise restraint and be clear about the personal and organisational resources they could invest in when supporting their mentee. Volunteerism is an endeavouring by an individual to do all they can to help an entity(ies) ‘in need’, but boundaries need to be drawn about what realistically can be delivered (See: Phillips 1982; Wilson 2000; Batson, Ahmad and Tsang 2002; Rehberg 2005; Ronel 2006; Haski-Leventhal and Bargal 2008; Haski-

Leventhal 2009; Wilhelm and Bekkers 2010; Ronel, Frid and Timor 2013; Corcoran and Grotz 2016; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). As Bill illustrates, it is through maturation in your role as a mentor that individuals recognise the importance not to be overzealous in the support you provide to your mentees:

“I try and help them too much sometimes, you know beyond the call of duty, and a lot of my experience in the past has shown me that once you do that people will try and manipulate you. As they see, the extent you will go to and they try and exploit that... You have got to be careful how you go about things though. It’s all about finding the balance so you don’t appear vulnerable, whilst still being empathetic to their cause, you know what I mean? Like you learn over time through experience when to shut your phone off and not answer your mentee’s demands. This can be really hard for new mentors.” (Bill – Volunteer)

Bill demonstrated the personal dangers associated with mentoring, particularly for newly recruited mentors, who have a tendency to overlook and henceforth lack the emotional stability required to mentor (See: Wilson 2000; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Durose et al. 2016). As an experienced mentor, Bill observes how newer volunteers have a tendency to be too empathetic, and struggle to adapt in their first year as a mentor in endorsing MALS’s liberative approach to mentees (See: Maruna 2001; Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph 2002; McNeill and Weaver 2010; King 2013; Veysey, Martinez and Christian 2013; Wahidin and Carr 2013; Rowe and Soppitt 2014; Rocque, Posick and Paternoster 2016; Sparkes and Day 2016; O’Sullivan et al. 2018).

However, the drawing of boundaries of care and managing personal investment is an ongoing live hazard for mentors of all levels of experience. Sue, the organisational lead with over 20 years of mentoring experience, reflected on how she still finds difficulty in withdrawing support, even when the continued offering of support impacts upon her own well-being:

“Some of them will go off on you big time, they will come here and stick their chest out threatening you for not helping them enough. They really turn quite nasty to be fairly honest with you, throwing bits and bobs round the office, but I won’t give up on them... No matter what you do for them, it is not good enough. Although for me, I can’t stop thinking though that maybe they are right. As they are a reflection of me, I am responsible for whether they do good, or do better than good. They could change at any moment.” (Sue – MALS Senior Manager)

There is a constant negotiation that organisational leads like Sue need to engage in when managing limited resources and judging the eligibility of who needs help and support. The disproportionate skewing of time and energy on one or two cases can create an inconsistency of service and is unfair to service users. For Sue, however, the urge to continue support, particularly to those who have struggled and succumb to re-offending whilst being mentored, is because she feels that the failure of her mentees to desist and cease offending is a reflection of her inability to provide ‘the right’ quantity and quality of support to prevent re-offending. It is, once again, evidence of the emotional strain mentors place on themselves (Buck 2017) as they develop a deep sense of responsibility for their mentees. Sue expressed that she is unwilling to ‘give up’ on individuals who have endured persistent rejection throughout their life histories. What Sue claims adds to this seemingly boundless patience is her belief, as an experienced mentoring practitioner, that offenders make progress towards their cessation at different times for an array of reasons. As Maruna (1997), Burnett (2004), and Terry and Abrams (2017) show, individuals will experience a trigger moment and events that can stimulate progress unexpectedly. The challenge of working in offender supervision is, for Sue – as it is for Raynor (2007), Kazemian and Maruna (2009), and Moore (2011) – accepting of the fact that mentees can experience an indefinite amount of unsuccessful attempts to desist before their eventual cessation. Sue, therefore, considers it challenging not to contemplate that those mentees who do re-offend may, with additional support, lead to them ceasing from offending (See: Maruna 1997; Burnett 2004; Maruna, Immarigeon and LeBel 2004; Raynor 2007; Terry and Abrams 2017).

However, it is not just the toil of emotional labour that can compromise the offer of unconditional support for mentees. There is stern economic reality for organisations like MALS operating within the age of austerity and the continuing reshaping of the criminal

justice landscape through TR. The organisation is a charity that receives limited funding and finds itself increasingly reliant on short-term funding injections, or contemplating being employed on a sub-contractual basis by a larger provider under the devolving of probation services. In practice, this can mean that mentors become overly cautious and selective in how and who they mentor, much to the detriment of mentees. As Laura observes, despite the ethos of MALS not to withhold support to any formerly incarcerated individual, regardless of their life history and previous offences, committed decisions are made over who to engage. Her fear is that some mentors exploit the limited resources available at their disposal as an excuse to rescind support from mentees they do not believe are ‘deserving’ of their support, that there is a tendency to veer towards those who are ‘easier’ for them to mentor. In Marge’s reflections of her mentoring activity, it is possible to see a degree of selectivity at work:

“I think for someone to come along and say I want to change, that’s the big first step, and I also think because there isn’t that many mentors why waste them on people who don’t want to change. They are easier to deal and get on with too because they want to be here... It’s left to us to decide who deserves supporting and who does not... And we haven’t got the resources nowadays to be helping everyone, so mentees should be doing more to show they are grateful and want to change.” (Marge – Volunteer)

As an organisation, MALS has to make judgement calls in how they will deploy their resources to mentor individuals and, in time, make selections over who they mentor and how. At an individual level, too, volunteers engage in the same process and shape their own opinions and views on how they will commit their time. These subjective processes have important implications for ex-offenders who engage with the organisation, and how ex-prisoners experience peer mentoring will be shaped heavily by these unseen and often subtle processes at work.

Investing and investment

Negotiating the challenges of investing in people when funders may not continue to invest in you

At the time of the research activity, the criminal justice sector was still coming to terms with the impact of the TR reform agenda that took hold in September 2013. The use of volunteers and locally based voluntary sector organisations was one of a number of components built into the developing of probation services that, it was hoped, would innovate service delivery (Robinson, Burke and Millings 2016). Chris Grayling, as Justice Secretary, introduced and had cited the potency of the VCS in bringing about new ways to tackle high re-offending rates for those serving short-term sentences (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). In practice, however, this was a time that organisations like MALS found challenging and threatening. Research by Marples (2013) has shown how bewildering penal VCS organisations found the process of bidding for money and/or aligning with prime providers in the newly former privatised landscape, and how challenging to their independence such processes can be.

During the fieldwork, it was obvious that the threat of funding shortages was impacting MALS managers' well-being and that fears for the longer-term security of the organisation weighed heavy on their minds. VCS organisations inevitably face ongoing concerns around their sustainability and, in times of austerity, these concerns are accentuated further (Bowen and Donoghue 2013; Calder and Goodman 2013; Hedderman 2013; Bastow 2014; Fox, Bannister and Miszczak 2016; Clinks 2018; House of Commons 2018c). MALS were operating in an environment where new providers had emerged; new allegiances were being formed between some providers, whilst other organisations were being forced to close. Mentors are conscious of how, due to their financial instability as a small penal VCS organisation, they are constantly on the cusp of having to make compromises to their original social mission and subsequent working practices in order to remain competitive:

“I must admit, I think we were a little bit duped by all the changes that have come in recently. It’s a case of making good out of a bad situation now... And, oh God, once our time with the IOM ends it’s all back to square one, and it’s that which makes me nervous. Because it’s just like one big fight with every bugger clawing at whatever funding is available... Like we used to be pally with many of the other services, as both are only down the road, but it’s a bit strained to say the least.” (Sue – MALS Senior Manager)

“They just keep moving the goalposts, you get me? Because it’s like your reputation means nothing, and everyone starts at zero. So yeah, it’s less than ideal, but we have as much chance as anyone else when contracts and that come up... Although like it is taking a toll on what we can do, I mean we have a ton of mentees, and can hardly do much with them. We were better off when we had a few and could manage them.” (Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

Sue and Owen were clear that, in their minds, TR had generated an even tougher climate to operate within that, despite the intent to have greater representation for VCS organisations, the reality was very different. In line with observations by Maguire (2016), Sue and Owen blame the TR agenda for promoting contestability as the means to enhance the involvement of local VCS organisations in the delivery of offender management, supervision and support (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b, c; Annison, Burke and Senior 2014; Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014; Ludlow 2014; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014). MALS found itself in routine contests for short injections of funding with fellow locally based penal VCS organisations, and mentors cited the failures to secure funding from local CRC sources and Merseyside Police and PCC’s crime prevention fund as a consequence of not being ‘savvy enough’ in writing funding applications (Merseyside PCC 2014d; Community Foundation 2018). Mentors and managers alike felt frustrated that the lack of funding was not as a result of a lack of motivation to support ex-prisoners or based upon their past mentoring success, but was, as Laura claims, how eloquently penal VCS organisations can ‘sell themselves’ when constructing proposals:

“It’s not like Sue and Owen aren’t trying to go out and bring investment into MALS. It’s just that there is so much competition nowadays.... Like we’re not just competing against the other services in Knowsley, but sum bids for stuff are open to the whole of Merseyside, like to do with the PCC, and some are even nationally. In my opinion, much failure comes down to that we aren’t professional, or for a better word prepared, when it comes to applying and selling ourselves. Maybe it’s a thing to do with the North West, but it seems MALS is good at talking a good game, but when it comes to official form filling we don’t use the right language to convey our message.”
(Laura – Volunteer)

MALS found itself locked in a cycle of needing to bid for funding to survive, but as knockbacks mounted it struggled to find the time to pause and evaluate its strategy and learn lessons to improve future chances. With funding so crucial to its survival, as it is for the vast majority of small VCS organisations (Clinks 2018), the organisation had to continually ‘re-brand’ MALS’ aims and objectives in order to apply for as great a number of funding sources as possible. Through partaking in this process of ‘mission drift’, Sue’s desperation shines bright as she, in turn, forfeits and undermines MALS’s traditional values and practices, as well as the well-being of its mentees (Jones 2007; Davies 2011; Cornforth 2014; Thompson and Williams 2014; Maguire 2016; Hyndman 2017; Henderson and Lambert 2018):

“I’ll tell you what sums up how tough it is more recently in securing investments to carry on mentoring, and that is Sue chasing after money MALS isn’t even entitled to, to begin with. It’s sad, as it really is a sign of the times of how MALS’s existence is on a knife edge. Because she will write applications that target funding which has nothing to do with the expertise of MALS, let alone to do with ex-offenders.” (Jean – Volunteer)

For MALS, like the vast majority of voluntary sector organisations operating locally and delivering rehabilitation services, the impact of TR had been to increase uncertainty and make organisations less confident about their longer-term survival (Clinks 2018). It was noticeable how even the volunteers were aware of the precarious financial situation of the organisation and how this had implications for how their time was used at MALS. Volunteers

would be involved in fundraising events and trying to collect money from the public as part of the collective push for stability. The volunteers had gone from wanting to offer time to help support ex-prisoners to being actively involved helping sustain the operation of the organisation they had aligned to.

Awareness of funding in day-to-day working

This section describes how the organisation had to adapt and contend with the consequences of market forces in the funding secured to provide mentoring services for the NPS through Knowsley's IOM team in reducing re-offending and victimisation caused by high-risk offenders. The NPS works solely with offenders who are high risk (with CRCs supervising low to medium-risk offenders). Therefore, whilst the partnership arrangement provided a degree of short-term stability and investment, it did entail working with a very specific client group, made up of services who have committed different offence types to the usual cohorts that MALS works with. Mentors reported noticing how the formal involvement with the NPS had impacted upon the organisational culture of the team:

“From the day I became a mentor here at MALS, it has been drilled into me how important funding is to making sure MALS can keep doing what it is doing. Although ever since Sue was asked to become a member of Knowsley IOM, has the importance of money in mine, and everyone else's, ability to mentor become so serious.” (Laura – Volunteer)

“Whenever you come in to do any one to ones with your mentee recently, you do realise that Sue and Owen are run off their feet. Like it's hard, because even with the financial support from the council, Probation, and that, they have still had to sell a few computers to pay the bills. So you're left to struggle supporting your mentee.” (Rachel – Volunteer)

Mentors detail that, although MALS receives funding support from Knowsley Council for providing a mentoring service to those high-risk offenders referred to them, the number of referrals MALS annually receives are unpredictable, with periods of exaggerated peaks and troughs. MALS's managers claimed that the funding they receive for providing services in

this relationship is not adequate to contend with the quantity of referrals they receive, but such is the importance of the work that they need to make the relationship function. Consequently, Owen and Sue explain that MALS must routinely subsidise its mentoring services to referrals with its own funding reserves:

“Even with my close links to key people in the IOM, I have no say on how many offenders we get referred... We’ve been waiting for the funding to come in, and who would have guessed it that when it does it just isn’t enough.” (Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

“The pressure that we have been put under since becoming part of the IOM was unexpected. It has been tough trying to balance the books, so Owen and I have took a bit of a pay cut for the time being. And the money we are given from the council just isn’t enough. I mean we are even having to turn people away who are voluntarily coming and knocking on our door here asking for help.” (Sue – MALS Senior Manager)

Some mentors at MALS argue that it has become an inconvenience to be associated with Knowsley’s IOM, suggesting that MALS is expected to deliver the same, if not greater, levels of success in supporting offenders due to the provision of funding from Knowsley Council. In practice, mentors state that, because funding is disproportionate to the number of referrals they receive, MALS is providing a lesser quality of mentoring service than it was prior to its involvement in Knowsley IOM:

“We are constantly told that we need to be more savvy when we are mentoring. I mean it’s not Sue’s fault, it’s just there is an expectation on MALS to do as good as it was before but without the resources to match the demand... It really has affected the mentoring, like I’m not the only one who is having less face-to-face meetings with mentees, we all are. You just end up having less check-ins, which means it’s become more about letting them get on with it.” (Laura – Volunteer)

Subsequently, due to the change in working practices at MALS, implemented to facilitate the daily challenges of contending with the tensions that arise with being a member of Knowsley’s IOM, Laura and Marge noted how morale amongst mentors had noticeably declined as a consequence of MALS’s involvement in Knowsley IOM. Aside from a

resentment amongst some mentors towards Knowsley Council, there was also ‘in-house’ conflicts regarding the mentoring service that is now being provided since associating with Knowsley’s IOM. Laura and Marge believe that the increasing turnover of mentors at MALS in recent years is due to the routine disagreements amongst mentors arising over cutting ties with the IOM:

“Not only would it help if we had some extra mentors around here, but we now need people to replace the ones that keep leaving. I don’t blame them in a way, as it’s just getting to everyone.” (Laura – Volunteer)

“It is hard to overlook the tension, but we are all doing what we can... Of course, we need everybody on board and on the same page, and people should not be leaving, but I understand their frustration... Standards are slipping, and we cannot be relying on family members and friends of the ex-prisoners to take the reins. It just seems that Sue and Owen were under the false assumption that past successes would guarantee financial support.” (Marge – Volunteer)

Being a member of Knowsley’s IOM, MALS has naturally encountered difficulties in balancing its VCS values with its priorities associated with the IOM. It is rather unsurprising to see a fallout ‘in-house’ amongst mentors at MALS on the directive of the organisations, having arisen from the tensions in practice between the public and private sector agencies of the IOM, and MALS, the solitary VCS representative. Unlike the VCS that traditionally supplies a client-led approach, grounded upon one-to-one communication (Corcoran 2008; Holloway and Brookman 2010; Macmillan 2010; McGarry 2013; Maguire 2016), the public and private sectors are often drawn to cost-effective, quick fix, one-size-fits-all solutions (Maguire 2016). As experienced practitioners in mentoring work, the MALS management reflected on how the sector has changed and how only those organisations that seek out investment by ‘going where the money is’ are being able to survive. In the process, they run the risk of calling into question the very values and independence that makes them such an innovative addition to rehabilitation services (Bennett and Savani 2011; Corcoran 2011; Benson 2014).

Investment for effective interventions

There was acknowledgement amongst mentors at MALS that the mentoring service they and the organisation provide is not the perfect example of how a mentoring service should be delivered. Yet, mentors at MALS emphasised that navigating the hostile and uncertain conditions of delivering effective support remains difficult when there is no resolute panacea on how ‘best’ to mentor formerly incarcerated individuals (See: Barry 2000; Cawood and Wood 2014; Hucklesby and Wincup 2014; Walker and Bowen 2015; Stacer and Roberts 2018). Moreover, mentors at MALS highlighted that their attempts to deliver a mentoring service fit for purpose is impeded when the difficulties of securing funding are an ever-present reality. Bill, aware of how accessing available sources of funding is increasingly competitive, explains how, in his opinion, when funding has been obtained by MALS this has not been utilised and invested by Sue and Owen in order to maximise its impact upon strengthening the effectiveness of interventions with mentees:

“Sometimes the likes of Sue and Owen forget about us... I get that the aim is to help the ex-offenders get back on their feet, but to do the job we need the support too, you get what I mean? Not just, how we could be better at mentoring, but the physical and mental side too.” (Bill – Volunteer)

Despite Bill raising concerns that their capacity to mentor is impeded by the limited availability of support from MALS for their mental, physical, and social health and well-being, Sundeen, Raskoff and Garcia (2007) and Haski-Leventhal (2009) argue the contrary in that some volunteers simply do not possess the confidence, emotional stability, and personality required to mentor, with Haski-Leventhal (2009) stating that some individuals pursue acts of mentoring because they have available time, and are compassionate to those in need of support. However, Haski-Leventhal (2009) contends that these principles alone do not discern an individual as being a ‘good’ mentor. Nevertheless, it was noted by Sue and Owen that they are aware of the concerns by some of MALS’s mentors, and thereby concede that they could do more to provide support and assistance to mentors. Sue and Owen were indeed reluctant to ‘sacrifice’ the funding they require for meeting the expectations of their suppliers, upon improving the well-being of their mentor:

“I think there is a lot more training and stuff that we could tap into... But why aren't the government doing something about it? I mean they are the ones wanting people to put their fair share back in and help out, but we can only do so much to prepare people. They should at least be giving us more free course to put them on, as we're doing them a favour aren't we?” (Sue – MALS Senior Manager)

“I must admit that is something we struggle with, as they're often left with knowing just the basics as I tell them you will learn on the job, but that's not what they want to hear. But then again, they know when they sign up it isn't going to be easy, these are ex-cons at the end of the day. MALS is here for the mentees, not the mentors, funding's always going to be earmarked for mentees.” (Owen – MALS Senior Manager)

The difficulties that VCS organisations encounter in balancing the best interest of mentors with those of their service users stem largely from the exploitation they feel from prime tier funding suppliers (Maguire 2016). VCS organisations are routinely exploited by prime tier providers, resulting often in incidences where there exists uncertainty over the number of referrals to be received, as well as late and/or less than expected payments (Maguire 2016). All of these factors compromise the level and quality of the support and supervision that service users receive (HMI Probation 2018). Yet, through fear of losing their funding and/or compromising future bidding applications, VCS organisations rarely voice criticisms of those at the head of the supply chains (Wolch 1990; Benson 2014; Maguire 2016). Indicative of the competitive climate that contestability has created, prime tier providers can readily seek out and add another willing VCS organisation to their supply chain, and so the process continues.

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the challenges for mentoring services in their efforts to deliver rehabilitation services to ex-prisoners. It has shown how the current climate for criminal justice practitioners, shaped as it is by the TR reform agenda, has created great unease and uncertainty for VCS organisations like MALS, with small penal VCS organisations like MALS having either to align with large providers, develop better strategies for securing funding, or live within very limited and diminishing means. In all three cases, the potential

impact on the organisation's future and independence, and even on their methods of working, are very real threats. As a consequence, there are a number of damaging outcomes of this climate that impact on the role of mentors to play an active role in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners. This begins with individuals who willingly give up their time to support service users finding themselves frustrated in organisations where managers become preoccupied with income generation and unable to attend to training needs and building positive working cultures (Maguire 2016; Hyndman 2017). At times, the need for funding means that the time that individuals give up is used not for dedicated supervisory work to support individuals, but instead on income-generating activities. For the sustainability of VCS organisations, this is a threatening trend, as was evident amongst the cohort of MALS, with individuals starting to question whether they wish to continue to invest time and energy in volunteering.

As VCS organisations evolve and mutate to secure funding, other factors come to govern how and with whom engagement takes place. In the case of MALS, this has meant taking clients from the local IOM team who are of high risk, although they have little say over who they are working with and drift away from the established service user profile that they have been working with and building their reputation with (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b; Maguire 2016). This is important to consider, as the success of MALS' work with these clients will have an impact on future funding decisions, and so it becomes crucial for them to concentrate on evidencing 'success'. Also, with an increasingly unpredictable mixture of clients coming into the organisation, it is difficult to manage which clients the volunteer mentors will be able to manage, and to establish what skills and competencies the mentors are building up when they are tasked with working with so many different clients. In both cases, there is once more a threat to the ability to attract and retain mentors, and there are serious concerns about the level of service that ex-prisoners are receiving in their efforts to desist.

The chapter's assessment of mentors' reflections of the experience of mentoring helps identify the threat of hierarchies of necessarily 'good' (and by extension 'not so good') mentoring. Owen, as an ex-prisoner himself, is considered in his role as a mentor to have a capacity to build a rapport with clients who can see elements of themselves in him, plus it is Owen who oversees training. However, the extent to which it is Owen's status – as an ex-prisoner – or his abilities as a mentor – as an empathetic communicator – that sees him build relationships with service users is poorly analysed in practice. There are some mentors who will defer to Owen and his background as setting his capacity to mentor apart from what they can offer in their role, whilst others are more dubious about the need for a person to have

experienced prison to be a good mentor. ‘Good’ mentoring can take different forms and be provided by people with very different backgrounds, and within the organisation there does appear to be a need to explore more critically what constitutes good mentoring and how volunteers can be used most effectively. There is also a need to engage in deeper assessment of the service user’s experience and opinions around how supportive they have found mentoring, particularly if the role of mentoring is to be utilised effectively as an outlet for greater public engagement in processes of desistance.

Whilst policy changes have negatively manipulated the mechanisms and structures for mentors to be involved in supporting ex-prisoners, what does remain consistent is that there are a steady resource of people who are willing to volunteer in the sector. Whilst possessing prior (in)direct experience of offending was considered by the majority of mentors to be of value to their successfulness as mentors, it was a shared sense of wanting to stimulate societal engagement that was their focused goal. The mentors reported how involvement in the mentoring of formerly incarcerated individuals has the capacity to enrich and positively alter the opinions a person may hold of those who have previously offended. However, difficulty arises foremost when motivating members of society to become involved. Mentors at MALS were resolute that an individual’s motivation to mentor ex-prisoners does not require them to be grounded in benevolence, but it certainly helps. Consequently, mentors at MALS detailed how, in order to appeal and hence encourage greater involvement by members of society, the act of mentoring should be promoted as an opportunity for individuals to acquire as many skills and attributes as they can to benefit themselves and their mentees.

Unlike the disparity that exists amongst individuals’ motivations for mentoring, an individual’s capacity to become and remain involved in mentoring was strictly viewed as being heavily influenced by funding. Accessing, securing, and maintaining sources of funding were identified by the mentors at MALS as imperative to the operational capacity of penal VCS organisations. There was considerable negativity expressed towards the impact the most recent policy changes have had in practice on mentoring (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014), with mentors at MALS detailing how their capacity to mentor is daily affected by the demands enforced upon them by the reforms to legislation. Moreover, the relationships amongst mentors, fellow localised mentoring services, the ability to attract potential mentors, MALS’ longevity and sustainability, and the quality of the mentoring service delivered to mentees, were all facets consequently jeopardised due to the changes to the landscape of the VCS and its role in offender management.

Chapter 7 – Public and private sector involvement in processes of desistance:

The experiences of Knowsley's Integrated Offender Management team

Introduction

This chapter supplies an analysis of the interviews conducted with practitioners involved in the delivery of rehabilitative support to formerly incarcerated individuals in Knowsley. The practitioners interviewed have roles within the organisations that represent Knowsley's IOM team. The IOM is composed of localised public, private and VCS organisations. In Knowsley, ex-prisoners identified as a high risk of re-offending are placed under the intensive supervision and joint management of Knowsley's IOM team. Working in partnership, IOMs seek to benefit from the collective array of knowledge and expertise that each agency possesses, as they endeavour to facilitate change by supplying ex-prisoners with a tailored package of support that will enable them to 'make good' and desist if they feel a self-motivation to change their behaviour.

Each semi-structured interview conducted with practitioners actively involved in Knowsley's IOM discussed their role(s) in joined-up multi-agency working practices. Emphasis, too, was placed on understanding their motivations and capacities for becoming and remaining an active member in the intensive supervision and joint management of persistent, problematic, and high-risk individuals. These interviews were also used to gain practitioners' insight of the role(s) currently played by the communities of Knowsley, with particular focus attributed to the realities of what is being achieved in practice to involve communities in the decision-making and delivery of rehabilitative services. For those involved in IOM teams, the TR agenda brought considerable change to the supervision and management of formerly incarcerated individuals post-release, with increasing powers and responsibilities transferred to communities in order to promote them to the forefront of service delivery. Yet, increasing the focus on engaging and listening to the concerns of communities throughout Merseyside has raised conflict amongst members of Knowsley's IOM, with practitioners providing their insight into how attempts in Knowsley to motivate and facilitate communities to play a role in processes of desistance have not transpired in practice as anticipated. Practitioners were able to offer their explanations for why this has transpired, and what they believe is required feasibly, to support the successful re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners into this area.

The structure of professional engagement with service users in Knowsley

Who wants it more?

Within Knowsley, the approach to supervising and managing ex-prisoners identified as persistent, problematic, and high risk of re-offending is the same method that is utilised throughout England and Wales. It is a localised joined-up multi-agency approach taking the form of an IOM team (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b). In addition to purposefully seeking to reduce the potential of re-offending by their offender cohort, IOMs aim to tackle the social exclusion of offenders and their families, strengthen public confidence in the criminal justice system, and improve the organisational performance of each agency within the IOM (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b). To operate and fulfil their aims in practice, IOMs require their members to work in partnership to capitalise upon their combined skills, knowledge, experiences, and resources (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b). In Knowsley, those who comprise this ‘strategic umbrella’ of localised provisions are as follows: Merseyside police service, the NPS, Knowsley Council, HM Prison Service, drug, alcohol, and mental health service providers, First Ark housing services, penal VCS organisation MALS, and Jobcentre Plus (Ministry of Justice 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017a, b; Merseyside CRC 2018c, e, f). The ability for Knowsley IOM to provide a cross-agency response is strengthened given that IOMs are provided leniency by the State, both in how they choose to formulate themselves (which agencies should be involved), and operate (their governance, leadership, and accountability structure) (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018a, c). This serves to promote the ability of IOMs to be far greater reflective of and responsible to the local environment in which they operate (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015).

Knowsley IOM’s cross-agency response to the threat of re-offending posed by those they supervise is predicated on the successful collaboration and common understanding amongst its members (Ministry of Justice 2015), with members of the IOM partnership clear on their roles and responsibilities in the pursuit of reducing re-offending (Ministry of Justice 2015). Through speaking to practitioners’ representatives of the agencies encompassing Knowsley’s IOM, there was noted agreement and transparency amongst all practitioners on how the principal role they and colleagues play in the lives of formerly incarcerated individuals are as the facilitators for change (See: Maruna 2001; Giordano, Cernkovich and Rudolph 2002; Giordano, Cernkovich and Holland 2003; Stevens 2012; Giordano 2014; O’Sullivan et al.

2018). Practitioners shared the belief that, in offender management, an ex-prisoner's successful ability to desist from re-offending begins with their motivations to change their own behaviour (Iselin et al. 2012; Veysey, Martinez and Christian 2013; Plesničar 2015). Practitioners voiced how it is the responsibility of the ex-prisoner to accept and engage with the 'hooks for change' that they are provided through the multi-agency working of the IOM, which supplies the capacity for them to 'make good' and become 'better citizens' (McNeill and Weaver 2010; Farrall et al. 2011; Rowe and Soppitt 2014; Rocque, Posick and Paternoster 2016). From their collective experiences in practice, practitioners asserted that, whilst an ex-prisoner's motivation to desist may not be instantaneous, their desistance will not transpire until they take the decision to 'make good' (Maruna 1997, 2001; Burnett 2004; Maruna, Immarigeon and LeBel 2004; Raynor 2007; Iselin et al. 2012; Kurlychek, Bushway and Brame 2012; Davis, Bahr and Ward 2013; King 2013; Veysey, Martinez and Christian 2013; Plesničar 2015; Terry and Abrams 2017):

“For all the good that we do in putting them on the right path, they still hold all the cards on whether they are going to make the choice to engage... Now that decision might not come straightaway, but... nothing good will come of anything I do unless something in their head clicks and they decide to put their thoughts into action.” (Ellie – Knowsley Community Safety Manager)

“I can put them on the straight and narrow to becoming a changed person, but it is up to them if they want to change for the better. Because if they don't, then my job is limited, as I can give them the keys, but they have to unlock the door.” (Paul – Safer Communities Senior Supervisor)

Practitioners too spoke of the role that the VCS has played in reducing the rates of recidivism by the cohorts of high-risk offenders under the supervision and management of the IOM. In Knowsley, the pathways in and out of (re-)offending have been identified to arise discernibly in relation to an individual's attitudes, thinking and behaviour, and their accessibility to education, training and employment (See: MALS Merseyside 2017b; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Knowsley's IOM has succeeded in responding, devising, and delivering interventions and support to attend to these specific gaps in meeting localised offender circumstances through the inclusion of MALS (Barrett et al. 2015; MALS

Merseyside 2017a; Merseyside PCC 2017). MALS, a small and localised VCS organisation, offers a peer mentoring service to formerly incarcerated individuals (MALS Merseyside 2017a). The aim of MALS is to provide an original response to altering the attitudes, thinking, and behaviour of its mentees through the act of one-to-one communication and positive reinforcement and encouragement in order for them to ‘make good’ (MALS Merseyside 2017b, c). The inclusion of MALS as a member of Knowsley’s IOM team has resulted in each high-risk individual under the IOM’s supervision and management to be assigned a peer mentor (Barrett et al. 2015; Ministry of Justice 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017b, c; Merseyside PCC 2017; Merseyside CRC 2018c, d, f):

“The mentoring services offered by MALS have led to considerable success... This emotional support is not always the best coming from a formal mode of authority such as ourselves. We don’t want to give it, and they don’t buy it. So it takes a charity such as MALS who have the experience of people in their team that have, or know of, people who have been inside. In order to make these high risk offenders open up, and speak out on what would help them stop re-offending.” (Hannah – Police Constable)

As Hannah details, the inclusion of MALS into the fold at Knowsley’s IOM has served to offer a valued informal holistic service to the ex-prisoners’ engaged within their peer mentoring service that she, in her role as a police constable, is unwilling to provide. Yet, whilst practitioners were clear of their roles as members of Knowsley’s IOM and emphasised how its success is predicated upon the cooperation of multiple agencies to work in partnership, the next section demonstrates how the realities of multi-agency working in Knowsley differ considerably from what is expected.

Working cultures and practice tensions

Unscripted joined-up thinking

Through speaking to practitioners encompassing the organisations involved in Knowsley’s IOM, it was evident that they had a clear understanding of its purpose, structure, and their roles within its delivery of offender management. However, practitioners revealed that the introduction of an IOM in practice within Knowsley remains an area of contention, having

not galvanised agencies, but rather brought to light new and existing tensions amongst them. Practitioners argued that multi-agency working has failed to transpire in practice as it was envisioned and marketed prior to its rollout, irrespective of Knowsley's IOM team being neatly stocked with representatives from statutory agencies, local authorities, and localised VCS organisations (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015; MALS Merseyside 2017c; Merseyside CRC 2018c, d, f). The frustration evidenced amongst practitioners of Knowsley's IOM team highlighted the tensions of this multi-agency arrangement in practice, and the jostling amongst agencies for power, authority, and legitimacy (Annison, Bradford and Grant 2015; Burke, Millings and Robinson 2017). Practitioners detailed how conflicts and disapprovals amongst members of the IOM are an ever-present feature of their meetings, with disagreements routinely leading to stalling progress made with ex-prisoners. Practitioners explained how, despite the agreement amongst organisations about their individual and collective roles as a member of Knowsley's IOM team, some members have from the outset either not upheld their responsibilities as a key stakeholder or, alternatively, sought to enact authority over other members of the IOM team, which has led to weakening the relationship of the IOM indefinitely:

“It’s not like we are short on resources, there are a fair few of us that each bring a range of skills. Although a joined-up approach, it is not... As sometimes, it can feel like there are too many voices and not enough ears. And those voices that are being heard are the same ones, which is my nice way of saying that a lot of us don’t get a say in matters.” (Steve – Crime Reduction Initiatives Senior Manager)

“If everyone played an equal part then yeah, the IOM could work better. But not everyone turns up who’s supposed to, and those that do, well some of them, are just too overbearing. Like especially in terms of agencies whose primary remit is catch and convict. So even when you manage to get everyone to show up and sit round the same table. Often one or two people bully everyone else on the approach to take with the offender. Which does little to nothing to encourage best practice.” (Lisa – KHT Housing Officer)

Practitioners highlighted how much of the tensions in practice amongst the Knowsley IOM partnership emanate from the State's devolvement of responsibilities upon agencies

throughout regions in England and Wales to choose themselves how their IOMs are structured and operate (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018a, c, d, f). Practitioners claimed that they are afforded too great an amount of leniency and responsibility in devising their own IOM team, and for ensuring that its members fulfil their obligations to operate cohesively in practice (See: Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018a, c, d, f). Practitioners argued that, for Knowsley IOM's ability to best respond to localised concerns and the needs of their offender cohort, the required organisations need to work in partnership harmoniously (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). Yet, conflicts arose over the considerable ambiguity of how IOM meetings were conducted in practice, and how the failure for practitioners to abide with an agreed-upon structure sought to hinder their capacity and efficiency to perform:

“Asset-based approaches and multi-agency work are imperative. It can allow each of us to educate one another, and share information to lead to the same common goal of reducing re-offending. But, this doesn't work, as you'd wish for in the field. If anything, I would blame it on us as an IOM being given too much choice. Because there is no structure, we dictate when we meet, for how long for, and who's in and who's out. This can, as you'd expect, lead to arguments.”
(Stephanie – Safer Communities Senior Supervisor)

Practitioners further expressed how the minimal accountability to abide to a particular set of obligations regularly leads to calls for the IOM to be re-constructed at every turn (See: Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Merseyside CRC 2018a, c, d), notably by practitioners when they do not believe the workings of the partnership reflect their and other organisations' directives. For instance, recent conflict was said to have arisen amongst some members of the Knowsley IOM team due to differences in opinions on which organisations should be included and why, specifically with regard to the representation of VCS organisations. This is despite the intention of Knowsley's IOM to be an opportunity for individuals from Knowsley to become involved at the frontline of the supervision and rehabilitation of high-risk individuals (Etherington 2006; Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). Practitioners stated that there was an apprehension amongst some to permit the availability for a greater representation of the local

area to become involved and represented beyond what they deemed necessary for the IOM to function:

“I think why the IOM seems to struggle and feel like a chore, is because we don’t agree with what we should be doing. As the expectation is for us to work with local VCS organisations, but aside from MALS who are locked down as being trusted. No one seems, and rightly so, to want to include anymore VCS rep. Because there is no need to get more volunteers on board, we need more formal involvement due to the expertise that brings.” (Hannah – Police Constable)

There was a reluctance shown amongst some practitioners towards too great of an inclusion of VCS and local community representation in the IOM, despite practitioners equally recognising and acknowledging the talents that VCS organisations and the local community currently afford to the operational capacity of Knowsley’s IOM. Practitioners emphasised how, despite the push to enable VCS organisations and local communities to become greater involved, especially at the forefront of practice, they were averse to giving up and transferring their powers and responsibilities. The lack of trust and uncertainty that a heightened representation of VCS and local communities would bring fostered a belief amongst practitioners that the management of offenders remains the remit of professionals, as will be discussed in the next sub-section.

Leave it to the professionals

Emboldening the presence of the VCS within the frontline of public and criminal justice service delivery has been prioritised by the State for over a decade (See: Crime and Disorder Act 1998; Home Office 2004; National Audit Office 2004; Alcock 2010; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2012, 2013a, b; House of Commons 2011; Marples 2013; Defty 2014; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014; Cabinet Office 2015; Gelsthorpe and Dominey 2016; Maguire 2016). Numerous opportunities have been created in Knowsley (See: Improvement and Development Agency 2010; Merseyside PCC 2014f; Neighbourhood Watch Network 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017, 2018; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; Ringmaster 2018) in order to purposefully tap into the experiences and knowledge of communities, and join up with localised VCS organisations with the intended desire to establish locally targeted and

successful solutions to addressing and tackling crime. However, there were differences of opinion amongst practitioners due to their experiences in practice regarding the gains made and shortcomings had through the involvement of the VCS in offender management in Knowsley. Of the smaller representation of practitioners who favoured increases to the involvement and support of the VCS within Knowsley's IOM team, their reasoning echoed the intention of the State's reforms to include a greater representation of the VCS and members of society within the forefront of offender management (See: Crime and Disorder Act 1998; Home Office 2004; National Audit Office 2004; Alcock 2010; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2012, 2013a, b; House of Commons 2011; Marples 2013; Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014; Defty 2014; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014; Cabinet Office 2015; Gelsthorpe and Dominey 2016; Maguire 2016). Practitioners noted that enabling volunteers and communities to play a role in the delivery of rehabilitative services improved the capacity of formerly incarcerated individuals under their supervision to desist, with practitioners emphasising how the involvement of volunteers and communities reduced their organisation's fiscal expenditure, whilst not leading to affect negatively its operational performance:

"It is hard to deny how having an extra body or two, pitching in, helps tremendously. I mean we are now able to help more and more ex-prisoners than ever before. Because, from a little picture perspective, it saves us a fair penny, as we get them to do bits and bobs, which frees up time for us to do other stuff on time... Looking at it from the big picture, having people from the community getting involved in the action shows to them offenders are not monsters, they are no different to you and me." (Derek – Knowsley Community Safety Manager)

As Derek attested, the involvement of volunteers and communities in their organisation has enabled them to increase their operational capacity by disseminating responsibilities. This has provided Derek with the opportunity to increase the organisation's available support to a greater number of ex-prisoners. Derek claimed that, in being able to support annually a greater proportion of formerly incarcerated individuals, this has increased the potential for a higher percentage of success to be attained at their organisation. However, unlike Derek, the majority of practitioners opposed the involvement and support of the VCS within Knowsley's IOM, arguing that any increases in success through VCS involvement are negligible compared to the diminished credibility to their own roles in offender management:

“If you have volunteers involved and you are seeing results, then not only will you be made to do more for less, but if this is volunteers, yeah volunteers doing your job, then something isn’t right. Are you not pulling your weight normally? Like come on what are you doing? It completely puts your role, my role, and everyone else’s in jeopardy. It just diminishes the credibility entirely.” (Elsie – JobCentre Plus Employability Officer)

Yet, practitioners such as Steve, who was a proponent of greater VCS engagement in service delivery, did not feel that the credibility of their role could be diminished, citing the gains that were to be made through the encouragement of volunteers increased representation of the VCS within offender management:

“It is not about diminishing the credibility of anyone’s role. It is only about allowing more people to have a voice on things, and enabling them to get involved. Why would you stop someone who wants to get involved? That would seem silly to me. I mean, they help us to do our job, but our job at serving them better. We need to know why people do and don’t want to help ex-prisoners, because they can undo or carry on what we have put in place for the ex-prisoner to stop offending.” (Steve – Crime Reduction Initiatives Senior Manager)

However, practitioners opposed to increasing the representation of the VCS in offender management noted how they agree that societal support is integral to an ex-prisoner’s ability to successfully desistance from re-offending. Yet, they believed it to be naïve to assume that the intentions of volunteers and communities who become involved in offender management are positive. Some practitioners, therefore, aired caution to their fellow colleagues who sought to empower individuals without being clear of their motivations for seeking to become involved in processes of desistance:

“What I find hard to believe is that everyone who wants to have a voice in proceedings is coming from the same place. It is very naïve to think that people want to help out, out of the kindness of their heart. Because everyone has an agenda, so it’s important to be careful why people are willing to help out. Are they not just doing it because they want their needs addressed, and throw their hat into the ring?”
(Peter – Prison Governor)

In contemplating their thoughts on the increases being sought in policy directives to enhance VCS and community involvement at the forefront of service delivery (See: Home Office 2004; Alcock 2010; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2013a, b, 2015; House of Commons 2011; Defty 2014; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014; Cabinet Office 2015; Gelsthorpe and Dominey 2016), practitioners stressed that ‘tapping into’ and ‘doing more’ to motivate and facilitate those community members of Knowsley who are unwilling and/or unable to play a positive role is a considerable feat to attain in practice. Practitioners referenced MALS as an opportunity for individuals from Knowsley to become positively involved in processes of desistance. Likewise, MALS was used as an example to evidence the realities of how individuals from Knowsley are unmotivated, unable and/or unclear of the role they could play, with practitioners citing the low staff numbers of MALS and active resistance by the communities of Knowsley to the existence of and engagement with such penal VCS organisations:

“Take MALS right, great at what they do, sadly for them relied upon too much, but that’s another story. Look at them, right, a viable opportunity in the heart of Knowsley, not the only one mind you, but one with a nice backstory and good successes. Tell me why, then, are they only a team of less than a dozen last time I checked? Why, if people were willing to get involved, do they not have a line of people out their door who want to help offenders? This is living proof of people in Knowsley being not happy to help former prisoners, or with no idea on what they could be doing to help, or with no ability to do anything, quite frankly.” (Dan – Police Sergeant)

However, some practitioners such as Clive and Helen contended that, in order to address and understand the answers to these and other concerns, this involves engagement and communication with the residents of Knowsley:

“How do we get more people on side then if that is what we should be doing? Well, it’s plain and simple, we need to ask them what is stopping them.” (Clive – Senior Probation Officer)

“There are far more people in Knowsley not involved when you compare it to the numbers that are involved. Whether they are scared, angry, or no clue of what they could be doing, who knows? Best bet of finding out is for members of the partnership to be doing more to go out and be asking them all.” (Helen – CRC Executive Manager)

There was a noticeable displeasure amongst the majority of practitioners concerning the attempts made to enhance the opportunities for VCS and local community representation in roles that delivered services that they, as practitioners, have previously been solely tasked with undertaking. Practitioners were nevertheless critical of themselves and evidenced how they could be doing more to enhance the quality of service they provide, with practitioners accepting that communicating with local communities to establish how their motivations and capacities play a role in processes of desistance could be improved, leading to greater successes attained with ex-prisoners in practice. The next section details practitioners reflecting on their own motivations and experiences of working with ex-prisoners.

Approaches to ‘service users’

A question of politics

When considering and reflecting on their experiences of working with ex-prisoners who use their organisation’s services, practitioners were able to present their appetite and ambitions for playing a role in processes of desistance. It was evident, throughout speaking to practitioners representing the organisations that compose Knowsley’s IOM, how their intentions when engaging with ex-prisoners were affected by their conflicting personal and organisational beliefs on prioritising them above residents of Knowsley, who are also reliant on the support and services of these organisations’. All practitioners spoke of the approach that their organisation instructed them to take in overcoming this aspect of their role in

practice, yet it was practitioners from Knowsley Housing Trust (KHT) who elaborated most extensively on the impact that this dilemma has on their role as a service provider to ex-prisoners and residents of Knowsley, given that access to stable accommodation in Knowsley is a concern for both offenders and non-offending alike. Knowsley's housing market is noticeably unbalanced compared to national averages (See: Knowsley MBC 2015, 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2016), whereby there are a far greater number of properties in Knowsley that are socially rented to meet the demands of its residents (Knowsley MBC 2016) due to the proclivity of Knowsley's residents to live predominantly in unstable accommodations and be far more susceptible to homelessness (See: Knowsley MBC 2015; The Knowsley Partnership 2016; Department for Work and Pensions 2018; Office for National Statistics 2018). Lisa, a Housing Officer at KHT, noted how the decisions taken to underplay how accommodation is allocated within the area is fuelled by the desire to lessen the potential for conflicts to occur amongst staff and their law-abiding clients – which, in turn, serves to minimise Lisa's and her colleagues' day-to-day workloads in a location where stable and suitable accommodation is in short supply:

“Here at KHT, we cater to those with and without an offending history. Although you would never know it because it's all hush hush. So to save any more work on our plate dealing with moaning clients, we are instructed to tell them lies, like ex-offenders don't get housed till those without criminal convictions are... We don't want them to be pissed that their neighbour has been to prison. We need them to treat them just normal, as we don't want to be reallocating anyone. It isn't good for anyone, because it wastes our time and money.” (Lisa – KHT Housing Officer)

The actions of Lisa in her role at KHT serve more than just a convenience; they are a realisation of the challenges that she endures daily in her role which emanate due to the multiple levels of deprivation encountered throughout Knowsley (See: Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016; MacDonald 2017). Both Lisa and Poppy, a Senior Manager at KHT, have come to accept that the people of Knowsley, who are themselves experiencing deprivation, are less motivated to play a positive role in processes of desistance. Although Lisa and Poppy detailed that communities play a key and lasting role in the successful re-integration and re-settlement of formerly incarcerated individuals, both explained how their role as practitioners is to allocate accommodation and ensure that tenants

uphold their responsibilities to KHT. They also stressed how they are not tasked to govern and instruct the communities of Knowsley on whether or not they should be welcoming and supportive to the ex-prisoners housed in their properties, within their neighbourhoods:

“It is a constant strain, as here you have the people who are the final piece of the jigsaw, and all they want to do is see them gone the second they move in. You can hardly blame them though... Knowsley is full of people struggling for a place to call home, either because they can’t afford it, or just because there is not enough to go round.”
(Poppy – KHT Senior Manager)

“Do I want people to just let them settle back into normal life? Absolutely. Do I expect them to do that? Not a chance... It is not my job to play peacekeeper and tell people how to think and act. I’m paid to put people into a property and make sure they don’t damage it.”
(Lisa – KHT Housing Officer)

Through discussing the role that they play in processes of desistance, Lisa and Poppy began detailing the internal conflict they experience in providing formerly incarcerated individuals with what they deemed ‘false hope’. Lisa stated that, through her experiences of allocating ex-prisoners accommodation, only a small percentage remains located at their originally assigned property. Moreover, Lisa noted that, irrespective of the motivations and capacities of an ex-prisoner to desist, in Knowsley residents are largely unwilling to overlook an ex-prisoner’s previous indiscretions and they subsequently remain to be adjudged on their past behaviour regardless of their time served in custody. However, Lisa explained that, in practice, the naivety of some ex-prisoners in their attempts to ‘make good’ and interact with those in the community could add to the difficulties of ensuring that they remain settled:

“You feel sorry for them, as they tell you they promise they are going to keep the property spick and span, and not do drugs in the property and what have you. But you feel like telling them, don’t bother, as your neighbours will do all they can to get you out the minute they hear you have a prison record. You’re talking like eight or nine out of every ten will be moved within a matter of weeks because of the hostility towards them.” (Lisa – KHT Housing Officer)

For Poppy, she explained that, in regard to their clientele, KHT instructs them that KHT's performance is not centred upon whether its clientele remain in their assigned accommodation. Rather, their performance and subsequent allocation of funding by their providers is based on finding service users' accommodation, irrespective of its suitability. Therefore, with regard to ex-prisoners, Poppy stated how fellow colleagues will regularly house this group of clients in properties that others have refused to occupy, hindering their future propensity to desist from re-offending:

"Because KHTs KPIs aren't scored on if a person remains in their allocated housing. All we are scored on is if we manage to get them a place to live or, at a minimum, registered officially as homeless. So people round here will put ex-cons into places that are far from habitable, like I'm talking our properties that have less than basic amenities. Because they know they daren't complain." (Poppy – KHT Senior Manager)

Both Lisa and Poppy noted that, unlike their fellow colleagues, their approach to all of their clients is the same, irrespective of the existence of a criminal background. Lisa and Poppy explained how they will give advice to clients who are ex-prisoners with the intention to aid their capacity to remain in their accommodation and promote their ability to desist. However, Lisa and Poppy revealed that their thoughts, feelings, and approach to a client with a background of criminal behaviour altered when that individual's prior criminal offence(s) included paedophilia:

"Don't get me wrong though, when I say I'm happy to give former offenders help in telling them to keep their head down and that. I don't give that advice to paedos. I draw the line there. They can get what's coming to them for all I care. They shouldn't ever be let out of prison... They shouldn't be getting anything more than a bloody tent." (Lisa – KHT Housing Officer)

“I have to admit that my approach does change, and I’m not afraid to admit it, but when you get a sex offender that you have to house, I do not deviate from the script. I have no compassion whatsoever for them, especially those that have touched kids. So I do the bare minimum with them, and couldn’t give a monkeys if they get found out.” (Poppy – KHT Senior Manager)

The insight provided by Lisa and Poppy has shown the difficulties of negotiating personal and organisational priorities when considering the approach to take with formerly incarcerated service users. Particularly revealing was the decision by Lisa and Poppy to amend their approach to some ex-prisoners due to their judgement on certain individuals being undeserving of their support (Maruna and King 2009; Currie 2013; Nhan, Bowen and Polzer 2017). Yet, this was a feeling that was shared in practice amongst practitioners throughout numerous agencies involved in the supervision and rehabilitation of formerly incarcerated individuals in Knowsley. This will now be discussed in further detail in the next sub-section.

The (un)deserving

In addition to practitioners detailing how and why their organisations took careful consideration to instruct them on the importance of prioritising the needs of service users with no prior criminal convictions, they and other practitioners interviewed expressed how they personally perceive different categories of offender. Amending the approaches taken in practice with ex-prisoners depending upon their criminal conviction(s) was not just expressed by practitioners as a method of traversing the hostile environment presented by the communities of Knowsley that ex-prisoners sought to (re-)enter. It was also suggested how the role a practitioner plays, including their motivations and capacity to support processes of desistance, are underpinned by their own morality and civic values towards whom they consider as deserving of their support. It was highlighted by some practitioners how, when meeting and engaging with formerly incarcerated individuals for the first time, they will prior to this event take into account the severity of ex-offender’s criminal history. Practitioners noted how this is not in preparation for discussing their and their organisations’ capacity to best address the required ‘hooks for change’ service that users require. Rather, it is to

establish the degree of effort that they as a practitioner are motivated to provide the ex-prisoner as they navigate their journey of desistance:

“Whoever I get in that comes before me, I always make the point of checking what got them into this position. Because if they were put in for something petty we can all relate to that... It is when they’ve done something despicable or unprovoked; it’s that which really put’s me off. I’ll just treat them as civil as I can, but won’t do any more than that.” (Ellie – Knowsley Community Safety Manager)

“I make every attempt to put myself in the position of the person who is put in front of me. It’s hard, though, when you know the true extent of what they have done. It can often make you withhold support, and yeah, often I’ve underperformed but that’s been through choice. As when you are in that position, faced with a repeat domestic abuser, you cannot help but to do as little as you can for them.” (Tim – Stronger Families Senior Coordinator)

In detailing why they as practitioners choose to differentiate the quality and quantity of the support they provide to formerly incarcerated individuals, some practitioners explained that their organisations instruct them to take a holistic and informal approach to their work with service users. Practitioners noted how their organisations stress that they seek to establish relatability with the service user to their own circumstances, in order to build an understanding of the support that the service user requires through unearthing the reasons what led to this individual becoming involved in crime. However, in practice, practitioners voiced how they implement an alternative approach which entails envisioning themselves foremost as the direct victim(s) of the offence(s) that their service user committed, and/or as a resident of the community in which this formerly incarcerated individual is seeking to re-integrate and re-settle:

“If it’s anything against kids or the elderly then that’s a hard one. Honestly, I try to wash my hands of them. As it’s difficult as a mother not to feel for the victims. I try not to let my mind go there, but you do think of what the victim went through and even whether I would want to live next to this person in front of me.” (April – Crime Reduction Initiatives Senior Manager)

Whether practitioners take the decision to conceive themselves as the ex-prisoner, the victim(s) of their offences and/or a resident of the community the ex-prisoner may (re-)enter, this evidence reveals the flavour of the practitioner's intent when engaging with this group of individuals in real time. This demonstrates how a practitioner's morality and civic values influence the approaches that they take in practice within their role. Practitioners further exemplified how their decision in some circumstances to not remain as an impartial service provider was not always through personal choice, but also influenced by their occupational culture:

"We operate much more differently than the other agencies in Knowsley. Unlike them, our remit is catch and convict... We're not in the business of helping them figure it out. It doesn't sit well with me all that holistic stuff... The protection of society from the threat offenders pose is our foremost priority. So here, as I'm sure you would agree, it is ingrained within you from day one not to give them an inch. It's all about remembering the damage they cause to communities." (Dan – Police Sergeant)

"That's why I like the job I do here, as everyone else is on the same wavelength. We are here to keep people safe... We are not here to be an offender's friend. That's why the likes of the IOM can be frustrating when everyone is wanting to give them everything under the sun. So I'll keep reminding them of our stance, and telling them to think of the victims they have wronged." (Bob – Police Constable)

For Dan and Bob, the influence of their occupational culture upon the approach they take with ex-prisoners was viewed neither as a positive nor negative, but rather as expected of their role and responsibilities as a frontline member of the police service. Moreover, they too were able to evidence the sense of differences between occupational cultures by those organisations involved in Knowsley's IOM (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). Dan and Bob revealed how, outside of their organisations' confines, they make a concerted attempt to promote and influence the practitioners of fellow partners in the IOM to adopt their own approach to ex-prisoners, alluding to the difficulties and tensions felt in practice by other organisations in multi-agency working (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015).

In addition to the challenges of performing a role when associated organisations attempt to flex their power and authority, there is also the role that the community plays, which has an influence on the operational capacity of those involved in offender management, as highlighted in the next section.

The role of the community

Putting victims first

In Knowsley, emphasis is placed on ‘putting victims first’ in order to heighten feelings of safety and security throughout its communities (See: Merseyside PCC 2014a, g, 2017; Victim Care Merseyside 2015a; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). When members of a community feel safe and secure, their overall well-being and quality of life is improved (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016). This, in turn, leads to greater stability among its members and reduces the likelihood of crime to occur in these happy, healthy, and stable environments (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016). In speaking to practitioners who are representative of each sector and organisation involved in Knowsley’s IOM, it was underscored how they found it challenging in exercising what was the ‘right thing’ to do in the interests of community life. Practitioners detailed how, in order to perform and uphold their role and responsibilities with the ex-prisoners under their supervision and management, this was in direct conflict with the notion of ‘putting victims first’ (Merseyside PCC 2014a, g, 2017; Victim Care Merseyside 2015a; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Practitioners noted that the multilateral domains of deprivation experienced by the ex-prisoners under their supervision and management in Knowsley, notably income deprivation, employment deprivation, and barriers to housing (Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016), equate to being the same pronounced areas that residents throughout the communities of Knowsley are frequently and intensely deprived within and are likewise seeking support from Knowsley Council and affiliated agencies (See: Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016; MacDonald 2017).

Practitioners revealed their awareness of the powerful and decisive role that communities of Knowsley have in processes of desistance. They explained that, so great and entrenched are the levels of deprivation experienced throughout the neighbourhoods of Knowsley (See: Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016; MacDonald 2017) that, through fear of community backlash and the potential of impeding the communities’ motivations to

play a role in supporting ex-prisoners to desist, their role in practice is far removed from the cross-agency response to supporting and managing the heightened threat of re-offending by high-risk offenders (See: Ministry of Justice 2015). Practitioners detailed the ways in which they are instructed by their organisations to prioritise the needs of their service users without a criminal background above those who do possess a prior history of offending. This was, as practitioners explained, because their organisations collectively do not wish to promote crime as being a route into gaining additional support, resources, and opportunities for an individual to overcome their deprivation. Thus, practitioners revealed the existence of an ever-present fear amongst their organisations that, if ex-prisoners are seen as being in receipt of preferable treatment, this could lead potentially to an increase in the levels of criminal activity amongst prospective first-time offenders:

“You may want to do this, that, and the other with your service user, but no matter how good your intentions are, you’re limited. Because the worry around here, is not to make it look like those coming out of custody are getting any preferable treatment. As there is a genuine concern that, as so many people in the borough are on the edge, there’s no telling if they will suddenly come to look at getting involved in crime as an easy way for them to get the help they need too.” (Steve – Crime Reduction Initiatives Senior Manager)

“High-risk prisoners not only expect, but require, a comprehensive package of tailored support. Yet, at each stage of the process, we are all consistently aware of the need to have the communities of Knowsley on board, as they are the ones living, working, and breathing alongside our former prisoners on a daily basis. This means we often pull back the reins on the support we give, just for the chance that people are more inclined to help them out in the long run.” (Peter – Prison Governor)

Practitioners voiced disagreement with the focused approach that their organisations take in favouring the needs of communities above former offenders, claiming it to be unfounded and, hence, unwarranted. Practitioners stated that their abilities to successfully mobilise the ex-prisoners who are also dependent upon their support to desist from re-offending are consequently stifled, which hinders innovation in practice, with practitioners claiming that

far more could be achieved, and done faster, in obtaining successes with their ex-offender service users. Noticeable resentment was shown by practitioners towards the community, viewing them not as partners, but irritants who served to undermine their position:

“Me personally, well I am not going to sugar-coat it, as I’ll admit we are letting people down. We are playing devil’s advocate with their futures for the sake of catering to the masses. Yes, they have a definitive role in the ex-prisoners’ decisions to re-offend, but we have a role to play too.” (Clive – Senior Probation Officer)

Practitioners like Clive had come to view the community not as a viable resource amidst a time of shrinking resources, but as a group hostile to ex-prisoners and those that serve to support their desistance. Due to a motivation by some practitioners to ‘do more’ for their formerly incarcerated service users, but who have had the legitimacy of their role reduced by the community, it was expressed that this had led the practitioners to contemplate leaving their current role:

“I’d be lying if I said I hadn’t contemplated leaving along the way, because this has turned into something I didn’t sign up for. It’s clear as day what they struggle with; it’s been the same for years. But rather than let us help them, we have to do the bare minimum... I want to be doing more, so I’m often thinking of getting just a job in the ASDA and putting all my other time into volunteering. Because no doubt I’d be able to do more for them that way, than actually working here if you can believe that.” (Stephanie – Safer Communities Senior Supervisor)

Some practitioners argued that the impositions of communities upon approaches to ex-prisoners were less pronounced at organisations within the penal VCS, whose service users did not feature individuals without a criminal background. However, practitioners representing such penal VCS organisations based in Knowsley, such as April, evidenced how the levels of widespread deprivation shared amongst offenders and non-offenders alike nevertheless influence their role and approach to ex-prisoners:

“The work that we do here is very much influenced by the environment around us. And I don’t just mean facilities, I mean the people living in the area. They are as much an influence upon whether our clients succeed, as are the tools we give them... They will do all they can to make a prisoner’s return impossible, trust me. As we have found that it is hard enough asking for donations from people in Knowsley, who are not only suffering themselves, but who are flat out against helping out former offenders.” (April – Crime Reduction Initiatives Senior Manager)

Representatives of penal VCS organisations thus reiterated those views of practitioners from public and private organisations involved in the supervision and rehabilitation of ex-prisoners, in the belief that communities, even at times when they appear disinterested, do indeed have a powerfully influential role upon their roles and working practices. This, in turn, serves to affect the motivations and capacities of ex-prisoners to cease from re-offending. The next sub-section emphasises how practitioners are instructed with emboldening communities to engage in processes of desistance.

Inciting communities to ‘do more’

Practitioners raised points from practice reflective of literature regarding the importance of the role that communities play in determining the ‘successfulness’ of ex-prisoners to desist from re-offending (See: McCold 1996; Braithwaite and Roche 2001; Walgrave 2003; Bazemore and Erbe 2004; Bazemore and Schiff 2005; Schiff 2007; Brooks 2012; Schlager 2018). Although practitioners stressed that, despite the acknowledgement and agreement among fellow colleagues and affiliated organisations of how communities have a definitive role, they were equally in limbo, reluctant to motivate communities to ‘do more’ due to the largely negative implications that their influence has already served in practice on amending their roles and operations. Practitioners revealed the challenges that exist within their day-to-day working in attempts to convey to the communities of Knowsley that, in order to reduce the prevalence of re-offending, it requires their active involvement and that such participation is positively inclined:

“Hell, our work is utterly useless if the community is ready to go on the offensive and resist their return. And regrettably that is the time after response that faces us and our service users. But, you don’t want to give them any credence as the feeling is they will exploit it.” (Clive – Senior Probation Officer)

“Each community, even in Knowsley, is not void of its problems. So how do you make sure everyone is ready, willing and able to get stuck in, when they are not involved in making people’s lives other than their own better. The only common interest they have is an angst and hatred of ex-cons, but who doesn’t?” (Paul – Safer Communities Senior Supervisor)

There was an underlying concern and hesitance amongst practitioners in making residents of Knowsley aware of the influence they possess within the desistance processes of ex-prisoners. Practitioners were conscious, based upon their experiences in practice, that the intentions of residents to become proactively involved in processes of desistance may be to serve better their own interests than those of ex-prisoners. Practitioners collectively reiterated how Knowsley, as an environment in which the majority of residents are experiencing multiple levels of deprivation (Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016; MacDonald 2017), were cautious to provide communities with greater opportunities and resources to become involved in offender management, when their motivations are unknown. Practitioners detailed further their concerns with instigating communities to ‘do more’, noting how it routinely results counteractively through inciting communities to criticise their organisations’ performance in reducing crime and anti-social behaviour within the borough:

“Knowsley has had initiatives before, that have tried to make residents do more to volunteer... Most just won’t. If anything, they just ask why more isn’t being done to help them who don’t have a criminal past. So it’s a catch twenty-two.” (Derek – Knowsley Community Safety Manager)

“I won’t be the first to tell you this, but Knowsley isn’t a happy and jolly place to live. People round here struggle. So it’s all well and good thinking they will pitch in and bring down recidivism, but in truth, in an area like this especially, that is not the case... They get word you want them to help out their community, the response is always, well, what are you going to do for me first.” (Tim – Stronger Families Senior Coordinator)

However, practitioners conceded that so decisive is the role and influence of communities throughout Knowsley regarding the motivations and capacities of ex-prisoners to desist from re-offending, that, in their day-to-day work, considerable weighting is now focused on producing a formerly incarcerated individual who fulfils and personifies the expectations of society, with less emphasis placed on atoning to the needs and best interests of the ex-prisoners utilising their services. Practitioners detailed how building trust amongst the communities that ex-prisoners seeking to re-integrate and re-settle into post-custody is promoted as key to developing a successful working relationship between both parties:

“If we have any chance of seeing the back of these offenders once and for all, building and maintaining a trusting relationship with residents of Knowsley is crucial. We are better off catering to their needs, as then if they are in a position where they feel happy and secure, they might slowly and surely be more up for helping out others.” (Stephanie – Safer Communities Senior Supervisor)

“There is no other choice than to put communities before offenders... You have got to keep going though as bad as it is to put the interests of the ex-prisoner on the back burner, by creating a person who residents are more likely to warm up to. As they’re not interested if they get a house or a job, they want someone who just won’t re-offend. They don’t understand there is a link, and aren’t willing to be lectured on it.” (Helen – CRC Executive Manager)

Yet, practitioners argued that there was an aura of desperation amongst their organisations to ensure that communities within Knowsley become motivated and capable of playing a role. Practitioners claimed that the plans to involve communities at the forefront of service delivery in Knowsley (Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017) appeared

forced, particularly as there are minimal conversations taking place with the communities that they and their organisations are seeking to re-settle and re-integrate ex-prisoners into. Practitioners denoted it as naïve to expect to manufacture a motivation amongst residents through creating roles for them and providing the tools to engage, as there exist no guarantees that members of a community will, irrespective of whether they are ready and able to do so (Atkinson 2012; Avis 2016). Practitioners claimed that increasing the opportunities for individuals to play a role serves to only enable those motivated to become or remain involved, which in Knowsley is too few a number of residents:

“There are two types of individual in Knowsley, those who are motivated to help offenders out, but without the capacity to do so. Then those who have the skills and money to do it, but just are flat-out uninterested. And believe me there are more of the latter.” (Clive – Senior Probation Officer)

Despite the efforts within Knowsley to encourage and empower communities to ‘do more’ in assisting with the prevention and early intervention of crime (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017), practitioners lay bare how, in practice, the move away from a paternalistic model of service provision to a co-operative model has not been realised. It was established that motivating and facilitating communities to become involved in service delivery is being attempted in Knowsley by practitioners who are uncertain whether this process is attainable, and apprehensive of the intentions of those who do become proactively involved in the desistance process of ex-prisoners. The conflicts over who should, and can, best deliver offender management in Knowsley had, in the experiences of practitioners, led to diminishing the quality and quantity of services available to supporting ex-prisoners desist from re-offending.

Conclusion

This chapter has revealed the difficulties experienced by professionals as they make attempts to supervise and manage high-risk ex-prisoners in the age of TR. This is evident with the considerable tensions that exist amongst the members of Knowsley’s IOM, with a persistent jostling for power, authority, and legitimacy since the IOM’s implementation. This has led to a compromise of the working practices of these multiple agencies in the progress achieved with the ex-prisoners who are reliant upon their collective support. There are also

occupational cultures, as well as individual moral and civic values, dictating the motivations and levels of resources a practitioner will supply to those they consider as deserving. Moreover, practitioners evidenced the challenge within their role of prioritising the concerns of communities (in)directly affected by crime, with practitioners voicing how the unsubstantiated fears of communities readily act to trump their experiences, approaches, and overall professionalism. Whilst practitioners were conscious of the definitive role communities play in an ex-prisoner's desistance and cessation from re-offending, attempts to increase the motivations and capacities of both communities and VCS involvement in service delivery were looked upon negatively by the majority of practitioners, who believed devolution delegitimised their own existence. In addition, practitioners contended an uncertainty about how to best encourage and mobilise communities, particularly in an area such as Knowsley that is blighted by deprivation, which has only served to increase tensions amongst professionals and communities averse to 'do more' and share their limited capital. There was, thus, a discernible sense of lethargy amongst practitioners about what can be achieved with offending populations, especially when their re-integration and re-settlement is taking place among communities who are less tolerant and receptive to playing a role. Being able to acknowledge, through the voices of professionals involved in reducing re-offending, that their roles and support efforts do not take place in a vacuum, is valuable. For their ability to succeed in reducing rates of recidivism is shaped by how they engage with and implement policy, as well as how their values form what, and why, they do what they do.

Practitioners stated that, in practice, approaches involving communities in offender management within Knowsley can only be claimed successful when they are providing opportunities to those already motivated to play a role. Practitioners emphasised how there is minimal consideration amongst members of Knowsley's IOM team to actively pursue the representation of communities in service delivery. The unwillingness shown by the majority of practitioners to support the transfer of powers and responsibility to the micro level was due to the practitioners' noticeable uncertainty regarding their own futures as professionals in the age of TR. The State afforded IOMs leniency in how they construct and operate themselves, in order to be much more reflective of, and responsible to, the local environment in which they operate (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015). However, in practice, as a method of limiting VCS and community involvement in Knowsley's IOM partnership, there was minimal accountability in upholding a particular set of responsibilities, thus, making it possible for the IOM to be reconstructed at every turn. Conflicts which were shown to arise

amongst members of the IOM upon decision-making practices sought to further demonstrate how, rather than galvanise agencies, the IOM had brought into sharp focus the new and existing tensions amongst them.

The disapproval amongst members of Knowsley's IOM regarding their individual and collective roles and responsibilities was evidenced as impeding upon the progress the IOM achieved with ex-prisoners. There was a weakening in the relationships amongst practitioners arising from the differing levels of commitment that some had shown of their involvement in the IOM. This was particularly evident regarding the conflicting personal and organisational beliefs amongst practitioners concerning the approaches taken with ex-prisoners, depending upon the severity of their previous offence(s). In practice, the motivations of a practitioner to support the desistance process of ex-prisoners was heavily underpinned by their own morals and civic values towards those they considered deserving of their support. This, in addition to the struggles in practice regarding the feasibility of getting everyone round a table at a given date and time to conduct IOM meetings, had led some to contemplate their motivations for performing their current roles as professionals. The willingness shown by some practitioners to do more to mobilise ex-prisoners, irrespective of their past criminal history, was shown to be further curtailed through having the legitimacy of their role reduced by communities.

For the practitioners encompassing Knowsley's IOM, communities were viewed as a hindrance to their capacities to perform their role in supervising and managing high-risk offenders, with practitioners claiming that too much emphasis has been aligned in Knowsley upon atoning to the best interests of communities (Merseyside PCC 2014a, g, 2017; Victim Care Merseyside 2015a; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). This had directly influenced the practitioners' roles and responsibilities in providing their cohorts of ex-prisoners with the support required to address their pathways out of offending. For practitioners were able to emphasise how the many failures to address the longstanding levels of deprivation felt by communities throughout Knowsley had culminated in a situation whereby, when asked and expected to 'do more', residents of Knowsley have refused to accept the invitation, instead choosing to react defiantly by demanding that agencies prioritise them above service users with a criminal background. Conscious of promoting crime as a way of alleviating an individual's struggles in a locale ravished by deprivation, practitioners expressed the view that it is they who are now being required through their working practices to do more to appease these hostile communities, merely serving to fuel tensions amongst the partners of Knowsley's IOM as they struggle to delegate these additional responsibilities.

Chapter 8 – Lay member involvement in processes of desistance: The experiences of communities encompassing the Metropolitan Borough of Knowsley

Introduction

This chapter provides an analysis of how the focus groups performed with a representation of individuals from communities throughout the Metropolitan Borough of Knowsley. These groupings featured individuals who resided in the same neighbourhoods of Knowsley, and the chapter sought to capture the views of those regarded as having lay participation in the desistance process of ex-prisoners. It was important, then, to speak to those with no previous experience, nor current involvement in performing a formal role in the supervision and delivery of rehabilitative services. For these are the individuals in informal positions within society that both theoretical explanations of desistance and transformative policy reforms have emphasised as decisive in the outcome of whether ex-prisoners cease from re-offending. Engaging with communities allowed for an understanding of the realities in how policy plays out in practice.

Those who participated in the focus groups represented the communities of people in Knowsley that individuals leaving prison encounter as they make efforts to arrange accommodation, seek employment, and use local facilities. The focus group discussions sought to explore the role(s) these communities play at present, would prefer to play, and the role(s) they consider others should play and why. The discussions investigated in real time why they do or do not feel motivated and capable, allowing participants to explore their general dispositions towards recently released prisoners, as they consider what role local communities throughout Knowsley could play in supporting processes of rehabilitation, re-integration, and re-settlement, and then of their appetite for engaging in these processes. What the analysis shows is that some people are supportive of efforts to help rehabilitate ex-prisoners, but that they find difficulty in articulating and comprehending a role for themselves in these processes when they, too, are disadvantaged and lacking the accompanying support to improve their own well-being and quality of life. This is a topic of interest largely overlooked during the implementation of reforms to criminal justice and social policies in practice.

A distinction without a difference

'The' community

Throughout each focus group, residents of Knowsley outlined what their communities represented to them. The term community was defined by focus groups as being a location with discernible functionality, as an environment where they and their family reside, and engage daily within a host of (in)formal activities. Many within the groups went further and explained how, for their communities to function 'successfully', it was dependent upon local residents to be bound by a collective common purpose of looking out for the community's best interests in maintaining the quality of life and well-being of all residents:

"For me, my community is the place where my kids go to school; we live, where I go to work, where the shops are. It's all one big community really, where we all look after each other as we get on with our day-to-day comings and goings. Everyone knows each other by name, and that's a blessing... It really is something to be proud of, as you won't find many places nowadays where people get on so well and have each other's back." (Ian – Huyton Community Group Two)

"I'm proud of my community, and so is everyone round here. There's a great community spirit... It's nice when you have a good bunch of people living round you, makes you feel safe. Because you want people who say hello, and actually care. Things just go downhill when people aren't bothered about their neighbours and are only interested in themselves." (Colin – Prescot Community Group One)

A theme common to all focus groups was not solely the importance of feeling a sense of belonging to community, but to a distinctive Knowsley community. Their neighbourhoods, areas where local people felt others would 'have their back', are seen as different to other locations where they perceive community bonds to be different and, by implication, weaker. Economic and social disadvantage meant that many in the groups were geographically immobile, unable to secure and benefit from new opportunities. Yet, the limited scope to move on or move out of the area brought with it a sense of rootedness and a pride of place that many used to positively inform their sense of community identity. There was an expectation that all members of their communities have pride in the location where they reside, and a loyalty to fellow residents informed by their own longstanding relationship(s)

with the area. Many in the focus groups were the third, fourth, or fifth generation of their family to live in the same community. Residents of Knowsley claimed that this affected their own reluctance to welcome ‘new’ people entering their communities to reside and/or work (See: Knowsley MBC 2012; Office for National Statistics 2015a, b). Through their narrative, residents of Knowsley inadvertently evidenced, too, how people of colour, as well as non-Christians, were particularly prone to experiencing difficulties assimilating into a community of Knowsley:

“I’ve lived in the same area since I was a kid, my mum, dad, and nan never moved out the area their whole lives. I’m not the only one, most of us in here no doubt will tell you the same story... Because it’s the same families and the same faces, people just remain loyal to the area. So when you get someone new trying to move into the area, they are targeted... People do look at people’s race and religion and are like I’m not having them here and it can get out of hand.” (Simon – Huyton Community Group One)

The aversion to supporting ‘new’ people integrating into their communities to reside and/or work, principally but not exclusive to people of colour and non-Christians, is to be expected, although not excusable (See: Knowsley MBC 2012; Office for National Statistics 2015a, b; Merseyside PCC 2018, Merseyside Police 2018). Evidence highlights how, in this racially and religiously imbalanced locale, incidences of hate crimes motivated by the race and religion of the victim have risen annually in Knowsley since 2006 (Knowsley MBC 2012; Office for National Statistics 2015a, b; The Knowsley Partnership 2015; Home Office 2018a; Merseyside Police 2018). This is despite the claims that it should be in the common interest of communities to promote the civic engagement, collective efficacy, and accessibility to capital for current and prospective members, irrespective of their past criminal behaviour (See: Walgrave 2003; Bazemore and Schiff 2005). Residents of Knowsley stated that the limited availability of resources, notably in the areas of employment, accommodation, and education, weighed upon their decision to welcome individuals who they believed could challenge residents native to Knowsley for these resources (See: Office for National Statistics 2015c, 2018; Knowsley MBC 2016). In addition, Knowsley residents believed that prospective residents could bring ideas and cultures not in accordance with those currently held by them and their community. To the residents of Knowsley, it was considered a safer and less invasive process to trust and cater to those in their communities who already

possessed like-minded cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986; Lyons and Lurigio 2010; Calverley 2013; Durnescu 2017):

“Why should we open our doors for people when there already are not enough affordable houses, jobs, never mind school places... We have been living here for generations and then you get new people move into the area, and it just makes it even harder as the pot gets thinner... What’s their background? Are they a criminal? You wouldn’t know, so that’s why we are careful round here who we trust.” (Edna – Stockbridge Village Community Group One)

“You don’t want to mess up a good thing, because I’ve seen it when you get a family move in and they don’t know the history of the area. We are all open and honest with each other in Knowsley, so if you keep to yourself you just look suspicious... You’re safer and better off trusting those you know.” (Dolly – Kirkby Community Group Two)

Residents of Knowsley demonstrated a clear preference amongst their communities to support and trust those who shared and upheld their morals and communal norms, values, and expectations. They also explained how current community members were not exempt from exclusion where committing a crime, especially an individual with a previous affiliation to the area, determines that the individual is considered to have betrayed the trust of the community and is no longer welcome. This is, therefore, irrespective of the evidence demonstrating that communities hold the greatest influence upon an ex-prisoner’s capacity to desist, given they possess the reinforcement that formerly incarcerated individuals require to ‘go straight’ (See: Shaw and McKay, 1942 cited in Bazemore and Schiff 2005:275; Kornhauser, 1978 cited in Bazemore and Schiff 2005:275; Braithwaite 1989; Pranis 1997; Johnstone 2001; Morenoff, Sampson and Raudenbush 2001; Brooks 2012). Residents of Knowsley offered counter-arguments for excluding those who offend indefinitely from their communities, as will be detailed in the following sub-section.

‘The’ offender

The sense of community and of collectives of people sharing values of decent and acceptable behaviour came through in the discussions of offenders and their re-integration and re-

settlement into the area. These discussions evidenced hostility towards ex-prisoners, individuals who were considered disloyal, to have betrayed the trust of the community, and no longer dependable on to protect the best interests of the community. The category of offence(s) the individual had committed was deemed secondary, as all offences were identified as posing actual and foreseeable harm to the community and the image of Knowsley. Preserving a positive image of Knowsley was considered as particularly important amongst focus groups. For instance, residents of Knowsley expressed being conscious of the views of ‘outsiders’ to Knowsley – non-Knowsley residents – that Knowsley was characterised as a locale in which incidences of anti-social and criminal behaviour were commonplace:

“I don’t think anyone would take offence to me saying that people who offend shouldn’t be allowed back in the community fold... Being able to trust someone is a big deal in Knowsley, and once someone offends that all ends; they are a risk to keep them around.” (Ken – Prescott Community Group One)

“Can’t stand it when you hear that some things happened, I mean it just brings the place down again. We just live up to the stereotype because of one bloody rotten don’t we? It really does get my goat too, as it doesn’t matter what they have done, it’s just the fact they have done it... Like I said, it gets everyone worried and undoes the progress we have made.” (Stan – Halewood Community Group)

Residents of Knowsley from all the focus groups expressed a pervasive hostility towards ex-prisoners. At times, this hostility sharpened as the nature of specific crime types were discussed, as judgements were formed on the severity of the offence(s) an individual commits, the demographics of their victim(s), and whether the offender was affiliated to Knowsley. Residents of Knowsley explained how offences towards children and the elderly were looked upon with added furore, which is in keeping with patterns of fear and crime-related anxiety reported elsewhere (See: Gray, Jackson and Farrall 2008). Examples of how the community has previously responded to offenders whose victims have been either children or the elderly were evidenced throughout the focus groups:

“If anyone is found to have touched up kids, then look out, as scum like that don’t belong anywhere, let alone in this neighbourhood... That’s right, it was a few years back now, but when that fella was under investigation his house got petrol bombed, and too right as well... I’m sure, God forbid, if something like that happened again, the same would happen.” (Joe – Kirkby Community Group Two)

“No doubt you’ve noticed but there is a large population of elderly pensioners round these ways... They are so vulnerable, and it takes a person with no morals to target a person like that... You get something like that happen and no one lets it go unanswered, like the time they beat that lad up good and proper for targeting the old fella in the Post Office.” (Sophie – Cronton Community Group)

The above two quotes exploring the judgements made by local people of the seriousness of offending behaviour lay bare the climate within which crime-talk takes place and its capacity to frame popular discourses around offenders (See: O’Connell and Whelan 1996; Cullen, Fisher and Applegate 2000; Kwan et al. 2002; Stylianou 2003; Maruna and King 2009; Douhou, Magnus and Van Soest 2011; Rogers and Ferguson 2011; Rogers, Hirst and Davies 2011; Adriaenssen et al. 2018). De Vel-Palumbo, Howarth and Brewer (2018) illustrate how the public views different categories of offender, and how they find their own moral judgements shaped and refined by the sense of sharing similar attitudes with others, in terms of the messages they consume through the media. If there exists a projection in the media of a professional judgement by someone working in offender management that offender groups – such as sex offenders – cannot or should not be rehabilitated, this informs community values where “beliefs about offender groups may lead to support for punitive sanctions that could do little to address the causes of re-offending”, alternatively “creating the conditions under which their offending behavior is most likely to be repeated” (De Vel-Palumbo, Howarth and Brewer 2018:14). Furthermore, what these two quotes by lay participants within the communities of Knowsley also capture about the climate of crime and insecurity is the sense of informal mechanisms of social control that they perceive to operate within their community. For instance, at one end of the spectrum are shared and common sets of values that knit people together where crime and anti-social behaviour is seen to deviate from these norms and represent a rejection of the sense of collective recognition. However, at the other extreme is the sense that community itself retains the capacity to police behaviours, where the

threat and execution of violence is tolerated in targeting those who have wronged. Underpinning both is a sense that those who commit crime do so rationally and make a conscious choice:

“It is so disappointing when you get typically the young ones going round and smashing up the shop windows, robbing them, and riding round on bleeding stolen bikes... It’s more so the fact that they’re kids from the area wrecking their own sodding neighbourhood... I wouldn’t mind as much if they weren’t targeting their own neighbours and sodded off somewhere else to get their kicks.” (Whitney – Huyton Community Group One)

Despite previously stressing how ‘successful’ communities operate when all members are loyal and supportive of their fellow residents, residents of Knowsley nevertheless pushed the notion that blameworthiness should lie solely with those in their community who offend. It was highlighted throughout all focus groups how residents of Knowsley consider those who offend to have acted rationally (Kendall 2004; Lewis 2005; Spandler 2007; Newman and Marongiu 2009). Residents of Knowsley justified their views through stating that they experience and endure equally high levels of multiple deprivation as their fellow residents. However, unlike themselves, who choose to remain law-abiding despite the challenges presented to them, those residents of their communities who offend were labelled as weak, selfish, and individualistic:

“They have only got themselves to blame... they make the decision to do what they do, so by getting themselves into a mess they can get out of it themselves... It isn’t mine, it isn’t yours, it is their fault and only their fault for looking at crime as an out... Because we are all on bad times aren’t we, but we do what we can with what we’ve got, they’re just plain selfish.” (David – Whiston Community Group)

“Am I struggling, yeah sure I am, but who isn’t round here, am I right?... It don’t half piss me off when they think I’ll bend the rules to suit me, with that sod everyone else mentality... All they are ever bothered about is themselves and their family; they are not interested in being a member of the community. We didn’t force them to do it, it’s their choice.” (Peter – Prescot Community Group Two)

To the residents of Knowsley, labelling offenders and rescinding their membership to the community acted to reduce the occurrence of victimisation through their direct exclusion and by way of deterring potential offenders. However, such actions are in direct opposition to literature, which contends that there is a lower probability for offenders to conform to communal norms, values, and expectations if they experience stigmatisation due to previous criminal behaviour (Dufour, Brassard and Martel 2015). In addition, ex-prisoners are known to experience personal shame when reflecting upon each occasion they re-offend (Healy 2010). It is, therefore, argued (See: Locke and Latham 2002; McNeill 2006, 2009; Healy 2014; Hylton 2014; Plesničar 2015) that, allowing an ex-prisoner to (re-)build their social identity through being permitted access to opportunities to impose the change necessary to ‘make good’, is beneficial for all of society. Although, this is only possible when communities acknowledge that the aspirations of offenders are similar to their own, and support them to make appropriate choices in the future to attain these goals (Ward and Maruna 2007; Canton 2011; Korobov 2015). Yet, the residents of Knowsley provide an example of the difficulties associated with the expectations of how a community should perform, and the representation of communities in reality (See: Crawford 1997; Van Ness and Strong 1997; Crawford and Newburn 2003; Bazemore and Erbe 2004). This sentiment is expressed further in the next section, which outlines the roles that residents of Knowsley believe they and the representatives of Knowsley’s CSP should play in processes of desistance, and why.

Framing the role of the community

Responsibilising unmotivated and incapable communities is untenable

Nobody who participated in the focus groups had been previously, or were currently, involved proactively in a role that supported the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners. Those participating also specified that neither did they believe there should be an expectation that they play a role in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners. The rationale provided by residents of Knowsley for holding this standpoint was underpinned by a belief that playing a proactive role in processes of desistance acts counter-intuitively to their own morality, and the civic values of the neighbourhood in which they reside:

“I can’t think of anyone I know to have ever been involved, let alone want to be involved in helping out louts... I mean the bloody damage that some of them cause is catastrophic, they ruin people’s bleeding lives for years after the act.” (Emma – Kirkby Community Group One)

“I just can’t can you... Yeah, it’s just not in me to want to help them, it doesn’t feel right whatsoever... It does, it does, it goes against everything you have ever been told by your parents or in school to not do wrong... Wouldn’t you agree it would be as if they are laughing at us, the people they have wronged, the whole community for that matter, if we made things easier by helping them after they get out of jail?” (Jean – Huyton Community Group One)

Common throughout all groups was the belief that non-engagement in acts of rehabilitative support could be justified by their beliefs that ex-prisoners had wronged them and the community. That, to provide re-integrative and re-settlement support would serve to devalue the harms inflicted upon the (in)direct victims of their crime(s). In some instances, to engage with processes of support was perceived as providing an ‘easier ride’ during their transition from custody to the community, and that this would negate their contention that ex-prisoners should ‘earn’ their place in their communities through making good for the harm they had caused. Once again, it was the sense of damage caused to the community and of the injustice of others behaving badly when faced with the same challenges and disadvantages as them that hardened dispositions:

“Rather than us have to do something about it, why don’t they beg and plead and have to earn our help?... Yeah true, if it is someone I’ve known well, I don’t think I could look them in the face. I mean I wouldn’t want to be associated with them, because they have let you down... Saying sorry does nothing, as I’m not going to then be like all is forgiven. It’s more like I’d want to help them less out of any of them that you put before me.” (Penelope – Kirkby Community Group One)

“They can say that they have fell on hard times, but haven’t we all?... They don’t get a free pass from me, because I mean where do they get off on expecting help... Because if you’ve already turned to crime then you are on your own... Yeah you deserve to be ousted that’s right, making it easier, give me a break.” (Darren – Stockbridge Village Community Group One)

It is important, however, not to conflate the unease Knowsley residents expressed in providing ex-prisoners with an ‘easier’ transition through their involvement with the assumption that they believe ex-prisoners should not be provided with support from the residents of the community with whom they are attempting to re-integrate and re-settle. The residents of Knowsley participating in this study outlined how their own morality and adherence to the civic values of their neighbourhood influenced their decisions to play a role in processes of desistance. They acknowledged that there do exist individuals who they considered are better equipped and motivated to play a role than themselves. This, in turn, served to evidence further how participating residents of Knowsley did not consider themselves to have the motivation, nor the capacity, to play a role in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners. In this way, they emphasis the sense that it cannot be expected that residents, notably in deprived areas, all possess the capital desistance that theorists argue is necessary for supporting formerly incarcerated individuals (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). This is particularly so when they are deficient in the level and scale of capital required to support their own quality of life and well-being (See: Zellerer and Cannon 2002; House of Commons 2011; Defty 2014; Gelsthorpe and Dominey 2016):

“As I said, it goes against everything I stand for to help people who have been to jail, but hey, if people want to help then be my guest... You get people who are a bit soft though and will support them tooth and nail. Each to their own I guess... Well, some people are better off and can do more, so if they have the time and money, just let them do it I say.” (Audrey – Cronton Community Group)

“I have no intention now, nor will I have ever dream of helping out a criminal. Sure, I donate to charities, but not a criminal organisation, please... I’m in no right shape to help them, think of the costs and the knowhow needed... One hundred percent, yes there are a great deal I am positive who are skilled enough and happy to help them, they don’t need us.” (Samantha – Halewood Community Group)

The narrative provided by focus group participants can, it appears, act as a means to circumvent further their own involvement in the desistance process. Residents of Knowsley stressed that they did not consider themselves as responsible in the decisions made by fellow members of their communities to offend, or the ability for formerly incarcerated individuals to cease offending. Christie (1982 cited in Johnstone 2001:126), McCold (1996), Johnstone (2001) and Bazemore and Schiff (2005) all, however, demonstrate that communities do not have a responsibility to aide an ex-prisoner’s re-integration and re-settlement post-release, and are therefore not accountable if individuals re-offend. Similarly, it has likewise been demonstrated that, in communities which are susceptible to experiencing deprivation, its members are more prone to agreeing that individuals be accountable for the choices they make (See: Maruna and LeBel 2010; Canton 2017). Members of more impoverished communities have, as a consequence, the propensity to reduce the levels of empathy that its members have to those whose choices result in an association with crime (Canton 2017), with communities favouring to punish and exclude those who do offend (Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997; Bazemore and Erbe 2004; Canton 2017). Such is indicative of the narrative supplied by residents of Knowsley within this study, and continues to be shown in the following sub-section as they emphasise the role Knowsley CSP should play in processes of desistance.

The accountability of Knowsley’s CSP

Residents of Knowsley through their focus groups also identified by name the organisations encompassing Knowsley’s CSP as having a role in processes of desistance (See: The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Knowsley residents emphasised their own aversion to playing a role, the principal justification being that organisations of Knowsley’s CSP have a role to play in processes of desistance. A clear and recurring theme in the focus groups was residents’ views that responding to the challenges of rehabilitation was a role for those who

are motivated and/or in receipt of payment for their services. Moreover, there was a level of confusion and resentment demonstrated by residents of Knowsley to the very existence of opportunities (Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017) for them and fellow members of society to play a role:

“Where is Probation in all of this? Aren’t they supposed to be keeping tabs on them and making sure they are complying? So what is the point of us in all of this... Because we are paying their wages through our taxes, so why are they not doing their job? Why is everything being directed on us to do this and that?... Next we will be made to go and meet them outside the prison and take them out for a meal, give me a break.” (Matt – Prescott Community Group Two)

“I hate the way things are going, like look at all these alcohol and drug addiction places popping up everywhere you go. I mean I get it they have problems, but why can’t they sort it out when they have so much help?... Yeah they will be getting given all freebies, no doubt at a cost to all of us like... Why do they need me to chat to them when they have all these places to go and speak to someone who’s paid to do that as their job?” (Pat – Halewood Community Group)

Evident from the focus groups with residents of Knowsley was that they also possessed a clear vision of the role that they believed practitioners from the organisations within the Knowsley CSP should play in processes of desistance. This role that focus groups outlined was comparable, and detailed that the responsibilities of Knowsley CSP should be to prioritise their well-being as law-abiding residents above formerly incarcerated individuals. They added that the organisations of Knowsley CSP do so, by focusing attention upon pre-emptive measures that would act to address and combat offending within their communities, with Knowsley residents identifying their preference to see specific increases to frontline policing and surveillance throughout the borough:

“We should come first always, not them, they are criminals, end of... Yep they should start with getting back more bobbies on the beat, that would put an end to a lot of the trouble. Whatever happened to that... Surely, we should not have to suffer because they have made cuts. They should make sure laying off police is the last bloody thing that they do.” (Alan – Huyton Community Group Two)

“I have never committed a crime in my entire life, so I think it’s not unreasonable to think that the thoughts of people like me come before a prisoner... I’ve found that CCTV makes people think twice as well, it’s the thought of being watched which scares them and stops them in their tracks... Can’t see it costing that much to put up more cameras in the area, and hey, what does it matter what it costs? If we don’t feel safe, and think that more cameras should be put up to stop these hoodlums, then they should listen to us.” (Paul – Whiston Community Group)

The fears and likelihood of victimisation expressed throughout each focus group by residents of Knowsley are a genuine concern to hold, as recent empirical data attests (See: The Knowsley Partnership 2017; Home Office 2018a). Available data indicates actual and projected rises in overall crime experienced throughout Knowsley, most notably anti-social behaviour, as well as violent and sexual offences (Home Office 2018a). Furthermore, although not causally linked to the rises in recorded crime, such rises have transpired against the backdrop of reductions in both frontline policing numbers at Merseyside police service and Merseyside’s annual police budget (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017, 2018; Hargreaves, Husband and Linehan 2018; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018; Ministry of Justice 2018b). Partners in Knowsley’s CSP have similarly experienced staffing reductions and an overall diminishing of resources (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017, 2018; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018), all of which combine to impact upon their collective capacity to prevent the occurrence of crime and anti-social behaviour, and promote community safety (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017, 2018; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018). Nevertheless, both Knowsley CSP and Merseyside police service plans continue to place and respond to the different needs of crime victims and communities at the forefront of practice (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; The

Knowsley Partnership 2015, 2017; Merseyside PCC 2017). Yet, in the view of those residents of Knowsley participating in this study, Knowsley CSP and Merseyside police service are failing to consult and respond to their needs. Particularly, that they do not wish to be devolved with the powers, influence, and responsibility to take ownership of their local neighbourhoods:

“I think they forget sometimes just to come and actually talk to us all face to face. Sounds simple, but it just sums them up really, as they are not bothered... Fancy leaving it to us to get on with, bet that would save them money, and that’s probably what it all comes down to... I don’t think it’s right that we fork out for the police to provide us a service, and at the end of the day here we are now being told to do this that and the other, which I’m still unsure what were supposed to do.” (Tom – Kirkby Community Group Two)

“Give me a break, think of the poor people that have been targeted by these scumbags, and now they are needed to do more to put a stop to crimes happening... What are we expected to do, go out the door and tackle the person ourselves?... It would help if we knew what it was they are now wanting us to do, but don’t they realise we are fed up of being told what to do when some of us are struggling to make ends meet ourselves.” (Steph – Halewood Community Group)

Whilst emphasis in Knowsley has been on moving away from a paternalistic model of service provision to a co-operative model (The Knowsley Partnership 2017), residents of Knowsley demonstrated how, in practice, this transition of powers and responsibilities cannot take place if they are unwilling and incapable of playing the role(s) expected of them. Throughout the focus groups, participants reasserted how the expectations upon them to ‘do more’ without the desire or tools to do so effectively only acted to heighten their anger and resentment towards Knowsley CSP (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018). This served to demotivate their foreseeable involvement in service delivery and fuel their criticism of Knowsley CSP’s performance. With seemingly no alternative plan of action to reducing re-offending at present to counteract this stand-off, the next section presents the methods that

residents of Knowsley considered could enhance their motivations and capacities to play a role in the desistance process of ex-prisoners.

Conditioning the creation of supportive communities

The potential of engendering motivations

In discussing their role in the desistance process of formerly incarcerated individuals, residents of Knowsley claimed to be unwavering in their reluctance to engage with the opportunities made available for them to play a role (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). However, when probed further on the potential that their motivations for becoming involved could be increased, it was evident throughout all the focus groups that residents of Knowsley would be more inclined to provide support to those ex-prisoners identified as a low risk of re-offending, and who they claimed were deserving of the residents' support. Those ex-prisoners characterised by residents of Knowsley as deserving were individuals who had committed minor offences that the residents considered had a minimal impact on the community, were unlikely to pose a threat of re-offending post-release, and of whom they were least fearful to interact and engage with:

“Like I would only be happy to help them ones, I thought deserved it too. So yeah the ones who were locked up for the littlest thing possible... Yeah, if it was something like that didn't hurt anyone, like let me say stealing money from a big shop then that I would be more okay with. Because they haven't hurt anyone really then, have they... Yeah, that's what I mean, they aren't likely to attack you if they were sitting opposite you.” (Sarah – Prescott Community Group Two)

“Now I'm not saying I would either, but if I were to then a person who just refused to pay their bills, or parking tickets, you know one of them... Well they are not going to be likely to welly you one, would they... True they might do it again, but I think the fact they haven't hurt anyone is what would make me feel like I'd be more swayed to helping one like that.” (Elizabeth – Cronton Community Group)

These findings are significant, as they are able to demonstrate that this group of residents from Knowsley had so fervently detailed their reluctance to become involved proactively in

the desistance process of ex-prisoners. Yet, there does indeed exist the potential that their motivations for playing a role in processes of desistance can be increased where, within focus groups, some participants indicated that they would be (at most) disposed to supporting ex-prisoners who identified with the characteristics they deemed as deserving. This opens the possibility of introducing residents of Knowsley to ex-prisoners for the first time, which would present them the opportunity to gain a first-hand account and understanding of ex-prisoners' life histories and the severity of their circumstances post-release. Doing so has been shown previously (See: Immerwahr and Johnson 2002; McNeill 2006; Gray 2009; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Burke and Collett 2010; Weaver and McNeill 2010; Hill and Stevens 2011; Smith and Laurie 2011) to have a high success rate of altering negatively held attitudes and preconceptions that an individual may possess of an offender.

Furthermore, despite demonstrating a potential willingness to provide support to those ex-prisoners the residents claimed were deserving, it was apparent amongst the narratives of residents from Knowsley that they were largely unclear of the localised opportunities available for them to become involved in processes of desistance. This offers additional evidence in Knowsley of the failures in the efforts by Knowsley CSP to encourage and empower residents to become involved in the delivery of offending services (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). As focus group discussion explored participants' lack of understanding and clarity of the role(s) they could play in processes of desistance, and identified opportunities, some residents of Knowsley engaged in reflection about the possible roles they could play with ex-prisoners:

"I think that the best I could do, if I wanted to, would be to teach them some of my mechanic skills. Because on the weekends I do up old cars... I mean it would keep them busy learning a skill, but yeah I want paying for it for sure, as you're not getting me to do that otherwise." (Adam – Stockbridge Village Community Group Two)

"I think I could talk to them and help them with reading and writing... Because some apparently haven't been bothered to learn to read or write. So yeah, if you paid me to help them read and write, then that would make me more likely to do something I guess." (Chris – Huyton Community Group One)

Individual motivations of residents to become involved in supporting ex-prisoners were informed heavily by enhancing their capacity to execute this role(s). For residents of Knowsley, this required being financially incentivised to provide support to ex-prisoners, a reward that would acknowledge the sacrifice of their time and the individual motivation they would look to bring to the role.

Facilitating the capacity to act

The ignorance of ways to become involved in the supporting of ex-prisoners was a common and powerful feature of the focus groups. Therefore, despite the current strategy at play in Knowsley, as delineated by Knowsley CSP and Merseyside PCC, which seeks to champion greater involvement of (in)direct victims of crime and communities at the fore of decision-making and service delivery (See: Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017), it was clear that very few participants themselves knew of people actively involved in playing a role in these localised opportunities and/or the broader VCS:

“Even if I knew what I could be doing to help ex-prisoners I wouldn’t... I don’t think I even know anyone either who is involved in all of that. Like are we supposed to be policing ourselves now? Is this because of all this austerity stuff they talk about?... Yeah, why should we be made to make all the decisions? I mean what happens if we don’t want to?” (Steven – Whiston Community Group)

“I think what we are meant to be doing is like volunteering more, is that right?... I don’t think it’s on if we were ever made to voluntarily help them like... Nobody I know helps out, because I think it starts with not knowing what we should be doing. Because I get what volunteering is, but what does it mean when it’s with criminals? Surely you cannot be forced to do something like that?” (Rachael – Kirkby Community Group One)

Participants, whilst not themselves actively involved in volunteering, were not in the main dismissive of the potential for increased citizen influence upon criminal and social justice decision-making and service delivery in their communities. However, their enthusiasm for involving more volunteers was tempered by their frustration that more was not being

accomplished by statutory agencies and partnerships and that these bodies were not stimulating more participation. With more leadership from organisations like Knowsley CSP, some believed that greater participation could be achieved:

“I bet there are loads of people out there who want to be doing something, it’s just that they don’t know what it is that they could be doing... Yeah fair play to them, because I might not agree that they should be helping criminals so easily, but if that is what they want to do then why aren’t things being advertised more?... I wouldn’t know how to get involved, so wouldn’t you think more would be getting done to sign up or whatever you do to get people who want a job in it?” (John – Cronton Community Group)

“It baffles me like too, because you’re expected to do this and that, and yet they aren’t really telling you what to do... What about people as well who want to actually help, as if they are unclear on what they could be doing, then isn’t that just a waste?... I mean it wouldn’t make an ounce of difference to me if I knew what to do, but I get how it will obviously help those that want to.” (Deborah – Stockbridge Village Community Group Two)

It is the ability of individuals to give up their time to support ex-prisoners that was seen as the greatest hurdle. That, whilst willingness may be there, the reality of redirecting time into volunteering was just too ambitious an activity to consider for many. Some went as far as to argue that it was naïve and ill-considered to expect that their impoverished communities process the knowledge and understanding on how best to re-integrate and re-settle ex-prisoners. What compromised their faith further was the underpinning sense that many had that crime was a rational act, where the act was an act not just against the law but against the wider community that residents identified with. The breaching of the social bonds that tie is a threat to that community ideal and, therefore, to assist with an offender’s rehabilitation risked, for some, challenging their own morality, and the civic values of their community. As Dawn and Helen reflect below, greater incentivisation would help stimulate more citizen involvement, but that then risks unsettling relationships within the community further:

“I’m with you, because if I knew that I was going to get paid for helping out a former prisoner to stop offending anymore, then I would be tempted to do something... Well I didn’t say what I would do, because I haven’t got a clue about that. But I must admit I would seriously consider putting to one side the trust I’d lost in them... Yeah it would depend on the amount I would be given to do it as well.”
(Dawn – Huyton Community Group Two)

“Money is the only thing that would ever change my mind about wanting to help them out. It isn’t that I really need the money to help them. It is the principle... So yeah, it is about answering the reasons why I don’t want to help them, not how can I better help them, isn’t it?... If I can get something out of it for me, then that is definitely a reason why you would get involved, isn’t it?” (Helen – Prescott Community Group One)

Whilst the suggestion that the capacity for some residents of Knowsley to play a positive and proactive role in processes of desistance can be purchased, the impracticalities of such a request reaffirm the challenges that continue to prevail in attempts to increase the involvement of communities in processes of desistance. Moreover, to be financially incentivised to play a role in the desistance process of ex-prisoners is in contention with evidence (See: Baier 1986; Spitz and Mackinnon 1993; Pettit 1995; Elshaug and Metzger 2001; Ronel et al. 2009; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Armstrong 2014; Corcoran and Grotz 2016; Hoogervorst et al. 2016) that states the likelihood of an ex-prisoner desisting is far greater when the individuals encouraging and facilitating their motivations and capacity to ‘make good’ are doing so voluntarily. Yet, despite attempts to greater involve communities in offender management, residents of Knowsley explained that the answer to reducing rates of recidivism by ex-prisoners was not predicated upon their involvement, as the next and final section details.

The realities of reducing re-offending in Knowsley

Communities, the solution or the problem?

Throughout each focus group, the residents of Knowsley who participated in this study collectively felt that the rates of recidivism by ex-prisoners would not subside under the current initiatives implemented in Knowsley, which have sought to increase communal involvement at the frontline of service delivery (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Participants argued that, in failing to consult and gather citizens' input, Knowsley Council and Merseyside PCC had created initiatives, which, in their current guise, did not account for their unwillingness and incapacity to play a role in processes of desistance. It was stated by residents of Knowsley that, had they been consulted, it would have been revealed to Knowsley Council and Merseyside PCC how residents believe that relying upon their involvement in processes of desistance is misguided. Participants identified what they considered to be attempts to promote their involvement in the supervision and support of ex-prisoners as an effort to divert blame from statutory and non-statutory services upon communities for incidences of re-offending:

“For me, I think if we were just asked, you know it’s not hard, it would be crystal clear that we are not interested in supporting them... Do you not think it’s just them anyway trying to blame us for their incompetence?... I think they are quite daft really, I mean they’re the ones with the money and the knowhow, yet they are turning to us to make a stop to crime, give me a break.” (John – Halewood Community Group)

“They certainly overlook that most of us yeah, well speaking for myself, that I’m not happy or able to get on board and assist ex-prisoners... It angers me too that there is no communication with the public, as why don’t we have a voice in things you know?... Yeah everything just seems thrust upon us, and it’s just them ducking how rubbish they have been in protecting us from them.” (Daniel – Huyton Community Group Two)

A common theme through the focus groups was the frustration that the inability by statutory and non-statutory services/agencies to prevent the occurrence of crime in their communities had resulted in criticism of communities. That, too much responsibility was being devolved

to the community and now too much expectation was placed on citizens to address and help respond to crime within their own communities. At its worst, this saw some participants consider themselves as scapegoats for Knowsley CSP and Merseyside PCC's uncertainty upon how 'best' to reduce re-offending. They felt strongly that not enough emphasis had been placed on tackling the onset of criminality and that, as criminal activity becomes normalised, local residents possess neither the motivation, resources, nor capacity to prevent crime occurring in their locale:

"The police are missing a trick really, because they should be focusing on stopping crime taking place to begin with. Surely, that is what should be prioritised?... Because if you want to stop people re-offending, just stop them offending in the bloody first place, right?... I know it's easier said than done, but how many times are they going to keep going round in circles before they realise this, or maybe they do and they won't admit it?" (David – Huyton Community Group One)

"It's like, they would rather put a big giant plaster over the problem as a last chance solution, low and behold, we are the plaster... It does, doesn't it, that is what it feels like and they feel alright in doing that. But they just don't get that we aren't up to task, plain and simple... If they attempted, whatsoever in trying to talk to us they would understand that the majority of us are not in any fit state to do anything. Nor do we want too, hey." (Bob – Cronton Community Group)

Throughout their focus groups, residents of Knowsley were resolute in their opinions that reductions to re-offending in Knowsley by ex-prisoners were not predicated upon the involvement of communities in the delivery of rehabilitative services (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018). Alternatively, residents of Knowsley believed that emphasis should be assigned upon reducing the reasons why, to them, a 'weaker' individual would seek to become involved in crime:

“It involves far more than the suggestion we do more to pull our weight. It starts with creating more jobs that we can apply for, improving the schools, and building more houses... These are absolutely the reasons why a weaker person would use crime as an out. It has nothing to do with us, it’s about the problems which haven’t been sorted and allowed to run amok everywhere in Knowsley.” (Anna – Stockbridge Village Community Group One)

“I’ve always said keep me out of it, especially as I think there is more to be said for the lack of amenities for everyone... It’s going to be a big ask to cut the number of people addicted to drugs, transform the school, you know stuff like that. But this won’t happen overnight, were talking it taking generations to make the changes needed to put an end to crime. About time someone got the ball rolling.” (Keith – Prescott Community Group One)

The strength of feeling in the focus groups showed how passionately individuals think about crime and (in)security in their local community. They often showed an advanced appreciation of the diversity and seriousness of the crime and anti-social behaviours impacting on the well-being of the community. What was often apparent was that participants felt that such was the entrenched nature of the issues that quick-fix solutions were not able to abate criminality, and that attention was needed to wider structures of power and equality. Participants voiced their concerns regarding the limited availability of affordable accommodation, underperforming systems of education, minimal number of opportunities for employment, and a rising dependency upon drugs and alcohol in the borough. These were areas that had been previously identified almost two decades ago as being inter-related factors that serve to influence the motivations and capacity of an individual to (re-)offend (See: Social Exclusion Unit 2002), and participants know this. Today, as then, these are issues where successive government policies have sought to increase the involvement of the VCS to work in partnership with statutory agencies and the public, in the planning and delivering of rehabilitative services (Home Office 2004). However, the participants’ sense of cynicism concerning current approaches lay bare how the realities of multi-agency working in practice within Knowsley have not been reflective of the aspirations that underpinned their implementation (Ministry of Justice 2010a). Moreover, the residents of Knowsley stressed that their levels of apathy towards becoming involved in processes of desistance have

remained steadfast, and will continue until the multifaceted deprivation they experience day to day is no longer overlooked within policy reforms.

Conclusion

This chapter revealed the problems in Knowsley emanating from TR reforms, which have pressed communities to take responsibility for the prevention, early intervention, and enforcement of crime and anti-social behaviour in their neighbourhoods, with residents of Knowsley noting how reforms in practice have achieved little in empowering and mobilising their communities to become involved at the fore of offender management. The communities of Knowsley represented in this study felt abandoned and unsure why they (and nobody else) should step in to support who they considered as rational thinking offenders, when others will not. In communities where people are already cynical about authority, and the past and present inability of local criminal justice partners to listen, share their values, and deliver, what has resulted in practice is a very charged and complex climate where communities recognise they are being asked and expected to ‘do more’, but who do not feel motivated and capable of engineering the mechanisms that will change the behaviour of ex-prisoners. This is particularly as Knowsley is an area which features a sense of disadvantage that serves to compromise what those already involved can achieve, even for those residents who claimed to possess the capacity, the time, opportunities, and fiscal means to support formerly incarcerated individuals to desist. They were reluctant to do so based on the limited understanding and motivations they had about why they should play a role. Through speaking directly to the residents of Knowsley, those very members of ‘The Big Society’, they were deeply unsettled by the idea that they are the ‘big giant plaster’ whose job it is to solve re-offending by filling the vacuum created by the public sector’s withdrawal. They were anxious of what lay ahead, as they felt unsure about how they would fulfil the responsibilities expected of them. They were conscious that, even as law-abiding members of the community, the State has evidenced through reforms little consideration for improving their own and their communities’ quality of life and well-being.

The role that the communities within Knowsley were evidenced as playing was dictated by their own morality and adherence to civic values, with residents of Knowsley asserting that they were uncertain how to play a role which would support ex-prisoners and overlook the damage they had inflicted upon the (in)direct victims of their crime(s). There was a

discernible uneasiness felt amongst the communities of Knowsley in how taking up a position to aide ex-prisoners to desist equated to accepting responsibility for contributing to their original decision to offend. However, promoting communities to take greater ownership and responsibilities for addressing and finding solutions to local social issues was indeed the intention of the State (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). Yet, in their failure to establish the motivations and capacities of communities to become proactively engaged in tackling entrenched social problems, such as crime, this has had the reversed desired effect, with residents of Knowsley and local council representatives reaching a deadlock, and communities resistant to undertaking their 'expected' role within the delivery of public and criminal services until their own needs and concerns are addressed.

Altering the motivations of communities within Knowsley to become greater involved in processes of desistance requires addressing residents' deep-rooted resilience to change. These groups of representatives from the communities throughout Knowsley were bound by a shared aversion to helping others, notably those who have wronged them and their communities in the past. Also, residents' unwillingness to become involved was evidenced as stemming from a history of false hope and broken promises on how the infrastructure of their communities would be improved if they played their part. These communities, composed of individuals whose families had resided for multiple generations in Knowsley, were frustrated, disheartened, and tired at being asked to again look inwards and ask themselves whether they could 'do more' (Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). Feeling unsupported and fragile, communities stressed how preserving what little forms of capital they had, and being selective of who accessed these resources, had consequently taken priority. Communities in Knowsley were keen to highlight how rises in crime and anti-social behaviour have occurred not because they remain unwilling to play a role, but rather due to the withdrawal of the public sector in a climate of austerity.

Communities throughout Knowsley evidenced that, whilst they may act as the lynchpin determining the success of an ex-prisoner to desist and cease re-offending, they could not and will not be able to perform this role if they are not supplemented foremost with capacities to improve their own well-being and quality of life. Communities were picking holes in TR's agenda of how emboldening communities with increased opportunities to become engaged in re-integrating and re-settling ex-prisoners is only feasible if communities are willing, clear, and able to perform this undertaking. Furthermore, residents stressed bewilderment at how, at a time of reductions to frontline policing, and rises in crime and anti-social behaviour

experienced within their communities (HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018), that their involvement would lead to curtailing incidences of offending which statutory agencies and their powers and access to resources have been unable to achieve. It was the absence of these reassurances that led to communities further questioning and doubting their capacities to play a role in processes of desistance.

Chapter 9 – Conclusion

The study has examined the roles that people play in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners. Within the extensive body of desistance literature, relatively little is discussed explicitly about understanding the motivations and capacities that influence the roles people undertake, and how they are able to perform. This was achieved through approaching and listening to the voices from the range of individuals who have the capacity to influence an ex-prisoner's ability to desist and cease from re-offending (See: Quetelet 1833; Glueck and Glueck 1940; Fanon 1952; Matza 1964; Maruna 2001; Home Office 2004; McNeill and Weaver 2010; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2012, 2013a, b, 2015, 2018c; House of Commons 2011; Grimwood and Berman 2012; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014; Cabinet Office 2015). At a time when successive changes to criminal justice policies have been concerned to promote the role of citizens in delivering interventions and supporting ex-prisoners, the need to fully engage with how involved members of the wider community are in processes of desistance has never been greater.

The 'Transforming Rehabilitation' reform programme has sought to profoundly change the rehabilitative approaches used to reduce re-offending, and in terms of who supervises and manages ex-prisoners in the community post-release (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b, 2015, 2018c; Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014). It is an agenda of reform grounded upon the assertions by the State that reducing recidivism rates of ex-prisoners would be served better if delivered by local partners, utilising local services, to address local needs (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b, 2015, 2018c; Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014). However, the evidence base to suggest that communities of local people are ready and able to engage with this devolved responsibility is limited, and more needs to be known about whether the lay participants in the communities of society that ex-prisoners will re-join are clear of the decisive roles they have within processes of desistance. A key flank of government policy has been around devolved responsibility to communities and the VCS and there is an implicit need for local people to become involved in the prevention and early intervention of crime, as well as management of offenders in practice. The study has shown how complex the challenges faced by policy are in practice. Through engaging with a representation of the communities, statutory partners, and VCS organisations collectively involved in processes of

desistance within Knowsley, the study has provided a detailed insight and understanding of how the transformations to the landscape of rehabilitative policy are playing out in practice within this microcosm in real time. It has shown how professionals working in the sector have become fatigued while operating within a landscape characterised by change, reform and diminishing resources. The study has shown that, even when people are motivated to support ex-offenders, they find it difficult to realise the ambitions of their desire to ‘do good’ and they increasingly have to contend with ‘mission drift’ and concerns away from direct engagement with the ex-prisoners they feel motivated to support (Jones 2007; Davies 2011; Cornforth 2014; Maguire 2016; Hyndman 2017; Henderson and Lambert 2018). Finally, it has also shown how much work needs to be done to support communities to feel ready and willing to support ex-prisoners, especially when groups of people see criminal activity as a rational act taken by individuals who knowingly threaten the social fabric of strongly rooted territorial identities that are in part shaped by austerity and deprivation. These different facets of ‘the publics’ that ex-prisoners can expect to encounter, who are unwilling to play a role in the ex-prisoners’ processes of desistance, show how complex delivering rehabilitation is and how the continued emphasis on devolving powers to local people is making the situation even more complex and intractable. Only is it through communicating directly with these key stakeholders can knowledge be gained upon the realities of why, how, and when an ex-prisoner is able to desist and cease from re-offending.

Main Findings

What role(s) do members of society play in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?

The ontogenic, sociogenic, and liberative theoretical explanations of desistance have advanced our knowledge and understanding about how, when, and why an individual ceases from (re-)offending (See: Quetelet 1833; Glueck and Glueck 1940; Fanon 1952; Matza 1964; Maruna 2001; McNeill and Weaver 2010). Examining these three theoretical perspectives has led to greater clarity and comprehension of how the common feature amongst each was their assertion that society has a definitive role in the ability for ex-prisoners to desist and cease from re-offending (See: King 2013; Korobov 2015; Rocque 2015; Canton 2017; Terry and Abrams 2017; Schlager 2018), most notably the roles of lay participants within the communities that ex-prisoners will (re-)enter following their release from custody. However, although each theoretical perspective of desistance highlights the role of lay participants and

wider society as decisive in processes of desistance, neither of the three perspectives has provided an explanation of what the role of society in processes of desistance should entail, nor whether communities throughout society are motivated and capable of playing the decisive role that theory outlines they possess (Sparkes and Day 2016). This has led those such as Nhan, Bowen and Polzer (2017) and Polaschek, Yesberg and Chauhan (2018) to argue that society's collective understanding on how it can serve to promote the 'successful' re-integration and re-settlement of formerly incarcerated individuals remains less understood than the concepts themselves. Through purposefully identifying and talking to the members of society who comprise the communities of Knowsley, this study was able to ascertain in real time the role(s) they play in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners. The realities were found to be that participants representing the communities of Knowsley were not currently or previously involved proactively in a role that supported ex-prisoners to re-integrate and re-settle. Throughout all the focus groups conducted with lay participants from the communities of Knowsley, it was expressed how they were indeed unclear of what their role within processes of desistance should be, despite the formulaic rollout of policies encompassing the rehabilitation revolution (Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2012, 2013a, b, 2015, 2018c; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014).

Through residents of Knowsley evidencing that they were unclear of the role(s) they could be playing in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners, this is a significant implication to be drawn out. This is particularly the case given the current political directive championed and implemented at reducing re-offending by offenders (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b, 2018c), which is predicated on encouraging lay participation at the forefront of rehabilitative service delivery and offender management. Throughout the past decade, the State has attempted to revolutionise rehabilitation and there has subsequently been considerable efforts in promoting a discernible shift in how, and who, supervises and delivers rehabilitative support to former offenders (See: Home Office 2004; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2012, 2013a, b, 2015; House of Commons 2011; Grimwood and Berman 2012; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014; Cabinet Office 2015), with emphasis on the notion of 'The Big Society' which has sought to promote volunteerism, localism, and devolution (House of Commons 2011; Defty 2014; Gelsthorpe and Dominey 2016). Increases to available opportunities for individuals to take ownership and responsibility of their own communities was a concerted attempt by the State to access and capitalise on local intelligence and expertise to provide more appropriately targeted and successful solutions to local needs such as the re-integration and re-settlement of offenders

(Zellerer and Cannon 2002; Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). The approach taken in Knowsley concerning the delivery of public and criminal justice services is further validation of the State's continued acknowledgement that communities possess an influential, and greatly more successful, role than the State in being able to address and tackle their own social problems (Norman 2010).

In Knowsley, the tiered approach to offender management that is incorporated into practice today, combining prevention, early intervention, and enforcement (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017), is grounded upon a greater utilisation of lay participation, as well as VCS involvement. The purpose of including an increased representation of communities and penal VCS organisations in service delivery emphasises the assertion in policy that approaches are better served if delivered by local partners, utilising local services, to address local needs (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). Knowsley Council's 'Community Safety Plan: Strategic Priorities 2017-2020', and Merseyside PCC's 'Merseyside Police and Crime Plan: 2017-2021' have most recently provided a detailed vision of the current and future plans to address crime and anti-social behaviour in Knowsley, protect the vulnerable victims and communities of Knowsley, and support returning ex-offenders to change their behaviour (Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). These plans have stressed that, to successfully create and maintain a 'safer' Knowsley in practice, it must be predicated on encouraging and empowering the communities of Knowsley to 'do more'. There is also the expectation for communities to assist in the prevention and early intervention of crime, as well as the support and supervision of ex-offenders as they (re-)integrate and (re-)settle into their communities (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018).

The available opportunities in Knowsley that endeavour to increase the motivations of lay participation in how crime and community safety issues are addressed and tackled continue to be developed by the co-operative work of Knowsley CSP and Merseyside PCC (See: Merseyside PCC 2017, 2018; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; Knowsley MBC 2018a, b). This has resulted in a series of measures implemented in practice within Knowsley to bolster involvement in prevention and early intervention, such as the introduction of Knowsley's community messaging service, community champions, and Neighbourhood Watch (Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). These are in addition to existing opportunities for lay participants to become involved in processes of desistance via the VCS,

such as those in mentoring offered by MALS (MALS Merseyside 2017b). However, whether the communities of Knowsley will indeed ‘do more’ was evidenced by the lay participants from within the communities of Knowsley, who participated in this study, to be predicated on whether they felt they possessed the motivations and capacities to do so. Through additionally talking to participants representative of Knowsley’s IOM team, and participants who comprised the mentoring contingent at MALS, this study was able to evidence that, in practice, throughout Knowsley the opportunities that have implicitly been created for lay participants to become engaged in processes of desistance are not as accessible to them as policy has intended.

To the practitioners of Knowsley’s IOM, the community and the role that its members play in the desistance process of ex-prisoners was conceptualised differently amongst individuals. There were practitioners who viewed communities as a viable resource amidst a time of shrinking resources, whilst others depicted the community as a group hostile to those employed and actively seeking to supervise, manage, and better support ex-prisoners. Moreover, practitioners were critical of rescinding their power and responsibility to those they regarded as having little knowledge, experience, or willingness to best facilitate the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners. In speaking to those representative of public and private sector involvement in processes of desistance, the study sought to evidence how practitioners in Knowsley reflect upon the public accountability and legitimacy of their role. The mentors from MALS were also able to demonstrate how they, too, exercise power that can limit and facilitate community engagement to aid their best interests and of those they mentor. Mentors cited that, in an era of contestability, opening their doors to lay participants seldom occurs (See: Ministry of Justice 2013a, b, c; Annison, Burke and Senior 2014; Ludlow 2014) as, despite political rhetoric championing volunteerism, they were able to lay bare that not all individuals possess the characteristic necessary to be a mentor (See: Sundeen, Raskoff and Garcia 2007; Haski-Leventhal and Bargal 2008; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Ronel et al. 2009; Haski-Leventhal, Hustinx and Handy 2011; Durose et al. 2016; Hoogervorst et al. 2016). Mentors from MALS demonstrated that the efforts to utilise the VCS, as a means of greater involvement of lay participants in processes of desistance, had served to force VCS organisations to become selective as they attempt to deliver on the increasing demands placed upon them as their own role in offender management altered. The picture that was portrayed, through speaking to the mentors, practitioners, and communities (in)directly involved in processes of desistance within Knowsley, was that the roles members

of society play in the desistance process of ex-prisoners are far different in practice to those envisioned and expected in policy.

What motivates members of society to become involved in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?

Speaking first-hand to those in Knowsley, who hold varying roles within the desistance process of ex-prisoners, resulted in illuminating within practice the limitations of desistance-orientated policies to focus attention on stimulating the involvement of people in processes of desistance. This sentiment was most pronounced amongst the focus groups conducted with the residents of communities encompassing Knowsley who had lay participation in processes of desistance. Within these focus groups, it was expressed that the State's most recent legislative efforts to revolutionise rehabilitation (See: Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2013a, b) have sought to responsibilise communities. Residents of Knowsley conveyed hostility towards this notion that they, as law-abiding members of the community, should be responsible for taking greater ownership of their communities and those who offend within; with these lay participants of Knowsley expressing their understanding of how, as statutory agencies withdraw from the delivery of frontline services, it is they and their communities who are being expected to fill the vacuum. For it is true that, within Knowsley, there have continued to be reductions made, noticeably to frontline policing, including to staff and resources available throughout the agencies encompassing Knowsley CSP (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015b; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018; Merseyside PCC 2018). The motivations of the 'Community Safety Plan: Strategic Priorities 2017-2020' and 'Merseyside Police and Crime Plan: 2017-2021' in instructing the communities of Knowsley to 'do more' (Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017) were underpinned by the notion that communities would serve to minimise the effects imposed by the withdrawal of Knowsley CSP partner agencies, due to the reductions to their capabilities to prevent crime and anti-social behaviour and promote community safety (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018; Merseyside PCC 2018), with communities thereby acting to placate the transition from a paternalistic model of service provision to a co-operative model (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017).

The expectation that communities would welcome the opportunities to become involved in the frontline of service delivery is a naively held belief by the State (Watt 2010; Hayton 2012; Morgan 2012). As, through conversing with the communities of Knowsley, it was discovered that they were unwilling to respond, devise, and deliver interventions and support to attend to the specific gaps in meeting localised offender circumstances, with residents of Knowsley citing poor to non-existent communication with local representatives of Knowsley Council and/or Merseyside's PCC as the reason for the mistaken assumption that they would be disposed to playing a role. The reality for the majority of participating residents of Knowsley was that they were deeply unsettled by the idea that they are regarded as the 'big giant plaster', whose job it is to be the quick-fix solution to reducing re-offending and the pain it causes them. For those residents of Knowsley were able to see ahead and recognise that the majority of those who offend do, in fact, return to their communities following their release from custody (Ministry of Justice 2018c). Residents' ability to play a role was compounded by the fact that they did not know how they were supposed to enact local control, management, and support for ex-prisoners, nor were they willing to do so. This study was, therefore, able to highlight how, in Knowsley, there exists a disconnect between theoretical and political understandings of society's motivations to play a role in processes of desistance, and the challenges in practice.

There was a heightened level of resentment expressed by the communities of Knowsley towards their local CSP, which particularly centred upon lay participants' disagreement with the approach towards them as a collective to 'do more' in the prevention and early intervention of crime, including supporting and supervising the (re-)integration and (re-)settlement of ex-prisoners into their communities (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018). The residents of Knowsley represented in this study asserted that their motivations to become involved in processes of desistance had become diminished by the suggestion that, at the macro and micro levels, they should be expected to play a role. Lay participants who were representative of the communities throughout Knowsley detailed how they were deeply unsettled by the idea that their communities should aide individuals who they regarded as rational actors (Bentham 1789; Becker 1968; Newman and Marongiu 2009; Healy 2010; Huebner and Berg 2011), through supplying their experiences of how crime has personally caused irreversible physical and/or emotional harm, including collective harm to the perception of the community to those on the outside looking in. Thus, they demonstrated

the charged atmosphere and difficulties of empowering and embodying lay member participation, when a community affected by the real and potential occurrence of crime is unmotivated to become involved. Lay participants within the communities of Knowsley argued that to play a proactive role in processes of desistance was counter-intuitive to their own longstanding morals and civic values of the neighbourhood. Although such thoughts are in direct opposition to the assertions made within desistance literature for why society should make a conscious effort to welcome and (re-)build trusting relationships with ex-prisoners (See: Avineri and De-Shalit 1992; Kymlicka 1992; Van Ness and Strong 1997; Etzioni 2000; Crawford and Newburn 2003; Bazemore and Erbe 2004; Ward and Maruna 2007; Raynor and Robinson 2009; Canton 2011; Brooks 2012; McNeill 2012, 2016; McNeill et al. 2012; Barry 2013; Beckett-Wilson 2014; Morenoff and Harding 2014; Korobov 2015), this enabled the study to offer further validation that, in Knowsley, the expectations of how a community should perform differ to the representation of communities in reality.

The unwillingness shown by lay participants in Knowsley to become engaged in processes of desistance highlights how opportunities for them to become positively and proactively involved are being underutilised. This study's inclusion of representatives from the VCS sector allowed for the opportunity to ascertain the motivations and capacities of those individuals already involved in the desistance process of ex-prisoners. Mentors from MALS stated that the act of mentoring enables individuals to learn first-hand an understanding of the life histories of ex-prisoners and experiences post-release, with mentors detailing experiences in practice of how involvement in mentoring has the potential to alter the attitudes and perceptions an individual may hold of offenders (See: Immerwahr and Johnson 2002; McNeill 2006; Gray 2009; Haski-Leventhal 2009; Burke and Collett 2010; Weaver and McNeill 2010; Hill and Stevens 2011; Smith and Laurie 2011). Citing their own experiences once more, mentors noted that, once individuals become involved in acts of mentoring, there is a high probability that they will be motivated to remain as a mentor. Mentors from MALS expressed how they routinely experience feelings of personal pride in supporting mentees to cease, renewed energy to assist further mentees, and faith in their ability to repeat successfully this process. Although mentoring can effectively serve as an opportunity to encourage the motivations of an individual to become engaged within the desistance process of ex-prisoners, mentors themselves identified that this is predicated upon individuals having the motivations and capacities to take the decision to become involved in the act of mentoring to begin with. It was encapsulated throughout the narratives of all those who participated in

the study that, by presenting members of society with the opportunities to become involved in processes of desistance, this does not guarantee that they will readily fill these positions. Rather, individuals first require the requisite motivations and capacities to play a role, a factor that has been neglected in the State's transformative reforms to practice.

What capacity do members of society have to engage in the desistance processes of ex-prisoners?

This study evidenced that, across the spectrum of participants representing the various approaches in Knowsley, a person can become involved in the desistance process of ex-prisoners. Their motivations to become (and remain) involved, the role(s) they choose to play, and their ability to perform this role(s), are all influenced by their personal capacities and/or of those facilitating their role. Attempts to empower and mobilise the involvement of lay participation in processes of desistance were discovered to be additionally challenging in Knowsley due to the multiple levels of deprivation experienced throughout each neighbourhood (See: Office for National Statistics 2015c; Knowsley MBC 2016), once again serving to demonstrate the difficulties that have been endured in reducing rates of recidivism, despite the wholesale transformations to rehabilitative policies (See: Home Office 2004; Ministry of Justice 2010a, 2012, 2013a, b, 2015; House of Commons 2011; Grimwood and Berman 2012; Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014; Cabinet Office 2015). Lay participants within the communities of Knowsley could not comprehend how 'out of touch' the State and local council were with the realities of their lives. This indicated that, irrespective of their motivations, the lay participants did not believe their communities should be devolved the powers and responsibility to take ownership of their local neighbourhoods, with lay participants claiming that their communities cannot be expected to perform a role when they are not in receipt of the tools and services necessary to serve and maintain their own personal quality of life and well-being (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, b, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018). Furthermore, lay participants throughout the communities of Knowsley emphasised their view of the State and local council's disconnect to their lived situation, by stating that the initiatives created to transition power and responsibility to them have failed to account for their unwillingness and incapacity to play a role in processes of desistance (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015a, b, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017).

The reforms to the delivery of public and criminal services in Knowsley, which have led to a discernible push to involve communities at the frontline, were argued by lay participants to be a sign of ongoing austerity measures (Knowsley JSNA 2015a, 2016; Merseyside PCC 2017; The Knowsley Partnership 2017). The belief amongst lay participants was that the shift in emphasis within offender management was a coerced effort to disseminate blame away from (non-)statutory agencies for their inability to prevent the (re-)occurrence of crime in their communities. Granted, over the previous 12 months there has been a rise in overall crime experienced throughout Knowsley, with noticeable increases in the number of incidents of anti-social behaviour, including violence and sexual offences (See: The Knowsley Partnership 2017; Home Office 2018b). Further evidence is able to highlight how, preceding and during such time of rising crime, there have been reductions to both frontline policing numbers across Merseyside and Merseyside's annual police budget (See: Knowsley JSNA 2015b; Merseyside PCC 2017, 2018; Hargreaves, Husband and Linehan 2018; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018), including reductions to staff and resources experienced by fellow partners of Knowsley's IOM and Knowsley CSP (Knowsley JSNA 2015b; The Knowsley Partnership 2017; HMI Constabulary and Fire and Rescue Services 2018; Merseyside PCC 2018). However, it was not until speaking directly to practitioners actively involved as members of Knowsley's IOM and Knowsley CSP that it was shown how, in practice, the current structure and capacities for (non-)statutory agencies to perform their role are not transpiring as policy would hope.

The introduction of an IOM team within Knowsley was identified amongst those practitioners involved as an underutilised opportunity to produce a far greater and meaningful impact to support and supervise those most at risk of re-offending. The ambition of Knowsley IOM, as detailed by practitioners, is to provide a joined-up multi-agency approach that takes advantage of the skills, knowledge, experiences, and resources of the localised public, private, and VCS agencies of which it encompasses (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). Yet, although Knowsley's IOM features representatives from statutory agencies, local authorities, and localised VCS organisations (See: Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015), the rehabilitation revolution has not galvanised agencies into a working partnership in practice, but rather has brought to the surface new tensions as they work within this multi-agency arrangement. Practitioners representing Knowsley's IOM detailed insight into the challenges they and their organisations encounter on each occasion that they come face to face with different

occupational cultures. Practitioners evidenced how, through the considerable leniency that they are afforded by the State in practice to construct and operate their IOM to be reflective of the local environment, this has essentially been their undoing (Ministry of Justice 2010a, b, 2015; Barrett et al. 2015; Worrall and Corcoran 2015). For, what has ensued has been a persistent jostling for power, authority, and legitimacy, with each organisation having attempted to influence the operationalisation of the IOM to best reflect and suit their needs. Practitioners within this study detailed how some partnering agencies choose not to uphold their responsibilities, believing that more could be achieved if agencies worked in partnership to address and tackle the reasons for why crime occurs in the first instance. Moreover, additional members of the IOM partnership sought to impose their authority and limit the voices of fellow agencies. It was significant to unearth the tensions that exist between the occupational cultures within Knowsley's IOM, as outlining the capacities at play on the multi-agency arrangement in Knowsley can help to educate and enrich an understanding of working partnership in practice and how policy is interpreted.

The capacities of MALS to engage in processes of desistance were also noted by mentors participating in the study to have been impacted negatively by reforms emanating from policy. For mentors, the actions of TR in opening up the delivery of post-release supervision and TTG rehabilitative services to marketisation, did not serve to benefit their small and localised penal VCS organisation (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b). For, in practice, marketisation has been able to establish a strong, plentiful, and sustainable pool of diverse and innovative service providers (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b, c; Annison, Burke and Senior 2014; Ludlow 2014). Mentors from MALS highlighted that this has served to impose challenges on their capacity to gain access and secure available funding sources due to the increasingly competitive environment (See: Bowen and Donoghue 2013; Calder and Goodman 2013; Hedderman 2013; Bastow 2014; Fox, Bannister and Miszczak 2016; Clinks 2018; House of Commons 2018c). Moreover, the increased competitiveness amongst VCS organisations has resulted in deterioration to the pre-existing relationships that MALS had established with local penal VCS organisations that hold the same aims to mentor ex-prisoners as they transition from custody. Mentors evidenced that there was considerable hostility created in practice, given that the sustainability and operational capacity of MALS and other organisations within the VCS are in persistent jeopardy each time there is a failure to acquire funding.

Furthermore, mentors provided insight from practice that evidenced how their most recent success in securing funding through their involvement in Knowsley's IOM neither guaranteed their sustainability nor capacity to operate (Merseyside CRC 2018a, c, f). Mentors detailed that they have since felt exploited by partners within Knowsley IOM, as the number of referrals they receive continues to be unpredictable, and the quantity of funding they are provided is inadequate to contend with the frequency of referrals, resulting in MALS regularly subsidising its commitment to Knowsley IOM with its own funding reserves. Mentors from MALS noted that, without reciprocal support from Knowsley IOM, this has resulted in providing a reduced quality of mentoring service to its mentees than that achieved prior to their involvement as a member of the IOM. Furthermore, mentors detailed how morale within MALS had weakened because of their involvement in Knowsley IOM, as mentors are over-stretched and communications with fellow members of the IOM are non-existent. Despite the push by policy reforms to increase the accessibility of the VCS as a method of enhancing and mobilising societal involvement in processes of desistance, this study highlighted how the current sustainability and operational capacity of many penal VCS organisations involved in the desistance process of ex-prisoners have been compromised. Increasing societal involvement in processes of desistance via the VCS during this period of competitiveness, hostility, politicisation, and instability may act to discourage rather than promote members of society to remain involved (Ministry of Justice 2013a, b, 2018c).

Possible areas for future research

Maintaining the confidentiality of participants within this research study was a priority in order to safeguard the likelihood of them experiencing harm during and post data collection. This was achieved by the use of pseudonyms, and ensuring general notes, recordings, and transcribed data were stored separately from participants' consent forms, which could identify them as the individual that provided the source of data (See: Chapter 5). Whilst upholding ethical principles throughout the course of the study was considered imperative, as reaffirmed by this research study by readily adopting a universalist stance (Bryman 2001), it also served the purpose of heightening the potential to 'exit the field' following the phase of data collection (Erikson 1967; Bryman 2001). By imposing efforts to minimise the harm caused to those who participated, this strengthened the potential for future research interests based on the relationships and networks that were forged (Ryen 2004).

A potential research study, which could also be of significance in further adding to current understandings and knowledge of how processes of desistance transpire in practice, would be to return to the location of Knowsley and revisit participants to repeat the research once 12–24 months have elapsed after data collection has ended. Following the findings outlined in the report by the House of Commons Justice Select Committee’s eight-month inquiry into the effectiveness and viability of TR, existing CRC contracts are to now end two years early, in 2020 (GOV.UK 2018a; House of Commons 2018c). There would, therefore, be gains to be made in evidencing against this backdrop as to whether improvements have been achieved in practice to improve the motivations and capacities of communities to become involved in processes of desistance. In addition to rediscovering how Knowsley IOM’s multi-agency approach has performed, it would also indicate the operational capacity of MALS in this ongoing age of marketisation.

There too exists the possibility that future research studies could attempt to increase the size of the participant samples that could be represented in this study. The addition of either of the two existing penal VCS organisations located in Knowsley, alongside a larger sample size of practitioners from Knowsley’s IOM and/or Knowsley CSP, as well as lay participants from the communities of Knowsley, would lead to a greater representation of those involved within processes of desistance in Knowsley. This may further exemplify the challenges experienced within practice in Knowsley, which have proceeded with the rollout of TR reforms. Alternatively, it may serve to rebuff previous sentiments that arose previously, and thereby open new lines of inquiry and themes, thus adding to current knowledge and understanding of how processes of desistance transpire in practice. Finally, there also exists the further advances that can be achieved if a future research study evidenced how the rehabilitation revolution has affected practice in two or more locales. For, if this research study was replicated in another area, preferably one that was not recognised as featuring the multiple levels of deprivation that the neighbourhoods within Knowsley experience, there would exist the ability to compare and contrast how theory and policy have influenced the roles communities play in the desistance process of ex-prisoners. This would include whether the VCS organisations, public and penal agencies, and lay participants in this alternate location feel motivated and capable of engaging in processes of desistance, and why.

Bibliography

- Aaltonen, M. (2016) Post-release employment of desisting inmates. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 56(2): 350-369.
- Adriaenssen, A., Paoli, L., Karstedt, S., Visschers, J., Greenfield, V.A. and Pleysier, S. (2018) Public perceptions of the seriousness of crime: Weighing the harm and the wrong. *European Journal of Criminology* [First published online May 15, 2018]. DOI: 10.1177/1477370818772768 [Accessed: 24th October 2018].
- Agnew, R. (1999) A general strain theory of community differences in crime rates. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 36(2): 123-155.
- Alcock, P. (2010) Building the big society: A new policy environment for the third sector in England. *Voluntary Sector Review* [Online]. 1(3): 379-389. DOI: 10.1332/204080510X538365 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Alderson, P. (1998) Confidentiality and consent in qualitative research. *British Sociological Association Network*. 69: 6-7.
- Ali, S. and Kelly, M. (1998) Ethics and social research. In: Seale, C. (ed.) *Researching Society and Culture*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.58-76.
- Alvarez, R.M. and Brehm, J. (1995) American ambivalence towards abortion policy: Development of a heteroskedastic probit model of competing values. *American Journal of Political Science* [Online]. 39(4): 1055-1082. DOI: 10.2307/2111669 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Andrews, M. (2014) *Narrative Imagination and Everyday Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Andrews, D.A. and Bonta, J. (2010) Rehabilitating criminal justice policy and practice. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law* [Online]. 16(1): 39-55. DOI: 10.1037/a0018362. [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J. and Wormith, S. (2011) The risk-need-responsivity (RNR) model: Does adding the good lives model contribute to effective crime prevention? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 38(7): 735-755.
- Annison, J., Burke, L. and Senior, P. (2014) Transforming Rehabilitation: Another example of English 'exceptionalism' or a blueprint for the rest of Europe? *European Journal of Probation*. 6(1): 6-23.

Annison, H., Bradford, B. and Grant, E. (2015) Theorizing the role of 'the brand' in criminal justice: The case of integrated offender management. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 15(4): 387-406.

Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014: Chapter 12 [Online]. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/12/pdfs/ukpga_20140012_en.pdf> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Apel, R. and Sweeten, G. (2010) The impact of incarceration on employment during the transition to adulthood. *Social Problems* [Online]. 57(3): 448-479. DOI: 10.1525/sp.2010.57.3.448 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Arditti, J.A. (2012) *Parental Incarceration and the Family: Psychological and Social Effects of Imprisonment on Children, Parents, and Caregivers*. New York, U.S.A.: New York University Press.

Armstrong, R. (2014) Trusting the untrustworthy: The theology, practice and implications of faith-based volunteers' work with ex-prisoners. *Studies in Christian Ethics* [Online]. 27(3): 299-317. DOI: 10.1177/0953946814530227 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ashworth, A. (2002) Responsibilities, rights, and restorative justice. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 4(2): 578-595.

Association of Police and Crime Commissioners. (2018) *Role of the PCC* [Online]. Available at: <<http://www.apccs.police.uk/role-of-the-pcc/>> [Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Atkinson, H. (2012) *Local Democracy, Civic Engagement and Community*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Avineri, S. and De-Shalit, A. (eds.) (1992) *Communitarianism and Individualism - Oxford Readings in Politics and Government*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Avis, J. (2016) *Social Justice, Transformation and Knowledge*. Oxon: Routledge.

Bahr, S.J., Harris, L., Fisher, J.K. and Armstrong, A.H. (2010) Successful reentry: What differentiates successful and unsuccessful parolees? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 54(5): 667-692.

Baier, A. (1986) Trust and antitrust. *Ethics* [Online]. 96(2): 231-260. DOI: 10.1086/292745 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Bain, A. and Parkinson, G. (2010) Resettlement and social rehabilitation: Are we supporting success? *Probation Journal*. 57(1): 63-74.

- Barlow, S. and Maruna, S. (2012) Rehabilitation, generativity and mutual aid. In: Crewe, B. and Bennett, J. (eds.) *The Prisoner*. Oxon: Routledge. pp.131-141.
- Barnes, J.C. and Beaver, K.M. (2012) Marriage and desistance from crime: A consideration of gene-environment correlation. *Journal of Marriage and Family* [Online]. 74(1): 19-33. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2011.00884.x
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Barnes, J.C., Golden, K., Mancini, C., Boutwell, B.B., Beaver, K.M. and Diamond, B. (2014) Marriage and involvement in crime: A consideration of reciprocal effects in a nationally representative sample. *Justice Quarterly*. 31(2): 229-256.
- Barrett, G., Beckett-Wilson, H., Burke, L. and Millings, M. (2015) *Working Together to Reduce Reoffending: Reducing Reoffending Project 2012-2015* [Online].
Available at: <<http://reducingreoffending.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Working-together-to-reduce-reoffending.pdf>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Barrick, K., Lattimore, P.K. and Visher, C.A. (2014) Reentering women: The impact of social ties on long-term recidivism. *The Prison Journal*. 94(3): 279-304.
- Barry, M. (2000) The mentor/monitor debate in criminal justice: 'What Works' for offenders. *The British Journal of Social Work*. 30(5): 575-595.
- Barry, M. (2006) *Youth Offending in Transition: The Search for Social Recognition*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Barry, M. (2013) Desistance by design: Offenders' reflections on criminal justice theory, policy and practice. *European Journal of Probation*. 5(2): 47-65.
- Bastow, S. (2014) Transforming rehabilitation: Evolution not revolution. *Criminal Justice Matters*. 97(1): 10-11.
- Batson, C.D., Ahmad, N. and Tsang, J.A. (2002) Four motives for community involvement. *Journal of Social Issues* [Online]. 58(3): 429-445. DOI: 10.1111/1540-4560.00269
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Bazemore, G. and Umbreit, M. (2001) *A Comparison of Four Restorative Conferencing Models* [Online].
Available at: <<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojdp/184738.pdf>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Bazemore, G. and Erbe, C. (2004) Reintegration and restorative justice: Towards a theory and practice of informal social control and support. In: Maruna, S. and Immarigeon, R. (eds.) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.27-56.
- Bazemore, G. and Schiff, M. (2005) *Juvenile Justice Reform and Restorative Justice: Building Theory and Policy from Practice*. Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Becker, G. (1968) Crime and punishment: An economic approach. *Journal of Political Economy* [Online]. 76(2): 169-217. DOI: 10.1086/259394 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Beckett-Wilson, H. (2014) Criminal justice? Using a social capital theory to evaluate probation-managed drug policy. *Probation Journal*. 61(6): 60-78.
- Benhabib, S. (2002) *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. New Jersey, U.S.A.: Princeton University Press.
- Bennett, R. and Savani, S. (2011) Surviving mission drift: How charities can turn dependencies on government contract funding to their own advantage. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* [Online]. 22(2): 217-231. DOI: 10.1002/nml.20050 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Benson, A. (2014) “*The Devil that has come amongst us*”: *The Impact of Commissioning and Procurement Practices*. Working Paper 6 [Online]. Available at: <<http://www.independentaction.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Commissioning-and-procurement-final.pdf>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Bentham, J. (1789) *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Berger, P.L. and Luckmann, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Penguin Books Limited.
- Berri, I. and Yuval, F. (2013) New localism and neutralizing local government: Has anyone bothered asking the public for its opinion? *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* [Online]. 25(2): 623-653. DOI: 10.1093/jopart/mut031 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Bijleveld, C.C.J.H., Van der Geest, V. and Hendriks, J. (2012) Vulnerable youth in pathways to adulthood. In: Loeber, R., Hoeve, M., Wim Slot, N. and Van der Laan, P.H. (eds.) *Persisters and Desisters in Crime from Adolescence into Adulthood: Explanation, Prevention and Punishment*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing. pp.105-126.

- Blitz, C.L. (2006) Predictors of stable employment among female inmates in New Jersey. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 43(1): 1-22.
- Blokland, A.A.J. (2014) School, intensive work, excessive alcohol use and delinquency during emerging adulthood. In: Weerman, F. and Bijleveld, C.C.J.H. (eds.) *Criminal Behaviour from School to the Workplace: Untangling the Complex Relations Between Employment, Education, and Crime*. Oxon: Routledge. pp.87-107.
- Boduszek, D., Adamson, G., Shevlin, M., Hyland, P. and Bourke, A. (2013) The role of criminal social identity in the relationship between criminal friends and criminal thinking style within a sample of recidivistic prisoners. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment* [Online]. 23(1): 14-28. DOI: 10.1080/10911359.2013.737289 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Bottoms, A. (2003) Some sociological reflections on restorative justice. In: Von Hirsch, A., Roberts, J.V., Bottoms, A., Roach, K. and Schiff, M. (eds.) *Restorative Justice and Criminal Justice: Competing or Reconcilable Paradigms?* Oxford: Hart Publishing. pp.79-114.
- Bottoms, A. and Shapland, J. (2011) Steps towards desistance amongst male young adult recidivists. In: Farrall, S., Hough, M., Maruna, S. and Sparks, R. (eds.) *Escape Routes: Contemporary Perspectives on Life After Punishment*. Oxon: Routledge. pp.43-80.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986) The forms of capital. In: Richardson, J.G. (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Connecticut, U.S.A.: Greenwood Publishing Group. pp.241-258.
- Bowen, P. and Donoghue, J. (2013) Digging up grassroots? The impact of marketisation and managerialism on local justice, 1997 to 2013. *British Journal of Community Justice*. 11(2/3): 9-20.
- Bracken, D.C., Deane, L. and Morrisette, L. (2009) Desistance and social marginalization: The case of Canadian Aboriginal offenders. *Theoretical Criminology*. 13(1): 61-78.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989) Crime, shame, and reintegration. In: Bazemore, G. and Schiff, M. (eds.) *Juvenile Justice Reform and Restorative Justice: Building Theory and Policy from Practice*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.238-323.
- Braithwaite, J. (1998) Restorative justice. In: Tonry, M. (ed.) *Handbook of Crime and Punishment*. New York, U.S.A.: Oxford University Press. pp.323-344.
- Braithwaite, J. (1999) Restorative justice: Assessing optimistic and pessimistic accounts. *Crime and Justice* [Online]. 25: 1-127. DOI: 10.1086/449287 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Braithwaite, J. (2000) Survey article: Repentance rituals and restorative justice. *The Journal of Political Philosophy* [Online]. 8(1): 115-131. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9760.00095 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Braithwaite, J. (2002) *Restorative Justice and Responsive Regulation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Braithwaite, J. (2012) Restorative justice: Reintegrative shaming. In: Cullen, F.T. and Jonson, C.L. (eds.) *Correctional Theory: Context and Consequences*. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated. pp.127-146.
- Braithwaite, J. and Roche, D. (2001) Responsibility and restorative justice. In: Bazemore, G. and Schiff, M. (eds.) *Restorative Community Justice: Repairing Harm and Transforming Communities*. London: Routledge. pp.63-83.
- Braithwaite, J. and Strang, H. (2001) Introduction: Restorative justice and civil society. In: Strang, H. and Braithwaite, J. (eds.) *Restorative Justice and Civil Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.1-13.
- Brame, R., Mulvey, E.P., Schubert, C.A. and Piquero, A.R. (2018) Recidivism in a sample of serious adolescent offenders. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. 34(1): 167-187.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* [Online]. 3(2): 77-101. DOI: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Britto, S., Van Slyke, D.M. and Francis, T.I. (2011) The role of fear of crime in donating and volunteering: A gendered analysis. *Criminal Justice Review*. 36(4): 414-434.
- Broadbridge, A. and Parsons, L. (2003) Still serving the community? The professionalisation of the UK charity retail sector. *International Journal of Retail and Distribution Management* [Online]. 31(8): 418-427. DOI: 10.1108/09590550310484098 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Brooks, T. (2012) *Punishment*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Brunton-Smith, I. and McCarthy, D.J. (2016) Prison legitimacy and procedural fairness: A multilevel examination of prisoners in England and Wales. *Justice Quarterly*. 33(6): 1029-1054.
- Bryman, A. (2001) *Social Research Methods*. 5th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buck, G. (2017) "I wanted to feel the way they did". Mimesis as a situational dynamic of peer mentoring by ex-offenders. *Deviant Behavior*. 38(9): 1027-1041.
- Buck, G. (2018) The core conditions of peer mentoring. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 18(2): 190-206.

- Burke, L. and Collett, S. (2010) People are not things: What New Labour has done to probation. *Probation Journal*. 57(3): 232-249.
- Burke, L. and Collett, S. (2015) *Delivering Rehabilitation: The Politics, Governance and Control of Probation*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Burke, L., Millings, M. and Robinson, G. (2017) Probation migration(s): Examining occupational culture in a turbulent field. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 17(2): 192-208.
- Burnett, R. (2004) To reoffend or not to reoffend? The ambivalence of convicted property offenders. In: Maruna, S. and Immarigeon, R. (eds.) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.152-180.
- Burnett, R. (2010) Post-corrections reintegration: Prisoner resettlement and desistance from crime. In: Alder, J.R. and Gray, J.M. (eds.) *Forensic Psychology: Concepts, Debates and Practice*. 2nd ed. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.508-528.
- Burnett, R. and Maruna, S. (2004) So 'prison works', does it? The criminal careers of 130 men released from prison under Home Secretary, Michael Howard. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*. 43(4): 390-404.
- Bursik, R.J. Jr. and Grasmick, H.G. (1993) *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. Maryland, U.S.A.: Lexington Books.
- Bushway, S.D. and Paternoster, R. (2014) Identity and desistance from crime. In: Humphrey, J.A. and Cordella, P. (eds.) *Effective Interventions in the Lives of Criminal Offenders*. New York, U.S.A.: Springer. pp.63-77.
- Bushway, S.D., Paternoster, R. and Brame, R. (2003) Examining the prevalence of criminal desistance. *Criminology*. 41(2): 423-448.
- Byrne, B. (1998) Qualitative interviewing. In: Seale, C. (ed.) *Researching Society and Culture*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.206-226.
- Byrne, D. (2005) *Social Exclusion: Issues in Society*. 2nd ed. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Byrne, J.M., Taxman, F.S. and Young, D. (2002) *Emerging Roles and Responsibilities in the Reentry Partnership Initiative: New Ways of Doing Business* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/196441.pdf>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Cabinet Office. (2010) *Supporting a Stronger Civil Society: An Office for Civil Society Consultation on Improving Support for Frontline Civil Society Organisations* [Online]. Available at:

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/78926/support-stronger-civil-society_0.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Cabinet Office. (2015) *Police and Crime Commissioners and Civil Society* [Online]. Available at:

<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/416621/PCCs_and_Civil_Society_24_March_2015.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Calder, S.D. and Goodman, A.H. (2013) Transforming rehabilitation, a fiscal motivated approach to offender management. *British Journal of Community Justice*. 11(2/3): 175-188.

Calverley, A. (2013) *Cultures of Desistance: Rehabilitation, Reintegration and Ethnic Minorities*. Oxon: Routledge.

Canton, R. (2011) *Probation: Working with Offenders*. Oxon: Routledge.

Canton, R. (2017) *Why Punish? An Introduction to the Philosophy of Punishment*. London: Palgrave.

Capaldi, D.M., Kerr, D.C.R., Eddy, J.M. and Tiberio, S.S. (2016) Understanding persistence and desistance in crime and risk behaviors in adulthood: Implications for theory and prevention. *Prevention Science* [Online]. 17(7): 785-793. DOI: 10.1007/s11121-015-0609-0 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Carlsson, C. (2012) Using 'turning points' to understand processes of change in offending: Notes for a Swedish study on life courses and crime. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 52(1): 1-16.

Casiday, R., Kinsman, E., Fisher, C. and Bamba, C. (2008) Volunteering and health: What impact does it really have? *Volunteering England* [Online]. 9(3): 1-13.

Available at:
<<http://www.volunteering.org.uk/whatwedo/projects+and+initiatives/volunteeringinhealth/hsc.htm>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Cawood, N.D. and Wood, J.M. (2014) Group mentoring: The experience of adolescent mentees on probation. *Social Work with Groups* [Online]. 37(3): 213-229. DOI: 10.1080/01609513.2013.862895

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Cherney, A. and Fitzgerald, R. (2016) Finding and keeping a job: The value and meaning of employment for parolees. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 60(1): 21-37.

Chinman, M.J. and Wandersman, A. (1999) The benefits and costs of volunteering in community organizations: Review and practical implications. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 28(1): 46-64.

Cho, R.M. and Tyler, J.T. (2013) Does prison-based adult basic education improve postrelease outcomes for male prisoners in Florida? *Crime & Delinquency*. 59(7): 975-105.

Christie, N. (1977) Conflicts as property. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 17(1): 1-15.

Cid, J. and Marti, J. (2012) Turning points and returning points: Understanding the role of family ties in the process of desistance. *European Journal of Criminology*. 9(6): 603-620.

Clary, E.G., Snyder, M. and Stukas, A.A. (1996) Volunteers' motivations: Findings from a national survey. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 25(4): 485-505.

Clary, E.G., Snyder, M., Ridge, R.D., Copeland, J., Stukas, A.A., Haugen, J. and Miene, P. (1998) Understanding and assessing the motivations of volunteers: A functional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* [Online]. 74(6): 1516-1530. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1516

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Clinks. (2015) *Early Doors: The Voluntary Sector's Role in Transforming Rehabilitation* [Online].

Available at: <https://blogs.ncvo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/track-tr_early-doors.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Clinks. (2016) *Change & Challenge: The Voluntary Sector's Role in Transforming Rehabilitation* [Online].

Available at: <<https://blogs.ncvo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Change-and-Challenge-Final.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Clinks. (2018) *Under Represented, Under Pressure, Under Resourced: The Voluntary Sector in Transforming Rehabilitation* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.clinks.org/sites/default/files/2018-10/clinks_track-tr_under_final-web.pdf> [Accessed: 24th October 2018].
- Clough, P. and Nutbrown, C. (2002) *A Student's Guide to Methodology: Justifying Enquiry*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Cobbina, J.E. and Bender, K.A. (2012) Predicting the future: Incarcerated women's views of re-entry success. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 51(5): 275-294.
- Cobbina, J.E., Huebner, B.M. and Berg, M.T. (2012) Men, women, and post-release offending: An examination of the nature of the link between relation ties and recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*. 58(3): 331-361.
- Codd, H. (2007) Prisoners families and resettlement: A critical analysis. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*. 46(3): 255-63.
- Coleman, J.S. (1958) Relational analysis: The study of social organizations with survey methods. *Human Organization* [Online]. 17(4): 28-36. DOI: 10.17730/humo.17.4.q5604m676260q8n7 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Commons Hansard Debates [Online], 19th July 2017, HCWS81 Available at: <<https://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/written-questions-answers-statements/written-statement/Commons/2017-07-19/HCWS81/>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Community Foundation. (2018) *Vision, Mission and Values* [Online]. Available at: <<http://www.cfmerseyside.org.uk/about-us/vision-mission-and-values>> [Accessed: 24th October 2018].
- Cook, K.J. (2006) Doing difference and accountability in restorative justice conferences. *Theoretical Criminology*. 10(1): 107-124.
- Cook, P.J., Kang, S., Braga, A.A., Ludwig, J. and O'Brien, M.E. (2015) An experimental evaluation of a comprehensive employment-oriented prisoner re-entry program. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. 31(3): 355-382.
- Corcoran, M. (2008) What does government want from the penal voluntary sector? *Criminal Justice Matters*. 71(1): 36-38.
- Corcoran, M. (2011) Dilemmas of institutionalization of the penal voluntary sector in England and Wales. *Critical Social Policy*. 31(1): 30-52.

- Corcoran, M. and Grotz, J. (2016) Deconstructing the panacea of volunteering in criminal justice. In: Hucklesby, A. and Corcoran, M. (eds.) *The Voluntary Sector and Criminal Justice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp.93-116.
- Cornforth, C. (2014) Understanding and combating mission drift in social enterprises. *Social Enterprise Journal* [Online]. 10(1): 3-20. DOI: 10.1108/SEJ-09-2013-0036 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Corry, D. and Stoker, G. (2017) *The 'Shared Society' Needs a Strong Civil Society: A Progressive Agenda for Change* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.thinknpc.org/resource-hub/the-shared-society-needs-a-strong-civil-society/>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Craig, J.M., Diamond, B. and Piquero, A.R. (2014) Marriage as an intervention in the lives of criminal offenders. In: Humphrey, J.A. and Cordella, P. (eds.) *Effective Interventions in the Lives of Criminal Offenders*. New York, U.S.A.: Springer. pp.19-40.
- Crawford, A. (1997) *The Local Governance of Crime: Appeals to Community and Partnerships*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crawford, A. (1999) Questioning appeals to community in crime prevention and control. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*. 7(4): 509-530.
- Crawford, A. (2002) The state, community and restorative justice: Heresy, nostalgia and butterfly collecting. In: Walgrave, L. (ed.) *Restorative Justice and the Law*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.101-129.
- Crawford, A. and Newburn, T. (2003) *Youth Offending and Restorative Justice: Implementing Reform in Youth Justice*. Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Creswell, J.W. (2009) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Crime and Disorder Act 1998: Chapter 37* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1998/37/pdfs/ukpga_19980037_en.pdf> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Crook, R. and Wood, D. (2014) 'The customer is always right'? Consumerism and the probation service. *European Journal of Probation*. 6(1): 57-66.
- Crow, I. (2001) *The Treatment and Rehabilitation of Offenders*. London: SAGE Publications Limited.

- Cuevas, C., Wolff, K.T. and Baglivio, M.T. (2017) Self-efficacy, aspirations, and residential placement outcomes: Why belief in a prosocial self matters. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 52: 1-11.
- Cullen, F.T. (2012) Taking rehabilitation seriously: Creativity, science, and the challenge of offender change. *Punishment & Society*. 14(1): 94-114.
- Cullen, F.T. and Moon, M.M. (2002) Reaffirming rehabilitation: Public support for correctional treatment. In: Allen, H.E. (ed.) *What Works? Risk Reduction: Interventions for Special Needs Offenders*. Maryland, U.S.A.: American Correctional Association. pp.7-25.
- Cullen, F.T., Fisher, B.S. and Applegate, B.K. (2000) Public opinion about punishment and corrections. *Crime and Justice* [Online]. 27: 1-79. DOI: 10.1086/652198 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Cullen, F.T., Sundt, J.L. and Wozniak, J.F. (2001) The virtuous prison: Toward a restorative rehabilitation. In: Pontell, H.N. and Shichor, D. (eds.) *Contemporary Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice: Essays in Honor of Gilbert Geis*. New Jersey, U.S.A.: Prentice Hall. pp.265-286.
- Cunneen, C. and Goldson, B. (2015) Restorative justice? A critical analysis. In: Goldson, B. and Muncie, J. (eds.) *Youth, Crime and Justice*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.137-156.
- Currie, E. (2013) *Crime and Punishment in America*. New York, U.S.A.: Picador.
- Curtis, J. (1971) Voluntary association joining: A cross-national comparative note. *American Sociological Review* [Online]. 36(5): 872-880. DOI: 10.2307/2093673 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Daly, K. (2000) Revisiting the relationship between retributive and restorative justice. In: Strang, H. and Braithwaite, J. (eds.) *Restorative Justice: From Philosophy to Practice*. Farnham: Ashgate Publishing. pp.33-54.
- Daly, K. (2003) Mind the gap: Restorative justice in theory and practice. In: Von Hirsch, A., Roberts, J.V., Bottoms, A., Roach, K. and Schiff, M. (eds.) *Restorative Justice and Criminal Justice: Competing or Reconcilable Paradigms?* Oxford. Hart Publishing. pp.219-236.
- Daly, K. (2016) What is restorative justice? Fresh answers to a vexed question. *Victims & Offenders*. 11(1): 9-29.
- Davey, L., Day, A. and Balfour, B. (2014) Performing desistance: How might theories of desistance from crime help us understand the possibilities of prison theatre? *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 59(8): 798-809.

Davies, S. (2011) Outsourcing, public sector reform and the changed character of the UK state-voluntary sector relationship. *International Journal of Public Sector Management* [Online]. 24(7): 641-649. DOI: 10.1108/09513551111172468 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Davis, C., Bahr, S.J. and Ward, C. (2013) The process of offender reintegration: Perceptions of what helps prisoners reenter society. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 13(4): 446-469.

Dean, H. (2010) *Understanding Human Need: Social Issues, Policy and Practice*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (2012) Motivation, personality, and development within embedded social contexts: An overview of self-determination theory. In: Ryan, R. (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp.85-107.

Defty, A. (2014) Can you tell what it is yet? Attitudes towards 'The Big Society'. *Social Policy and Society* [Online]. 13(1): 13-24. DOI: 10.1017/S1474746413000213 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

DeLisi, M. and Piquero, A.R. (2011) New frontiers in criminal careers research, 2000-2001: A state-of-the-art review. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 39(4): 289-301.

Denscombe, M. (1998) *The Good Research Guide: For Small-scale Social Research Projects*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Denscombe, M. (2010) *Ground Rules for Social Research: Guidelines for Good Practice*. 2nd ed. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Department for Work and Pensions. (2018) *DWP Benefit Claimants – Working Age Client Group: Out-of-Work Benefits* [Online].

Available at:

<<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmb/la/1946157103/report.aspx?town=knowsley>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

De Vaus, D. (2001) *Research Design in Social Research*. London: SAGE Publications Limited.

De Vel-Palumbo, M., Howarth, L. and Brewer, M.B. (2018) 'Once a sex offender always a sex offender'? Essentialism and attitudes towards criminal justice policy. *Psychology, Crime & Law*. 25(5): 1-19.

Devereux, P.J. (2014) *Intergenerational Return to Human capital: Better Educated Parents Invest More Time and Money in their Children, who are More Successful in the Labor Market* [Online].

Available at: <<https://wol.iza.org/uploads/articles/19/pdfs/intergenerational-return-to-human-capital.pdf?v=1>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Diamond, B., Morris, R.G. and Piquero, A.R. (2017) Stability in the underlying constructs of self-control. *Crime & Delinquency*. 63(3): 235-266.

Dignan, J. (2005) *Understanding Victims and Restorative Justice*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Doherty, E.E. and Ensminger, M.E. (2013) Marriage and offending among a cohort of disadvantaged African Americans. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 50(1): 104-131.

Doherty, E.E. and Bersani, B.E. (2016) Understanding the mechanisms of desistance at the intersection of race, gender, and neighborhood context. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 53(5): 681-710.

Dorling, D. (2010) *Injustice: Why Social Inequality Persists*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

Douhou, S., Magnus, J.R. and Van Soest, A. (2011) The perception of small crime. *European Journal of Political Economy* [Online]. 27(4): 749-763. DOI: 10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2011.05.005 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Duff, R.A. (1992) Alternatives to punishments - or alternative punishments? In: Cragg, W. (ed.) *Retributivism and its Critics: Papers of the Special Nordic Conference Held at the University of Toronto, 25-27th June 1990, vol.47*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag. pp.44-68.

Duff, R.A. (2001) *Punishment, Communication, and Community*. New York, U.S.A.: Oxford University Press.

Dufour, I.F., Brassard, R. and Martel, J. (2015) An integrative approach to apprehend desistance. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 59(5): 480-501.

Durnescu, I. (2017) The five stages of prisoner reentry: Toward a process theory. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 62(8): 2195-2215.

Durose, C., Van Hulst, M., Jeffares, S., Escobar, O., Agger, A. and De Graaf, L. (2016) Five ways to make a difference: Perceptions of practitioners working in urban neighborhoods. *Public Administration Review* [Online]. 74(4): 576-586. DOI: 10.1111/puar.12502 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Duwe, G. and Clark, V. (2013) Blessed be the social tie that binds: The effects of prison visitation on offender recidivism. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. 24(3): 271-296.
- Dwyer, P. (2003) *Understanding Social Citizenship: Themes and Perspectives for Policy and Practice*. 2nd ed. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Dwyer, P. (2013) Social justice. In: Dwyer, P. and Shaw, S. (eds.) *An Introduction to Social Policy*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.14-25.
- Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989) Building theories from case study research. *The Academy of Management Review* [Online]. 14(4): 532-550. DOI: 10.5465/amr.1989.4308385 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Eland-Goossensen, M.A., Van De Goor, L.A.M., Vollemans, E.C., Hendriks, V.M. and Garretsen, H.F.L. (1997) Snowball sampling applied to opiate addicts outside the treatment system. *Addiction Research* [Online]. 5(4): 317-330. DOI: 10.3109/16066359709004346 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Elshaug, C. and Metzger, J. (2001) Personality attributes of volunteers and paid workers engaged in similar occupational tasks. *The Journal of Social Psychology* [Online]. 141(6): 752-763. DOI: 10.1080/00224540109600586 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Eman, J. (2012) The role of sport in making sense of the process of growing old. *Journal of Aging Studies* [Online]. 26(4): 467-475. DOI: 10.1016/j.jaging.2012.06.006 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Erikson, K.T. (1967) A comment on disguised observation in sociology. *Social Problems* [Online]. 14(4): 366-373. DOI: 10.2307/798850 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Esposito, R. (2010) *Communitas: The Origin and Destiny of Community*. California, U.S.A. Stanford University Press.
- Etherington, S. (2006) The transformation of public services - The voluntary and community sector and the criminal justice system. In: Tarry, N. (ed.) *Returning to its Roots? A Role for the Third Sector in Probation*. London: Social Market Foundation. pp.36-43.
- Etzioni, A. (1995) *The Spirit of Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Communitarian Agenda*. London: Fontana Press.
- Etzioni, A. (2000) *The Third Way to a Good Society*. London: Demos.
- Evans, E. (2016) The expected impacts of Transforming Rehabilitation on working relationships with offenders. *Probation Journal*. 63(2): 153-161.
- Fanon, F. (1952) *White Skin: Black Masks*. New York, U.S.A.: Grove Press.

- Farrall, S. (2002) *Rethinking What Works with Offenders*. Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Farrall, S. (2004) Social capital, probation supervision and desistance from crime. In: Maruna, S. and Immarigeon, R. (eds.) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.57-82.
- Farrall, S., Sharpe, G., Hunter, B. and Calverley, A. (2011) Theorizing structural and individual-level processes in desistance and persistence: Outlining an integrated perspective. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* [Online]. 44(2): 218-234. DOI: 10.1177/0013164410381366 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Faulkner, D. (2003) Taking citizenship seriously: Social capital and criminal justice in a changing World. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 3(3): 287-315.
- Faulkner, D. and Burnett, R. (2012) *Where Next for Criminal Justice?* Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Feldman, S. (2003) Values, ideology, and structure of political attitudes. In: Sears, D.O., Huddy, L. and Jervis, R. (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. New York, U.S.A.: Oxford University Press. pp.477-508.
- Ferreira, F.H.G. and Peragine, V. (2015) *Equality of Opportunity: Theory and Evidence*. Policy Research Working Paper 7217 [Online]. Available at: <<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/382131467998206429/pdf/WPS7217.pdf>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Fleurbaey, M. (1995) Equality and responsibility. *European Economic Review* [Online]. 39(3/4): 683-689. DOI: 10.1016/0014-2921(94)00075-B [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Flick, U. (1998) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. 5th ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Flynn, L.R. and Goldsmith, R.E. (2013) *Case Studies for Ethics in Academic Research in the Social Sciences*. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated.
- Fontana, A. and Frey, J.H. (2000) The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In: Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.) *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.645-672.
- Forrest, W. and Hay, C. (2011) Life-course transitions, self-control and desistance from crime. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 11(5): 487-513.

- Fox, J.K. (2016) Civic commitment: Promoting desistance through community integration. *Punishment & Society*. 18(1): 68-94.
- Fox, C., Bannister, J. and Mischczak, P. (2016) The 2010-2015 coalition and criminal justice: Continuities and contradictions. *Safer Communities* [Online]. 15(2): 110-120. DOI: 10.1108/SC-11-2015-0039
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Fraser, N. (1999) Social justice in the age of identity politics: Redistribution, recognition, and participation. In: Ray, L. and Sayer, A. (eds.) *Culture and Economy after the Cultural Turn*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.25-52.
- Freeman, T. (2006) 'Best practice' in focus group research: Making sense of different views. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* [Online]. 56(5): 491-497. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2648.2006.04043.x
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Frey, J.H. and Fontana, A. (1993) The group interview in social research. In: Morgan, D.L. (ed.) *Successful Focus Groups: Advancing the State of the Art*. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated. pp.20-34.
- Garland, D. (1990) *Punishment and Modern Society: A Study in Social Theory*. Illinois, U.S.A.: University of Chicago Press.
- Garland, D. (2001) *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Garland, B.E. and Hass, A.Y. (2015) An outcome evaluation of a Midwestern prisoner reentry initiative. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. 26(3): 293-314.
- Garland, B.E., Wodahl, E. and Schuhmann, R. (2013) Value conflict and public opinion toward prisoner reentry initiatives. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*. 24(1): 27-48.
- Gatti, U., Tremblay, R.E. and Vitaro, F. (2009) Iatrogenic effect of juvenile justice. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* [Online]. 50(8): 991-998. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.02057.x
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Gelsthorpe, L. and Dominey, J. (2016) Diversity: The voluntary sector's vision in criminal justice. In: Hucklesby, A. and Corcoran, M. (eds.) *The Voluntary Sector and Criminal Justice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp.189-210.
- Gergen, K.J. (1985) The social constructionist movement in modern psychology. *American Psychologist* [Online]. 40(3): 266-275. DOI: 10.1037/0003-066X.40.3.266
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Gibson, W.J. and Brown, A. (2009) *Working with Qualitative Data*. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Gilbert, N. (2008) *Researching Social Life*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Connecticut, U.S.A.: Stanford University Press.
- Gideon, L. (2010) Drug offender's perceptions of motivation: The role of motivation in rehabilitation and reintegration. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 54(4): 597-610.
- Giordano, P.C. (2014) Mechanisms underlying the desistance process: Reflections on 'a theory of cognitive transformation'. In: Shapland, J., Farrall, S. and Bottoms, A. (eds.) *Global Perspectives on Desistance: Reviewing what we know and looking to the Future*. London: Routledge. pp.11-27.
- Giordano, P.C., Cernkovich, S.A. and Rudolph, J.L. (2002) Gender, crime and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American Journal of Sociology*. 107(4): 990-1064.
- Giordano, P.C., Cernkovich, S.A. and Holland, D.D. (2003) Changes in friendship relations over the life course: Implications for desistance from crime. *Criminology*. 41(2): 293-328.
- Giziene, V. and Simanaviciene, Z. (2015) The impact of human capital on labour market: Lithuanian case. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* [Online]. 191: 2437-2442. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.331
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Glueck, S. and Glueck, E. (1940) *Juvenile Delinquents Grown Up*. Oxford: Commonwealth Fund.
- Gomm, R. (2004) *Social Research Methodology: A Critical Introduction*. 2nd ed. New York, U.S.A.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Goodey, J. (2005) *Victims and Victimology: Research, Policy and Practice*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Gorard, S. (2013) *Research Design: Creating Robust Approaches for the Social Sciences*. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Gosling, H. (2016) 'All this is about is money and making sure that heads are on beds': Perceptions of payment by results in a therapeutic community. *Probation Journal*. 63(2): 144-152.
- Gosling, H. and Buck, G. (2015) Mentoring: Crossing boundaries with care? *Criminal Justice Matters*. 99(1): 22-33.

- GOV.UK. (2013) *Local Commissioning of Victims' Services* [Online].
Available at: <<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/local-commissioning-of-victims-services>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- GOV.UK. (2014a) *70 Resettlement Prisons Announced for England and Wales* [Online].
Available at: <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/70-resettlement-prisons-announced-for-england-and-wales>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- GOV.UK. (2014b) *Charities in Front Seat of New Reoffending Drive* [Online].
Available at: <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/charities-in-front-seat-of-new-reoffending-drive>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- GOV.UK. (2018a) *All Schools and Colleges in Knowsley: Overall Performance at end of Key Stage 4 in 2017 – All Pupils* [Online].
Available at: <<https://www.compare-school-performance.service.gov.uk/schools-by-type?step=phase®ion=340&geographic=la&phase=secondary&page=2&For=secondary&DatasetFilter=final&Show=All+pupils+2018>>
[Accessed: 24th October 2018].
- GOV.UK. (2018b) *GCSE Results ('Attainment 8') for Children Aged 14 to 16 (Key Stage 4)* [Online].
Available at: <<https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/education-skills-and-training/11-to-16-years-old/gcse-results-attainment-8-for-children-aged-14-to-16-key-stage-4/latest>>
[Accessed: 24th October 2018].
- GOV.UK. (2018c) *Justice Secretary Outlines Future Vision for Probation* [Online].
Available at: <<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/justice-secretary-outlines-future-vision-for-probation>>
[Accessed: 24th October 2018].
- Granfield, R. and Cloud, W. (2001) Social context and 'natural recovery': The role of social capital in the resolution of drug-associated problems. *Substance Use & Misuse* [Online]. 36(11): 1543-70. DOI: 10.1081/JA-100106963
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Gray, E.D. (2004) *Doing Research in the Real World*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited.

Gray, P. (2009) The political economy of risk and the new governance of youth crime. *Punishment & Society*. 11(4): 443-458.

Gray, E., Jackson, J. and Farrall, S. (2008) Researching everyday emotions: Towards a multi-disciplinary investigation of the fear of crime. In: Kury, H. (ed.) *Fear of Crime – Punitivity: New Developments in Theory and Research*, vol.3. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Brockmeyer. pp.3-24.

Grimwood, G.G. and Berman, G. (2012) *Reducing Reoffending: The “What Works” Debate* (12/71) [Online].

Available at: <<http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/RP12-71/RP12-71.pdf>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Haldane, A.G. (2014) *In Giving, How Much do we Receive? The Social Value of Volunteering*, speech 9 September, London [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/-/media/boe/files/speech/2014/in-giving-how-much-do-we-receive-the-social-value-of-volunteering.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Halsey, M. (2017) Narrative criminology. In: Deckert, A. and Sarre, R. (eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Australian and New Zealand Criminology, Crime and Justice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp.633-647.

Halsey, M. and Harris, V. (2011) Prisoner futures: Sensing the signs of generativity. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* [Online]. 44(1): 74-93. DOI: 10.1177/0004865810393100

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Hancock, L., Mooney, G. and Neal, S. (2012) Crisis social policy and the resilience of the concept of community. *Critical Social Policy*. 32(3): 343-346.

Handy, F., Cnaan, R.A., Brudney, J.L., Ascoli, U., Meijs, L.C.M.P. and Ranade, S. (2000) Public perception of “who is a volunteer”: An examination of the net-cost approach from a cross-cultural perspective. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* [Online]. 11(1): 45-65. DOI: 10.1023/A:1008903032393 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Harding, D.J., Morenoff, J.D. and Herbert, C.W. (2013) Home is hard to find: Neighborhoods, institutions, and the residential trajectories of returning prisoners. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* [Online]. 647(1): 214-236. DOI: 10.1177/0002716213477070

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Harding, D.J., Wyse, J.J.B., Dobson, C. and Morenoff, J.D. (2014) Making ends meet after prison. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* [Online]. 33(2): 440-470. DOI: 10.1002/pam.21741

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Hargreaves, J., Husband, H. and Linehan, C. (2018) *Police Workforce, England and Wales, 31 March 2018* (11/18) [Online].

Available at:
<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/726401/hosb1118-police-workforce.pdf>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Haski-Leventhal, D. (2009) Altruism and volunteerism: The perceptions of altruism in four disciplines and their impact on the study of volunteerism. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* [Online]. 39(3): 271-299. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-5914.2009.00405.x
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Haski-Leventhal, D. and Bargal, D. (2008) The volunteer stages and transitions model: Organizational socialization of volunteers. *Human Relations* [Online]. 61(1): 67-102. DOI: 10.1177/0018726707085946

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Haski-Leventhal, D., Hustinx, L. and Handy, F. (2011) What money cannot buy: The distinctive and multidimensional impact of volunteers. *Journal of Community Practice* [Online]. 19(2): 138-158. DOI: 10.1080/10705422.2011.568930

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Hayton, R. (2012) Fixing broken Britain. In: Heppell, T. and Seawright, D. (eds.) *Cameron and the Conservatives: The Transition to Coalition Government*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp.136-148.

Healy, D. (2010) *The Dynamics of Desistance: Charting Pathways through Change*. Devon: Willan Publishing.

Healy, D. (2013) Changing fate? Agency and the desistance process. *Theoretical Criminology*. 17(4): 557-574.

Healy, D. (2014) Becoming a desister: Exploring the role of agency, coping and imagination in the construction of a new self. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 54(5): 873-891.

Hedderman, C. (2007) Rediscovering resettlement: Narrowing the gap between policy rhetoric and practice reality. In: Hucklesby, A. and Hagley-Dickinson, L. (eds.) *Prisoner Resettlement: Policy and Practice*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.9-25.

Hedderman, C. (2013) Payment by results: Hopes, fears and evidence. *British Journal of Community Justice*. 11(2/3): 43-58.

Henderson, E. and Lambert, V. (2018) Negotiating for survival: Balancing mission and money. *The British Accounting Review* [Online]. 50(2): 185-198. DOI: 10.1016/j.bar.2017.12.001 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Her Majesty's Government. (2010) *Building a Stronger Civil Society: A Strategy for Voluntary and Community Groups, Charities and Social Enterprises* [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/78927/building-stronger-civil-society.pdf

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation. (2018) *Probation Supply Chains: A Thematic Inspection by HM Inspectorate of Probation* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprobation/wp-content/uploads/sites/5/2018/04/Probation-Supply-Chains-Thematic-Report.pdf>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary. and Fire & Rescue Services. (2018) *State of Policing: The Annual Assessment of Policing in England and Wales 2017* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmicfrs/wp-content/uploads/state-of-policing-2017-2.pdf>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation. and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. (2016) *An Inspection of Through the Gate Resettlement Services for Short-Term Prisoners* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/cjji/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2016/09/Through-the-Gate.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation. and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons. (2017) *An Inspection of Through the Gate Resettlement Services for Prisoners Serving 12 Months or More* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/cjji/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2017/06/Through-the-Gate-phase-2-report.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons., Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation. and Ofsted. (2014) *Resettlement Provision for Adult Offenders: Accommodation and Education, Training and Employment* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/cjji/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2014/09/Resettlement-thematic-for-print-Sept-2014.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Hilder, S. and Kemshall, H. (2013) Multi-agency approaches to effective risk management in the community in England and Wales. In: Craig, L.A., Dixon, L. and Gannon, T.A. (eds.) *What Works in Offender Rehabilitation: An Evidence-Based Approach to Assessment and Treatment*. Oxford: John Wiley & Sons Limited. pp.436-451.

Hill, M. and Stevens, D. (2011) Volunteers who manage other volunteers and the professionalisation of volunteer management: Implications for practice. *Voluntary Sector Review* [Online]. 2(1): 107-114. DOI: 10.1332/204080511X560657

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Hill, J.M., Blokland, A.A.J. and Van der Geest, V.R. (2016) Desisting from crime in emerging adulthood: Adult roles and the maturity gap. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 53(4): 506-535.

Hirschi, T. (1969) *Causes of Delinquency*. 3rd ed. Oxon: Routledge.

Hirschi, T. and Gottfredson, M. (1983) Age and the explanation of crime. *American Journal of Sociology*. 89(3): 552-584.

Holloway, K. and Brookman, F. (2010) *An Evaluation of the Women's Turnaround Project* [Online].

Available at: <<https://wccsj.ac.uk/images/docs/report.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Homeless Link. (2011) *Better Together: Preventing Reoffending and Homelessness* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.homeless.org.uk/sites/default/files/site-attachments/2.Better%20Together%20-%20full%20report.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Homelessness Act 2002: Chapter 7 [Online].

Available at: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/7/pdfs/ukpga_20020007_en.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Homelessness Reduction Act 2017: Chapter 13 [Online].

Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2017/13/pdfs/ukpga_20170013_en.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Home Office. (2004) *Reducing Re-Offending: National Action Plan* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.nicco.org.uk/userfiles/downloads/024%20-%20Reducing%20Reoffending%20Action%20Plan%202004.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Home Office. (2018a) *Detailed Statistics for Knowsley Community Police Team* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.police.uk/merseyside/C1C2C3/crime/stats/>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Home Office. (2018b) *Hate Crime, England and Wales, 2017/18 (20/18)* [Online]. Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/748598/hate-crime-1718-hosb2018.pdf>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Hood, J.C. (2007) Orthodoxy vs power: The defining traits of grounded theory. In: Bryant, A. and Charmaz, K. (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of Grounded Theory*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.151-162.

Hoogervorst, N., Metz, J., Roza, L. and Van Baren, E. (2016) How perceptions of altruism and sincerity affect client trust in volunteers versus paid workers. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 45(3): 593-611.

Houle, B.J., Sagarin, B.J. and Kaplan, M.F. (2005) A functional approach to volunteerism: Do volunteer motives predict task preference? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* [Online]. 27(4): 337-344. DOI: 10.1207/s15324834basp2704_6

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

House of Commons Public Administration Select Committee. (2011) *The Big Society, Seventeenth Report of Session 2010-12, Volume I (902-I)* [Online].

Available at: <<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmpubadm/902/902.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

House of Commons Work and Pensions Committee. (2016a) *Support for Ex-Offenders, Fifth Report of Session 2016-17 (58)* [Online].

Available at: <<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmworpen/58/58.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts. (2016b) *Transforming Rehabilitation, Seventeenth Report of Session 2016-17* (484) [Online].

Available at:

<<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201617/cmselect/cmpubacc/484/484.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

House of Commons Justice Committee. (2018a) *Transforming Rehabilitation*, 27th February 2018, HC 482, Q118-192 [Online].

Available at:

<<http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/justice-committee/transforming-rehabilitation/oral/79391.html>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

House of Commons Justice Committee. (2018b) *Transforming Rehabilitation*, 17th April 2018, HC 482, Q279-374 [Online].

Available at:

<<http://data.parliament.uk/writtenevidence/committeeevidence.svc/evidencedocument/justice-committee/transforming-rehabilitation/oral/81716.html>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

House of Commons Justice Committee. (2018c) *Transforming Rehabilitation, Ninth Report of Session 2017-19* (482) [Online].

Available at: <<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmjust/482/482.pdf>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Housing Act 1996: Chapter 52 [Online].

Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1996/52/pdfs/ukpga_19960052_en.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Hoyle, C. and Rosenblatt, F.F. (2016) Looking back to the future: Threats to the success of restorative justice in the United Kingdom. *Victims & Offenders*. 11(1): 30-49.

Hucklesby, A. and Wincup, E. (2014) Assistance, support and monitoring? The paradoxes of mentoring adults in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Social Policy* [Online]. 43(2): 373-390. DOI: 10.1017/S0047279413001013

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Huebner, B.M. and Berg, M.T. (2011) Examining the sources of variation in risk for recidivism. *Justice Quarterly*. 28(1): 146-173.

Hurrell, A. (2013) *Starting Out or Getting Stuck/ An Analysis of who gets Trapped in Low Paid Work – and who Escapes* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.resolutionfoundation.org/app/uploads/2014/08/Starting-out-or-getting-stuck-FINAL.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Hustinx, L. and Meijs, L.C.P.M. (2011) Re-embedding volunteering: In search of a new collective ground. *Voluntary Sector Review* [Online]. 2(1): 5-21. DOI: 10.1332/204080511X560594

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Hustinx, L., Cnaan, R.A. and Handy, F. (2010) Navigating theories of volunteering: A hybrid map for a complex phenomenon. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* [Online]. 40(4): 410-434. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-5914.2010.00439.x

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Hwang, M., Grabb, E. and Curtis, J. (2005) Why get involved? Reasons for voluntary-association activity among Americans and Canadians. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 34(3): 387-403.

Hylton, J. (2013) The implications of ‘Transforming Rehabilitation’ and the importance of probation practitioner skills, methods and initiatives in working with service-users. *British Journal of Community Justice*. 11(2/3): 165-174.

Hylton, J. (2014) Acknowledging desistance: A practitioner response to ‘A view from the inside out’. *Probation Journal*. 61(3): 286-291.

Hyndman, N. (2017) Editorial: The charity sector – changing times, changing challenges. *Public Money & Management* [Online]. 37(3): 149-153. DOI: 10.1080/09540962.2017.1281608

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Immerwahr, J. and Johnson, J. (2002) *The Revolving Door: Exploring Public Attitudes Toward Prisoner Reentry* [Online].

Available at: <http://webarchive.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410804_RevolvingDoor.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Improvement and Development Agency. (2010) *Community Empowerment Framework* [Online].

Available at: <<http://www.knowsley.gov.uk/pdf/community-empowerment-framework-0714.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Interserve. (2015) *Purple Futures Takes Over Running of Probation and Rehabilitation Services* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.interserve.com/news-media/press-releases/press-release/2015/02/01/purple-futures-takes-over-running-of-probation-and-rehabilitation-services>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Iselin, A-M.R., Mulvey, E.P., Loughran, T.A., Chung, H.L. and Schubert, C.A. (2012) A longitudinal examination of serious adolescent offenders' perceptions of chances for success and engagement in behaviors accomplishing goals. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychological* [Online]. 40(2): 237-249. DOI: 10.1007/s10802-011-9561-z

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Jardine, C. (2018) Constructing and maintaining family in the context of imprisonment. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 58(1): 114-131.

Johnstone, G. (2001) *Restorative Justice: Ideas, Values, Debates*. 2nd ed. Oxon: Routledge.

Jones, M.B. (2007) The multiple sources of mission drift. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*. 36(2): 299-307.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation. (2014) *Reducing Poverty in the U.K.: A Collection of Evidence Reviews* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/reducing-poverty-uk-collection-evidence-reviews>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Kang, J.H. (2015). Participation in the community social control, the neighborhood watch groups: Individual – and neighborhood – related factors. *Crime & Delinquency*. 61(2): 188-212.

Kansky, J. and Allen, J.P. (2018) Long-term risks and possible benefits associated with late adolescent romantic relationship quality. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* [Online]. 47(7): 1531-1544. DOI: 10.1007/s10964-018-0813-x

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Katz, S. (2011) Hold on! Falling, embodiment, and the materiality of old age. In: Casper, M.J. and Currah, P. (eds.) *CORPUS: An Interdisciplinary Reader on Bodies and Knowledge*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp.186-205.

Kazemian, L. and Maruna, S. (2009) Desistance from crime. In: Krohn, M.D., Lizotte, A.J. and Hall, G.P. (eds.) *Handbook on Crime and Deviance*. New York, U.S.A.: Springer. pp.277-295.

- Kelly, M. (1998) Research questions and proposals. In: Seale, C. (ed.) *Researching Society and Culture*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.97-117
- Kendall, K. (2004) Dangerous thinking: A critical history of correctional cognitive behaviouralism. In: Mair, G. (ed.) *What Matters in Probation*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.53-89.
- King, S. (2013) Early desistance narratives: A qualitative analysis of probationers' transitions towards desistance. *Punishment & Society*. 15(2): 147-165.
- Kirk, D.S. (2012) Residential change as a turning point in the life course of crime: Desistance or temporary cessation? *Criminology*. 50(2): 329-258.
- Kitzinger, J. (1994) The methodology of focus groups: The importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociology of Health & Illness* [Online]. 16(1): 103-121. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9566.ep11347023
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Kitzinger, J. (1995) Qualitative research: introducing focus groups. *The British Medical Journal* [Online]. 311(7000): 299-302. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.311.7000.299
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Knodel, J. (1993) The design and analysis of focus group studies: A practical approach. In: Morgan, D.L. (ed.) *Successful Focus Groups: Advancing the State of the Art*. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated. pp.35-50.
- Knoke, D. (1986). Associations and interest groups. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 12(1): 1-21.
- Knowsley Chamber. (2016) *Knowsley: Our Plan for Accelerating Economic Growth 2016-2021* [Online].
Available at: <<https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/knowsleycouncil/media/Documents/eco-growth-plan-2016.pdf>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Knowsley Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. (2015a) *Crime and Community Safety* [Online].
Available at: <<http://knowsleyknowledge.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/JSNA-Report-Crime.pdf>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Knowsley Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. (2015b) *Employment and Unemployment: Knowsley's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment Report* [Online].
Available at: <<http://knowsleyknowledge.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/JSNA-Employment-and-unemployment.pdf>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Knowsley Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. (2016) *Knowsley Joint Strategic Needs Assessment: Crime and Community Safety Report* [Online].

Available at: <<http://knowsleyknowledge.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Crime-JSNA-Sept-16.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council. (2012) *Diversity Profile: Census Information Summary* [Online].

Available at: <<http://knowsleyknowledge.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/Census-Information-Summary-3-Dec-2012-Diversity-Profile-of-Knowsley.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council. (2014) *Children and Young People: Needs Assessment* [Online].

Available at: <<http://knowsleyknowledge.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Children-and-Young-Peoples-Needs-Assessment.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council. (2015) *Knowsley Preventing Homelessness Strategy 2016-2021* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/knowsleycouncil/media/Documents/knowsley-homelessness-strategy-2016-21.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council. (2016) *Knowsley Local Plan: Core Strategy* [Online].

Available at: <<https://localplanmaps.knowsley.gov.uk/documents/knowsley-local-plan-adopted-core-strategy.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council. (2018a) *Merseyside Police and Crime Panel* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/your-council/decision-making-and-governance/merseyside-police-and-crime-panel>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Knowsley Metropolitan Borough Council. (2018b) *The Community Trigger* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/residents/crime-and-safety/the-community-trigger>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

- Korobov, N. (2015) Identities as an interactional process: In: McLean, K.C. and Syed, M. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Identity Development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp.210-227.
- Krueger, R.A. and Casey, M.A. (1988) *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. 4th ed. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated.
- Kumar, R. (1999) *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners*. 4th ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Kurlychek, M.C., Bushway, S.D. and Brame, R. (2012) Long-term crime desistance and recidivism patterns – Evidence from the Essex County convicted felon study. *Criminology*. 50(1): 71-103.
- Kwan, Y.K., Chiu, L.L., Ip, W.C. and Kwan, P. (2002) Perceived crime seriousness: Consensus and disparity. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 30(6): 623-632.
- Kymlicka, W. (1992) *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lageson, S. and Uggen, C. (2013) How work affects crime – and crime affects work – over the life course. In: Gibson, C.L. and Krohn, M.D. (eds.) *Handbook of Life-Course Criminology: Emerging Trends and Directions for Future Research*. New York, U.S.A.: Springer. pp.201-212.
- Laub, J.H. and Sampson, R.J. (1995) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Massachusetts, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press.
- Laub, J.H. and Sampson, R.J. (2001) Understanding desistance from crime. *Crime and Justice* [Online]. 28: 1-69. DOI: 10.1086/652208
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Laws, D.R. and Ward, T. (2011) *Desistance from Sex Offending: Alternatives to Throwing Away the Key*. New York, U.S.A.: The Guilford Press.
- Laz, C. (2003) Age embodied. *Journal of Aging Studies* [Online]. 17(4): 503-519. DOI: 10.1016/S0890-4065(03)00066-5
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Lee, N., Sissons, P., Hughes, C., Green, A., Atfield, G., Adam, D. and Rodríguez-Rose, A. (2014) *Cities, Growth and Poverty: A Review of the Evidence* [Online].
Available at: <<https://www.jrf.org.uk/report/cities-growth-and-poverty-evidence-review>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Levitas, R. (2012) The just's umbrella: Austerity and the Big Society in Coalition policy and beyond. *Critical Social Policy*. 32(3): 320-343.

Levitas, R., Pantazis, C., Fahmy, E., Gordon, D., Lloyd, E. and Patsios, D. (2007) *The Multi-Dimensional Analysis of Social Exclusion* [Online].

Available at:

<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/social_exclusion_task_force/assets/research/multidimensional.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Levrant, S., Cullen, F.T., Fulton, B. and Wozniak, J.F. (1999) Reconsidering restorative justice: The corruption of benevolence revisited? *Crime & Delinquency*. 45(1): 3–27.

Lewis, L. (2005) The civil society sector: A review of critical issues and research agenda for organizational communication scholars. *Management Communication Quarterly* [Online]. 19(2): 238-267. DOI: 10.1177/0893318905279190

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Liem, M. and Richardson, N.J. (2014) The role of transformative narratives in desistance among released lifers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 41(6): 692-712.

Lindegaard, M.R. and Jacques, S. (2014) Agency as a cause of crime. *Deviant Behavior*. 35(2): 85-100.

Lindlof, T.R. and Taylor, B.C. (2002) *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. 3rd ed. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated.

Lloyd, C.D. and Serin, R.C. (2012) Agency and outcome expectancies for crime desistance: Measuring offenders' personal beliefs about change. *Psychology, Crime & Law*. 18(6): 543-565.

Loader, I. (2010) Journeying into, and away from, neoliberal penality. In: McCarthy, M. (ed.) *Incarceration and Human Rights: The Oxford Amnesty Lectures 2007*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. pp.91-100.

Localism Act 2011: Chapter 20 [Online].

Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/20/pdfs/ukpga_20110020_en.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Locke, E.A. and Latham, G.P. (2002) Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation – a 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist* [Online]. 57(9): 705-717. DOI: 10.1037/0003066X.57.9.705

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Lodge, A.C. and Umberson, D. (2013) Age and embodied masculinities: Midlife gay and heterosexual men talk about their bodies. *Journal of Aging Studies* [Online]. 27(3): 225-232. DOI: 10.1016/j.jaging.2013.03.004 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Loveday, B. (2015) Police management and workforce reform in a period of austerity. In: Wankhade, P. and Weir, D. (eds.) *Police Services: Leadership and Management Perspectives*. New York, U.S.A.: Springer. pp.115-127.
- Loveday, B. (2018) Police and Crime Commissioners: Developing and sustaining a new model of police governance in England and Wales. *International Journal of Police Science & Management* [Online]. 20(1): 28-37. DOI: 10.1177/1461355717748974 [Accessed: 24th October 2018].
- Ludlow, A. (2014) Transforming Rehabilitation: What lessons might be learned from prison privatisation? *European Journal of Probation*. 6(1): 67-81.
- Lund, V. and Juujärvi, S. (2018) Residents' agency makes a difference in volunteering in an urban neighbourhood. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* [Online]. 29(4): 756-769. DOI: 10.1007/s11266-018-9955-4 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Lyngstad, T.H. and Skardhamar, T. (2013) Changes in criminal offending around the time of marriage. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 50(4): 608-615.
- Lyons, T. and Lurigio, A.J. (2010) The role of recovery capital in the community reentry of prisoners with substance use disorders. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 49(7): 445-455.
- Maccagnan, A., Wren-Lewis, S., Brown, H. and Taylor, T. (2018) Wellbeing and society: Towards quantification of the co-benefits of wellbeing. *Social Indicators Research*. 141(1): 217-243.
- MacDonald, S. (2011) '*Big Society*': *Social Action and the Role of Public Space* [Online]. Available at: <<https://cles.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/Big-Societyweb.pdf>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- MacDonald, M. (2017) *Halsnead Garden Village – Land use and Economic Development Report* [Online]. Available at: <https://consultations.knowsley.gov.uk/Documents/halsnead/Land_Use_and_Economic_Development_Report.pdf> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Macmillan, R. (2010) *The Third Sector Delivering Public Services: An Evidence Review* (20) [Online].

Available at: <http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/799/1/WP20_Service_Delivery_Evidence_review_-_Macmillan_July_2010.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Maguire, M. (2016) Third tier in the supply chain? Voluntary agencies and the commissioning of offender rehabilitation services. In: Hucklesby, A. and Corcoran, M. (eds.) *The Voluntary Sector and Criminal Justice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp.43-70.

Malloch, M. and Munro, W. (2016) (Re)imagining punishment and justice. *Scottish Justice Matters*. 4(1): 2-3.

Manetti, G., Bellucci, M., Como, E. and Bagnoli, L. (2015) Investing in volunteering: Measuring social returns of volunteer recruitment, training and management. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* [Online]. 26(5): 2104-2129. DOI: 10.1007/s11266-014-9497-3

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Markson, L., Lösel, F., Souza, K. and Lanskey, C. (2015) Male prisoners' family relationships and resilience in resettlement. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 15(4): 423-441.

Marples, R. (2013) Transforming rehabilitation – The risks for the voluntary, community and social enterprises sector in engaging in commercial contracts with tier 1 providers. *British Journal of Community Justice*. 11(2/3): 21-32.

Marshall, T.F. (1994) Grassroots initiatives towards restorative justice: The new paradigm? In: Duff, R.A., Marshall, S., Dobash, R.E. and Dobash, R.P. (eds.) *Penal Theory and Practice: Tradition and Innovation in Criminal Justice*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. pp.245-260.

Marshall, T.F. (1999) *Restorative Justice: An Overview* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.antoniocasella.eu/restorative/Marshall_1999-b.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G.B. (2006) *Designing Qualitative Research*. 4th ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited.

Martinez, D.J. and Abrams, L.S. (2011) Informal social support among returning young offenders: A metasynthesis of the literature. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 57(2): 169-190.

- Maruna, S. (1997) Going straight: Desistance from crime and self-narratives of reform. In: Lieblich, A. and Josselson, R. (eds.) *The Narrative Study of Lives: Volume 5*. London: SAGE Publications. pp.59-93.
- Maruna, S. (2001) *Making Good: How Ex-convicts Reform and Rebuild their Lives*. Washington D.C., U.S.A.: American Psychological Association.
- Maruna, S. (2014) Reintegration as a right and the rites of reintegration: A comparative review of de-stigmatization practices. In: Humphrey, J.A. and Cordella, P. (eds.) *Effective Interventions in the Lives of Criminal Offenders*. New York, U.S.A.: Springer. pp.121-138.
- Maruna, S. and LeBel, T.P. (2002) Revisiting ex-prisoner re-entry: A buzzword in search of a narrative. In: Rex, S. and Tonry, M. (eds.) *Reform and Punishment: The Future of Sentencing*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.158-180.
- Maruna, S. and Farrall, S. (2004) Desistance from crime: A theoretical reformulation. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*. 43: 171-194.
- Maruna, S. and King, A. (2004) Public opinion and community penalties. In: Bottoms, A., Rex, S. and Robinson, G. (eds.) *Alternatives to Prison: Options for an Insecure Society*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.83-112.
- Maruna, S. and King, A. (2009) Once a criminal, always a criminal?: 'Redeemability' and the psychology of punitive public attitudes. *European Journal on Criminal Policy Research*. 15(1/2): 7-24.
- Maruna, S. and LeBel, T.P. (2010) The desistance paradigm in correctional practice: from programs to lives. In: McNeill, F., Raynor, P. and Trotter, C. (eds.) *Offender Supervision: New Directions in Theory, Research and Practice*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.65-88.
- Maruna, S., Immarigeon, R. and LeBel, T.P. (2004) Ex-offender reintegration: Theory and practice. In: Maruna, S. and Immarigeon, R. (eds.) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.3-26.
- Marx, G.T. (1997) Of methods and manners for aspiring sociologists: 37 Moral imperatives. *The American Sociologist*. 28(1): 102-125.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954) *Motivation and Personality*. New York, U.S.A.: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Mason, J. (2002) Qualitative interviewing: Asking, listening and interpreting. In: May, T. (eds.) *Qualitative Research in Action*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.200-213.
- Massoglia, M. (2008) Incarceration, health, and racial disparities in health. *Law & Society Review*. 42(2): 275-306.

- Massoglia, M. and Uggen, C. (2010) Settling down and aging out: Toward an interactionist theory of desistance and the transition to adulthood. *American Journal of Sociology*. 116(2): 543-582.
- Matza, D. (1964) *Delinquency and Drift*. 3rd ed. Oxon: Routledge.
- Mawby, R.I. and Smith, K. (2013) Accounting for the police: The new Police and Crime Commissioners in England and Wales. *The Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles*. 86(2): 143-157.
- Mawby, R.I. and Smith, K. (2017) Civilian oversight of the police in England and Wales: The election of Police and Crime Commissioners in 2012 and 2016. *International Journal of Police Science & Management* [Online]. 19(1): 23-30. DOI: 10.1177/1461355716677875 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- May, T. (1993) *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process*. 4th ed. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Mears, D.P. and Cochran, J.C. (2015) *Prisoner Reentry in the Era of Mass Incarceration*. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated.
- McAlinden, A-M. (2008) Restorative justice as a response to sexual offending: Addressing the failings of current punitive approaches. *Sexual Offender Treatment*. 3(1): 1-12.
- McCold, P. (1996) Restorative justice and the role of community. In: Galaway, B. and Hudson, J. (eds.) *Restorative Justice: International Perspectives*. New York, U.S.A.: Criminal Justice Press. pp.85-101.
- McCold, P. (2008) The recent history of restorative justice: Mediation, circles, and conferencing. In: Sullivan, D. and Tifft, L. (eds.) *Handbook of Restorative Justice: A Global Perspective*. New York, U.S.A.: Routledge. pp.23-51.
- McCracken, G. (1988) *The Long Interview: Qualitative Research Methods Series 13*. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated.
- McCulloch, T. (2015) Beyond compliance: Participation, co-production and change in justice sanctions. *European Journal of Probation*. 7(1): 40-57.
- McCullough, M. (2008) *Beyond Revenge: The Evolution of the Forgiveness Instinct*. California, U.S.A.: Jossey-Bass.
- McGarry, S. (2013) Why cultural differences between sectors mean probation won't work as a commodity. *British Journal of Community Justice*. 11(2/3): 103-106.
- McNeill, F. (2004) Desistance, rehabilitation and correctionalism: Developments and prospects in Scotland. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*. 43(4): 420-436.

McNeill, F. (2006) A desistance paradigm for offender management. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 6(1): 39-62.

McNeill, F. (2009) What works and what's just? *European Journal of Probation*. 1(1): 21-40.

McNeill, F. (2012) Four forms of 'offender' rehabilitation: Towards an interdisciplinary perspective. *Legal and Criminological Psychology* [Online]. 17(1): 18-36. DOI: 10.1177/2F0306624X09342435

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

McNeill, F. (2016) Desistance and criminal justice in Scotland. In: Croall, H., Mooney, G. and Munro, M. (eds.) *Crime, Justice and Society in Scotland*. London: Routledge. pp.200-215.

McNeill, F. and Weaver, B. (2010) *Changing Lives? Desistance Research and Offender Management* (03/10) [Online].

Available at: https://www.sccjr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Report%202010_03%20-%20Changing%20Lives.pdf

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

McNeill, F., Farrall, S., Lightowler, C. and Maruna, S. (2012) *How and Why people Stop Offending: Discovering Desistance* (15) [Online].

Available at: <https://www.iriss.org.uk/sites/default/files/iriss-insight-15.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Meisenhelder, T. (1982) Becoming normal: Certification as a stage in exiting from crime. *Deviant Behavior*. 3(2): 137-153.

Mentor Achieve Learn Support Merseyside. (2017a) *About us* [Online].

Available at: <https://malsmerseyside.co.uk/about-us/>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Mentor Achieve Learn Support Merseyside. (2017b) *Mentor, Achieve, Learn, Support* [Online].

Available at: <https://malsmerseyside.co.uk/>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Mentor Achieve Learn Support Merseyside. (2017c) *What we do* [Online].

Available at: <https://malsmerseyside.co.uk/what-we-do/>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

MerseyNow. (2018) *What we do: Community Messaging for Merseyside* [Online].

Available at: <https://www.merseyNow.org/>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Merseyside Community Rehabilitation Company. (2018a) *About us* [Online].

Available at: <<http://www.merseysidecrc.co.uk/about-us/>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Merseyside Community Rehabilitation Company. (2018b) *Interchange Model* [Online].

Available at: <<http://www.merseysidecrc.co.uk/what-we-do/interchange-model/>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Merseyside Community Rehabilitation Company. (2018c) *Integrated Offender Management* [Online].

Available at: <<http://www.merseysidecrc.co.uk/what-we-do/integrated-offender-management/>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Merseyside Community Rehabilitation Company. (2018d) *Programmes & Services* [Online].

Available at: <<http://www.merseysidecrc.co.uk/what-we-do/programmes-services/>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Merseyside Community Rehabilitation Company. (2018e) *Supervision* [Online].

Available at: <<http://www.merseysidecrc.co.uk/what-we-do/supervision/>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Merseyside Community Rehabilitation Company. (2018f) *Through the Gate* [Online].

Available at: <<http://www.merseysidecrc.co.uk/what-we-do/through-the-gate/>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Merseyside Police. (2018) *Hate Crime Statistics Response Table - DJ 2018-143 MERPOL* (Excel spreadsheet) [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.merseyside.police.uk/document-library/accessing-information/freedom-of-information/disclosure-log/crime-or-incident-statistics/>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Merseyside Police Crime Commissioner. (2014a) *About us* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.merseysidepcc.info/home/about-us.aspx>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Merseyside Police Crime Commissioner. (2014b) *Community Remedy* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.merseysidepcc.info/home/down-to-business/community-remedy.aspx>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Merseyside Police Crime Commissioner. (2014c) *Community Trigger* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.merseysidepcc.info/home/down-to-business/community-trigger.aspx>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Merseyside Police Crime Commissioner. (2014d) *Crime Prevention Fund 2017/18* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.merseysidepcc.info/home/down-to-business/crime-prevention-fund-201718.aspx>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Merseyside Police Crime Commissioner. (2014e) *Neighbourhood Watch* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.merseysidepcc.info/NeighbourhoodWatch.aspx>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Merseyside Police Crime Commissioner. (2014f) *Putting Victims First: Victims' Services and Restorative Justice Commissioning Intentions, 2014/15* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.merseysidepcc.info/userfiles/Putting%20Victims%20First%20report%20FINAL.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Merseyside Police Crime Commissioner. (2014g) *Victim Care Merseyside 18/19* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.merseysidepcc.info/home/down-to-business/victim-care-merseyside.aspx>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Merseyside Police Crime Commissioner. (2017) *Merseyside Police and Crime Plan 2017-2020* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.merseysidepcc.info/userfiles/FINAL%20PCCM%20Plan%202017-21.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Merseyside Police Crime Commissioner. (2018) *Police and Crime Commissioner for Merseyside Annual Report 2017-2018* [Online].

Available at: <https://issuu.com/merseysidepcc/docs/final_pccm_annual_report_17-18/2>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Milbourne, L. and Murray, U. (2014) *The State of the Voluntary Sector: Does Size Matter? Working Paper 6* [Online].

Available at: <<http://www.independentaction.net/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Does-Size-Matter-paper-1-final.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Miller, J. and Glassner, B. (1997) The “inside” and the “outside”: Finding realities in interviews. In: Silverman, D. (ed.) *Qualitative Research: Issues of Theory, Method and Practice*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.131-148.

Ministry of Justice. (2010a) *Breaking the Cycle: Effective Punishment, Rehabilitation and Sentencing of Offenders* (7972) [Online].

Available at: <<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20111206103817/http://www.justice.gov.uk/consultations/docs/breaking-the-cycle.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ministry of Justice. (2010b) *Integrated Offender Management: Key Principles* [Online].

Available at: <<http://library.college.police.uk/docs/APPref/Integrated-Offender-Management-Key-Principles-2010.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ministry of Justice. (2012) *Punishment and Reform: Effective Probation Services* (8333) [Online].

Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/236077/8333.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ministry of Justice. (2013a) *Transforming Rehabilitation: A Revolution in the Way we Manage Offenders* (8517) [Online].

Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/228580/8517.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ministry of Justice. (2013b) *Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform* (8619) [Online].

Available at: <<https://consult.justice.gov.uk/digital-communications/transforming-rehabilitation/results/transforming-rehabilitation-response.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ministry of Justice. (2013c) *Victims' Services Commissioning Framework* [Online].

Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/203979/victims-services-commissioning-framework.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ministry of Justice. (2015) *Integrated Offender Management: Key Principles* [Online].

Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/406865/HO_IOM_Key_Principles_document_Final.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ministry of Justice. (2017) *Proven Reoffending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin, October 2014 to September 2015* [Online].

Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/633194/proven-reoffending-2015-q3.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ministry of Justice. (2018a) *Final and Interim Proven Reoffending Statistics for the Community Rehabilitation Companies and the National Probation Service* [Online].

Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/676711/crc-nps-final-interim-results-bulletin-jan18.pdf>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Ministry of Justice. (2018b) *Offender Management Statistics Bulletin, England and Wales* [Online].

Available at: <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/702297/omsq-q4-2017.pdf>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

- Ministry of Justice. (2018c) *Strengthening Probation, Building Confidence* (9613) [Online]. Available at: <https://consult.justice.gov.uk/hm-prisons-and-probation/strengthening-probation-building-confidence/supporting_documents/strengtheningprobationbuildingconfidence.pdf> [Accessed: 24th October 2018].
- Moffitt, T.E. (1993) Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behaviour: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review* [Online]. 100(4): 674-701. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.100.4.674 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Monsbakken, C.W., Lyngstad, T.H. and Skardhamar, T. (2012a) *Crime and the Transition to Marriage: The Roles of Gender and Partner's Criminal Involvement* (687) [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.ssb.no/a/publikasjoner/pdf/DP/dp678.pdf>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Monsbakken, C.W., Lyngstad, T.H. and Skardhamar, T. (2012b) Crime and the transition to parenthood: The role of sex and relationship context. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 53(1): 129-148.
- Moore, R. (2011) Beyond the prison walls: Some thoughts on prisoner 'resettlement' in England and Wales. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 12(2): 129-147.
- Morenoff, J.D. and Harding, D.J. (2014) Incarceration, prisoner reentry, and communities. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 40(1): 411-429.
- Morenoff, J.D., Sampson, R.J. and Raudenbush, S.W. (2001) Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology*. 39(3): 517-559.
- Morgan, R. (2012) Crime and justice in the 'Big Society'. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 12(5): 463-481.
- Murray, J. and Farrington, D.P. (2008) The effects of parental imprisonment on children. In: Tonry, M.H. (ed.) *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, Vol.37. Illinois, U.S.A.: University of Chicago Press. pp.133-206.
- Musick, M.A. and Wilson, J. (2008) *Volunteers: A Social Profile*. Indiana, U.S.A.: Indiana University Press.
- Nahmias, E. and Murray, D. (2011) Experimental philosophy on free will: An error theory for incompatibilist intuitions. In: Aguilar J.H., Buckareff A.A. and Frankish K. (eds.) *New Waves in Philosophy of Action*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp.189-216.
- Nancy, J-L. (2000) *Being Singular Plural*. California, U.S.A.: Stanford University Press.

National Audit Office. (2004) *Reducing Crime: The Home Office Working with Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2004/12/040516.pdf>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

National Audit Office. (2016) *Transforming Rehabilitation: Session 2015-16* (951) [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.nao.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Transforming-rehabilitation.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

National Council for Voluntary Organisations. (2016) *Why Volunteer?* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.ncvo.org.uk/ncvo-volunteering/why-volunteer>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Neighbourhood Watch Network. (2016) *Neighbourhood Watch: Merseyside* [Online].

Available at: <<http://merseyside.ourwatch.org.uk/>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Newman, G.R. and Marongiu, P. (2009) *Cesare Beccaria: On Crimes and Punishments, Translation, Annotations, and Introduction*. New Jersey, U.S.A.: Transaction Publishers.

Nhan, J., Bowen, K. and Polzer, K. (2017) The reentry labyrinth: The anatomy of a reentry services network. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 56(1): 1-19.

Nicholson-Crotty, S., Peterson, D.A.M. and Ramirez, M.D. (2009) Dynamic representation(s): Federal criminal justice policy and an alternative dimension of public mood. *Political Behavior* [Online]. 31(4): 629-655. DOI: 10.1007/s11109-009-9085-1
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Norman, J. (2010) *The Big Society: The Anatomy of the New Politics*. Buckingham: University of Buckingham Press.

O'Connell, M. and Whelan, A. (1996) Taking wrongs seriously: Public perceptions of crime seriousness. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 36(2): 299-318.

O'Leary, Z. (2005) *Researching Real World Problems: A Guide to Methods of Inquiry*. London: SAGE Publications Limited.

O'Mahony, D. and Doak, J. (2017) *Reimagining Restorative Justice: Agency and Accountability in the Criminal Process*. Oxford: Hart Publishing.

O'Sullivan, K., Williams, R., Hong, X.Y., Bright, D. and Kemp, R. (2018) Measuring offenders' belief in the possibility of desistance. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 62(5): 1317-1330.

Offender Rehabilitation Act 2014: Chapter 11 [Online].
Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2014/11/pdfs/ukpga_20140011_en.pdf>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Office for National Statistics. (2015a) *Ethnicity and National Identity in England and Wales: 2011* [Online].

Available at:
<<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/ethnicity/articles/ethnicityandnationalidentityinenglandandwales/2012-12-11>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Office for National Statistics. (2015b) *Religion in England and Wales 2011* [Online].

Available at:
<<https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/culturalidentity/religion/articles/religioninenglandandwales2011/2012-12-11>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Office for National Statistics. (2015c) *The English Indices of Deprivation 2015: Statistical Release* [Online].

Available at:
<https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/465791/English_Indices_of_Deprivation_2015_-_Statistical_Release.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Office for National Statistics. (2018) *ONS Annual Population Survey: Labour Supply – Knowsley* [Online].

Available at:
<<https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/reports/lmb/la/1946157103/report.aspx?town=knowsley>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. (2002) *Allocation of Accommodation: Code of Guidance for Local Housing Authorities* [Online].

Available at:
<<https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20120920054724/http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/housing/pdf/157737.pdf>>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Offstein, E.H., Chory, R.M and Childers Jr, J.S. (2015) A cross-cultural analysis of factors influencing choice in volunteering activities. *Competitiveness Review* [Online]. 25(1): 74-97. DOI: 10.1108/CR-05-2013-0054

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2013) *Tackling Long-term Unemployment Amongst Vulnerable Groups* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/Tackling%20Long_Term%20unemployment_%20WP_cover_s.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

P3 – People Potential Possibilities. (2018a) *Justice Services* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.p3charity.org/get-help/justice-services>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

P3 – People Potential Possibilities. (2018b) *Merseyside Linkworker Service* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.p3charity.org/services/merseyside-linkworker-service>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Parsons, E. and Broadbridge, A. (2004) Managing change in nonprofit organizations: Insights from the UK charity retail sector. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* [Online]. 15(3): 227-242. DOI: 10.1023/B.VOLU.00000046279.46964.b5 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Paternoster, R., Bachman, R., Bushway, S., Kerrison, E. and O'Connell, D. (2015) Human agency and explanations of criminal desistance: Arguments for a rational choice theory. *Journal of Developmental and Life-Course Criminology* [Online]. 1(3): 209-235. DOI: 10.1007/s40865-015-0013-2

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Paternoster, R., Bachman, R., Kerrison, E., O'Connell, D. and Smith, L. (2016) Desistance from crime and identity: An empirical test with survival time. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 43(9): 1204-1224.

Pavlich, G. (2017) Promised communities and unrestored justice. In: Aertsen, I. and Pali, B. (eds.) *Critical Restorative Justice*. Oxford: Hart Publishing Limited. pp.297-313.

Pettit, P. (1995) The cunning of trust. *Philosophy & Public Affairs* [Online]. 24(3): 202-225. DOI: 10.1111/j.1088-4963.1995.tb00029.x

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Phillips, M. (1982) Motivation and expectation in successful volunteerism. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* [Online]. 11(2): 118-125. DOI: 10.1177/089976408201100213 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Piketty, T. (2014) Capital in the Twenty-First Century: A multidimensional approach to the history of capital and social classes. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 65(4): 736-747.
- Piquero, A.R. (2015) What we know and what we need to know about developmental and life-course theories. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* [Online]. 48(3): 336-344. DOI: 10.1177/0004865815589825 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Pirutinsky, S. (2014) Does religiousness increase self-control and reduce criminal behaviour? A longitudinal analysis of adolescent offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 41(11): 1290-1307.
- Platt, A. (2002) The triumph of benevolence: The origins of the juvenile system in the United States. In: Muncie, J., Hughes, G. and McLaughlin, E. (eds.) *Youth Justice: Critical Readings*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.177-196.
- Plesničar, M.M. (2015) Why do people stop offending? Recent theories on desistance and their value in practical approaches to offenders. *Zbornik Znanstvenih Razprav* [Online]. 75: 191-212. DOI: 284169324 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Polaschek, D.L.L., Yesberg, J.A. and Chauhan, P. (2018) A year without a conviction: An integrated examination of potential mechanisms for successful reentry in high-risk violent prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 45(4): 425-446.
- Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011: Chapter 13* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/13/pdfs/ukpga_20110013_en.pdf> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Pranis, K. (1997) From vision to action: Church and society. *Presbyterian Church Journal of Just Thoughts*. 87(4): 32-42.
- Pranis, K. (2001) Restorative justice, social justice, and the empowerment of marginalized populations. In: Bazemore, G. and Schiff, M. (eds.) *Restorative Community Justice: Repairing Harm and Transforming Communities*. Ohio, U.S.A.: Anderson Publishing Company. pp.287-306.
- Puchta, C. and Potter, J. (2004) *Focus Group Practice*. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Punch, K.F. (1998) *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited.

Putnam, R.D. (2000) *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York, U.S.A.: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks.

Quetelet, A. (1833) *Recherches sur le Penchant au Crime aux Differents Ages*. Belgium: Hayez.

Raaijmakers, E.A.C., Loughran, T.A., De Keijser, J.W., Nieuwbeerta, P. and Dirkzwager, A.J.E. (2017) Exploring the relationship between subjectively experienced severity of imprisonment and recidivism: A neglected element in testing deterrence theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 54(1): 3-28.

Rabee, F. (2004) Focus-group interview and data analysis. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* [Online]. 63(4): 655-660. DOI: 10.1079/PNS2004399

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ramakers, A.A.T., Van Wilsem, J.A., Nieuwbeerta, P. and Dirkzwager, A.J.E. (2016) Returning to a former employer: A potentially successful pathway to ex-prisoner re-employment. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 56(4): 668-688.

Rawls, J. (1971) *A Theory of Justice*. Massachusetts, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press.

Raynor, P. (2007) Risk and need assessment in British probation: The contribution of LSI-R. *Psychology, Crime & Law*. 13(2): 125-138.

Raynor, P. and Robinson, G. (2009) Why help offenders? Arguments for rehabilitation as a penal strategy. *European Journal of Probation*. 1(1): 3-20.

Rehberg, W. (2005) Altruistic individualists: Motivations for international volunteering among young adults in Switzerland. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* [Online]. 16(2): 109-122. DOI: 10.1007/s11266-005-5693-5 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

ResPublica. (2016) *Achieving Educational Excellence in Knowsley: A Review of Attainment* [Online].

Available at: <https://www.respublica.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/Final_Report_October_2016.pdf>

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Richardson, L., Purdam, K., Cotterill, S., Rees, J., Squires, G. and Askew, R. (2014) Responsible citizens and accountable service providers? Renegotiating the contract between citizen and state. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* [Online]. 46(7): 1716-1731. DOI: 10.1068/a46127

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Ringmaster. (2018) *Knowsley Community Messaging* [Online].

Available at: <<https://www.knowsleycommunitymessaging.org>>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Roach, K. (2000) Changing punishment at the turn of the century: Restorative justice on the rise. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*. 42(3): 249-280.

Roberts, N. (2018) Inspecting ‘Transforming Rehabilitation’: The pitfalls of an austerity managerialist approach to offender supervision. In: Rushton, P. and Donovan, C. (eds.) *Austerity Policies: Bad Ideas in Practice*. London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp.121-146.

Robinson, G. and Shapland, J. (2008) Reducing recidivism: A task for restorative justice? *The British Journal of Criminology*. 48(3): 337-358.

Robinson, G., Burke, L. and Millings, M. (2016) Criminal justice identities in transition: The case of devolved probation services in England and Wales. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 56(1): 161-178.

Robson, C. and McCartan, K. (1993) *Real World Research: A Resource for Users of Social Research Methods in Applied Settings*. 4th ed. Chichester: Wiley and Sons Limited.

Roche, D. (2003) *Accountability in Restorative Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rochester, C., Paine, A.E. and Howlett, S. (2010) *Volunteering and Society in the 21st Century*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rocque, M. (2015) The lost concept: The (re)emerging link between maturation and desistance from crime. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 15(3): 340-360.

Rocque, M., Posick, C. and Paternoster, R. (2016) Identities through time: An exploration of identity change as a cause of desistance. *Justice Quarterly*. 33(1): 45-72.

Rogers, D.L. and Ferguson, C.J. (2011) Punishment and rehabilitation attitudes toward sex offenders versus nonsexual offenders. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma* [Online]. 20(4): 395-414. DOI: 10.1080/10926771.2011.570287

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Rogers, P., Hirst, L. and Davies, M. (2011) An investigation into the effect of respondent gender, victim age, and perpetrator treatment on public attitudes towards sex offenders, sex offender treatment, and sex offender rehabilitation. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 50(8): 511-530.

Ronel, N. (2006) When good overcomes bad: The impact of volunteers on those they help. *Human Relations* [Online]. 59(8): 1133-1153. DOI: 10.1177/0018726706068802 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Ronel, N., Frid, N. and Timor, U. (2013) The practice of positive criminology: A Vipassana course in prison. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 57(2): 133-153.
- Ronel, N., Haski-Leventhal, D., Ben-David, B.M. and York, A.S. (2009) Perceived altruism: A neglected factor in initial intervention. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 53(2): 191-210.
- Rose, D.R. and Clear, T.R. (1998) Incarceration, social capital, and crime: Implications for social disorganization theory. *Criminology*. 36(3): 441-480.
- Rosenbaum, D.P. (1987). The theory and research behind neighborhood watch: Is it a sound fear and crime reduction strategy? *Crime & Delinquency*. 33(1): 103-134.
- Rosenbaum, D.P. (1988) Community crime prevention: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Justice Quarterly*. 5(3): 323-393.
- Rossner, M. (2011) Emotions and interaction ritual: A micro analysis of restorative justice. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 51(1): 95-119.
- Rossner, M. (2013) *Just Emotions: Rituals of Restorative Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rotman, E. (1986) Do criminal offenders have a constitutional right to rehabilitation? *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. 77(4): 1023-1068.
- Rowe, M. and Soppitt, S. (2014) 'Who you gonna call?' The role of trust and relationships in desistance from crime. *Probation Journal*. 61(4): 397-412.
- Rowe, M., Irving, A. and Soppitt, S. (2018) The legitimacy of offender management programmes in a post-TR landscape. *Safer Communities* [Online]. 17(2): 69-80. DOI: 10.1108/SC-07-2017-0028
[Accessed: 24th October 2018].
- Rubin, H.J. and Rubin, I.S. (1995) *Qualitative Interviewing: The Art of Hearing Data*. 3rd ed. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated.
- Rutterford, C. (1998) Research design. In: Seale, C. (ed.) *Researching Society and Culture*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.118-133.
- Ryen, A. (1997) Ethics and qualitative research. In: Silverman, D. (ed.) *Qualitative Research: Issues of Theory, Method and Practice*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.416-438.
- Ryen, A. (2004) Ethical issues. In: Seale, C., Gobo, G., Gubrium, J.F. and Silverman, D. (eds.) *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.218-235.

- Sampson, R.J. (2004) Neighbourhood and community: Collective efficacy and community safety. *New Economy* [Online]. 11(2): 106-113. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0041.2004.00346.x [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Sampson, R.J. (2015) Crime and the life-course in a changing world: Insights from Chicago and implications for global criminology. *Asian Journal of Criminology* [Online]. 10(4): 277-286. DOI: 10.1007/s11417-015-9220-3 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Sampson, R.J. and Laub, J.H. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and Turning Points Through Life*. Massachusetts, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press.
- Sampson, R.J. and Raudenbush, S.W. (1999) Systematic social observation of public spaces: A new look at disorder in urban neighborhoods. *American Journal of Sociology*. 105(3): 603-651.
- Sampson, R.J. and Laub, J.H. (2003) Life-course desisters? Trajectories of crime among delinquent boys followed to age 70. *Criminology*. 41(3): 555-592.
- Sampson, R.J. and Laub, J.H. (2016) Turning points and the future of life-course criminology: Reflections on the 1986 Criminal Careers Report. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 53(3): 321-335.
- Sampson, R.J., Raudenbush, S.W. and Earls, F. (1997) Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science* [Online]. 277(5328): 918-924. DOI: 10.1126/science.277.5328.918 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Sarantakos, S. (1993) *Social Research*. 3rd ed. New York, U.S.A.: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sayer, A. (1984) *Method in Social Science: A Realist Approach*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Schervish, P.G. (1997) Inclination, obligation, and association: What we know and what we need to learn about donor motivation. In: Burlingame, D.F. (ed.) *Critical Issues in Fund Raising*. New York, U.S.A.: John Wiley & Sons Incorporated. pp.110-138.
- Schiff, M. (2007) *Handbook of Restorative Justice*. Devon: Willan Publishing.
- Schlager, M.D. (2018) Through the looking glass: Taking stock of offender reentry. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*. 34(1): 69-80.
- Seale, C. (1998) *Researching Society and Culture*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited.
- Seim, J. (2016) Short-timing: The carceral experience of soon-to-be-released prisoners. *Punishment & Society*. 18(4): 442-458.
- Sen, A.K. (1999) *Developments as Freedom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shapland, J. and Hall, M. (2007) What do we know about the effects of crime on victims? *International Review of Victimology* [Online]. 14(2): 175-217. DOI: 10.1177/026975800701400202

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Shapland, J. and Bottoms, A. (2011) Reflections on social values, offending and desistance among young adult recidivists. *Punishment & Society*. 13(3): 256-282.

Shapland, J., Robinson, G. and Sorsby, A. (2011) *Restorative Justice in Practice: Evaluating What Works for Victims and Offenders*. Oxon: Routledge.

Shapland, J., Atkinson, A., Atkinson, H., Colledge, E., Dignan, J., Howes, M., Johnstone, J., Robinson, G. and Sorsby, A. (2006) Situating restorative justice within criminal justice. *Theoretical Criminology*. 10(4): 505-532.

Shelter. (2018) *Shelter's Impact 2017/18* [Online]. Available at:

<https://england.shelter.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/1594276/Impact_Hub_sheet_Merseyside.pdfhttps://england.shelter.org.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/1594276/Impact_Hub_sheet_Merseyside.pdf>

[Accessed: 24th October 2018].

Silverberg, K., Ellis, G., Backman, K. and Backman, S. (1999) An identification and explication of a typology of public parks and recreation volunteers. *World Leisure and Recreation* [Online]. 41(2): 30-34. DOI: 10.1080/10261133.1999.9674148

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Silverman, D. (2000) *Doing Qualitative Research*. 4th ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited.

Simons, R.L. and Barr, A.B. (2014) Shifting perspectives: Cognitive changes mediate the impact of romantic relationships on desistance from crime. *Justice Quarterly*. 31(5): 793-821.

Šipilova, V. (2013) Human capital, education and the labour market: Evaluation of interaction in Latvia. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* [Online]. 106: 1384-1392. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.154

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Skardhamar, T., Monsbakken, C.W. and Lyngstad, T.H. (2014) Crime and the transition to marriage: The role of the spouse's criminal involvement. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 54(3): 411-427.

Skogan, W.G. (1990). *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral Decay in American Neighborhoods*. California, U.S.A.: University of California Press.

Smith, M.B. and Laurie, N. (2011) International volunteering and development: Global citizenship and neoliberal professionalisation today. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographies* [Online]. 36(4): 545-559. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-5661.2011.00436.x [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Snacken, S. (2016) Punishment, legitimacy and the role of the state: Reimagining more moderate penal policies. In: Farrall, S., Goldson, B., Loader, I. and Dockley, A. (eds.) *Justice and Penal Reform: Re-Shaping the Penal Landscape*. London: Routledge. pp.47–68.

Social Exclusion Unit. (2002) *Reducing Re-offending by Ex-prisoners* [Online]. Available at: https://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/social_exclusion_task_force/assets/publications_1997_to_2006/reducing_summary.pdf >

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Soller, B. (2014) Caught in a bad romance: Adolescent romantic relationships and mental health. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* [Online]. 55(1): 56-72. DOI: 10.1177/0022146513520432

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Soller, B. (2015) “I did not do it my way”: The peer context of inauthentic romantic relationships. *Sociological Perspectives* [Online]. 58(3): 337-357. DOI: 10.1177/0731121415576578

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Soyer, M. (2014) The imagination of desistance: A juxtaposition of the construction of incarceration as a turning point and the reality of recidivism. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 54(1): 91-108.

Spandler, H. (2007) From social exclusion to inclusion? A critique of the inclusion imperative in mental health. *Medical Sociology Online* [Online]. 2(2): 3-16. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-349-92322-9.18

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Sparkes, A.C. and Day, J. (2016) Aging bodies and desistance from crime: Insights from the life stories of offenders. *Journal of Aging Studies* [Online]. 36: 47-58. DOI: 10.1016/j.jaging.2015.12.005

[Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Spitz, R.T. and MacKinnon, J.R. (1993) Predicting success in volunteer community service. *Psychological Reports* [Online]. 73(3): 815-818. DOI: 10.2466/pr0.1993.73.3.815 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Stacer, M.J. and Roberts, M.R. (2018) “Reversing the trend”: The role of mentoring in offender reentry. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 57(1): 1-21.
- Stake, R.E. (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research*. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated.
- Steiner, B., Makarios, M.D. and Travis III, L.F. (2015) Examining the effects of residential situations and residential mobility on offender recidivism. *Crime & Delinquency*. 61(3): 375-401.
- Stevens, A. (2012) ‘I am the person now I was always meant to be’: Identity reconstruction and narrative reframing in therapeutic community prisons. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*. 12(5): 527-547.
- Stewart, D.W. and Shamdasani, P.N. (1990) *Focus Groups: Theory and Practice*. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated.
- Stiglitz, J.E., Sen, A. and Fitoussi, J-P. (2009) *Report by the Commission on the Measurement of Economic Performance and Social Progress* [Online].
Available at:
<<https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/118025/118123/Fitoussi+Commission+report>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Stone, R. (2016) Desistance and identity repair: Redemption narratives as resistance to stigma. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 56(5): 956-975.
- Strang, H. (2002) *Repair or Revenge: Victims and Restorative Justice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stuart, B. (1996) Circle sentencing – turning swords into ploughshares. In: Galaway, B. and Hudson, J. (eds.) *Restorative Justice: International Perspectives*. New York, U.S.A.: Criminal Justice Press. pp.193-206.
- Studer, S. and Von Schnurbein, G. (2013) Organizational factors affecting volunteers: A literature review on volunteer coordination. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* [Online]. 24(2): 403-440. DOI: 10.1007/s11266-012-9268-y [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Stylianou, S. (2003) Measuring crime seriousness perceptions: What have we learned and what else do we want to know. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 31(1): 37-56.

Sundeen, R.A., Raskoff, S.A. and Garcia, M.C. (2007) Differences in perceived barriers to volunteering to formal organizations: Lack of time versus lack of interest. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership* [Online]. 17(3): 279-300. DOI: 10.1002/nml.150 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Taylor, C.J. (2016) The family's role in the reintegration of formerly incarcerated individuals: The direct effects of emotional support. *The Prison Journal*. 96(3): 331-354.

Taylor, S., Burke, L., Millings, M. and Ragonese, E. (2017) Transforming rehabilitation during a penal crisis: A case study of Through the Gate services in a resettlement prison in England and Wales. *European Journal of Probation*. 9(2): 115-131.

Teddle, C. and Yu, F. (2007) Mixed methods sampling: A typology with examples. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* [Online]. 1(1): 77-100. DOI: 10.1177/1558689806292430 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Terry, D. and Abrams, L.S. (2017) Dangers, diversions, and decisions: The process of criminal desistance among formerly incarcerated young men. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 61(7): 727-750.

The Knowsley Partnership. (2015) *Knowsley Partnership Community Safety Plan Executive Summary: A Summary of the Priorities for the Knowsley Partnership 2015-16* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.knowsley.gov.uk/knowsleycouncil/media/Documents/Community-safety-Plan-2015-16.pdf> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

The Knowsley Partnership. (2016) *Strategy for Knowsley 2016-2020* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.knowsley.gov.uk/knowsleycouncil/media/Documents/strategy-for-knowsley-september-2016.pdf> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

The Knowsley Partnership. (2017) *Community Safety Plan: Strategic Priorities 2017-2020* [Online]. Available at: <http://www.knowsley.gov.uk/knowsleycouncil/media/Documents/Community-Safety-Strategic-Plan.pdf> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Theobald, D., Farrington, D.P. and Piquero, A.R. (2015) Does the birth of a first child reduce the father's offending? *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* [Online]. 48(1): 3-23. DOI: 10.1177/0004865814537840 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Thoits, P.A. and Hewitt, L.N. (2001) Volunteer work and well-being. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior* [Online]. 42(2): 115-131. DOI: 10.2307/3090173
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Thompson, P. and Bornat, J. (1978) *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, P. and Williams, R. (2014) Taking your eyes off the objective: The relationship between income sources and satisfaction with achieving objectives in the UK third sector. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* [Online]. 25(1): 109-137. DOI: 10.1007/s11266-012-9326-5
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Tight, M. (2010) The curious case of case study: a viewpoint. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* [Online]. 13(4): 329-339. DOI: 10.1080/13645570903187181
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- TimeBank. (2018) *Why Volunteer?* [Online].
Available at: <<http://timebank.org.uk/why-volunteer>>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Tollenaar, N., Van der Laan, A.M. and Van der Heijden, P.G.M. (2014) Effectiveness of a prolonged incarceration and rehabilitation measure for high-frequency offenders. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* [Online]. 10(1): 29-58. DOI: 10.1007/s11292-013-9179-y
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Tonkiss, F. (1998) Focus groups. In: Seale, C. (ed.) *Researching Society and Culture*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.227-244.
- Travis, J., Solomon, A.L. and Waul, M. (2001) *From Prison to Home: The Dimensions and Consequences of Prisoner Reentry* [Online].
Available at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=5D105A1AA179348262A430B734437D54?doi=10.1.1.212.6235&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Travis, J., Western, B. and Redburn, F.S. (2014) *The Growth of Incarceration in the United States: Exploring Causes and Consequences*. Washington D.C, U.S.A.: The National Academic Press.
- Tyler, T. (1990) *Why People Obey the Law*. New Haven, U.S.A.: Yale University Press.

- Uggen, C., Manza, J. and Thompson, M. (2006) Citizenship, democracy, and the civic reintegration of criminal offenders. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* [Online]. 60(5): 281-310. DOI: 10.1177/0002716206286898 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Ulmer, J.T. and Steffensmeier, D. (2014) The age and crime relationship: Social variation, social explanations. In: Beaver, K.M., Barnes, J.C. and Boutwell, B.B. (eds.) *The Nurture Versus Biosocial Debate in Criminology: On the Origins of Criminal Behavior and Criminality*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.377-396.
- Van Gunsteren, H. (1994) Four conceptions of citizenship. In: Van Steenberg, B. (ed.) *The Condition of Citizenship*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.36-48.
- Van Ness, D. and Strong, K.H. (1997) *Restoring Justice: An Introduction to Restorative Justice*. 5th ed. London: Routledge.
- Van Schellen, M., Apel, R. and Nieuwebeerta, P. (2012) “Because you’re mine. I walk the line”? Marriage, spousal criminality, and criminal offending over the life course. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. 28(4): 701-723.
- Varghese, F.P. (2012) Vocational interventions with offenders: Interdisciplinary research, theory, and integration. *The Counseling Psychologist* [Online]. 41(7): 1011-1039. DOI: 10.1177/0011000012462369 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Varghese, F.P. and Cummings, D.L. (2012) Introduction: Why apply vocational psychology to criminal justice populations? *The Counseling Psychologist* [Online]. 41(7): 961-989. DOI: 10.1177/0011000012459363 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Vaughan, B. (2007) The internal narrative of desistance. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 47(3): 390-404.
- Vere van Koppen, M. (2018) Criminal career dimensions of juvenile- and adult-onset offenders. *Journal of Developmental and Life-course Criminology* [Online]. 4(1): 92-119. DOI: 10.1007/s40865-017-0074-5 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Veysey, B.M., Martinez, D.J. and Christian, J. (2013) “Getting out”: A summary of qualitative research on desistance across the life course. In: Gibson, C.L. and Krohn, M.D. (eds.) *Handbook of Life-Course Criminology: Emerging Trends and Directions for Future Research*. New York, U.S.A.: Springer. pp.233-260.

Veysey, B.M., Ostermann, M. and Lanterman, J.L. (2014) The effectiveness of enhanced parole supervision and community services: New Jersey's serious and violent offender reentry initiative. *The Prison Journal*. 94(4): 435-453.

Victim Care Merseyside. (2015a) *About us* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.victimcaremerseyside.org/home/about-us.aspx>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Victim Care Merseyside. (2015b) *Community Trigger* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.victimcaremerseyside.org/home/community-trigger.aspx>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Victim Care Merseyside. (2015c) *What is Community Remedy?* [Online]. Available at: <<https://www.victimcaremerseyside.org/home/community-remedy.aspx>> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

Visher, C.A. and Travis, J. (2011) Life on the outside: Returning home after incarceration. *The Prison Journal*. 91(3): 102-119.

Visher, C.A., Bakken, N.W. and Gunter, W.D. (2013) Fatherhood, community reintegration, and successful outcomes. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 52(7): 451-469.

Wahidin, A. and Carr, N. (2013) *Understanding Criminal Justice: A Critical Introduction*. Oxon: Routledge.

Wakefield, S. and Uggem, C. (2010) Incarceration and stratification. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 36(1): 387-406.

Walgrave, L. (2003) Imposing restoration instead of inflicting pain: reflections on the judicial reaction to crime. In: Von Hirsch, A., Roberts, J.V., Bottoms, A., Roach, K. and Schiff, M. (eds.) *Restorative Justice and Criminal Justice: Competing or Reconcilable Paradigms?* Oxford. Hart Publishing. pp.61-78.

Walgrave, L. (2007) *Restorative Justice, Self-Interest and Responsible Citizenship*. Devon: Willan Publishing.

Walker, M. (2013) Social exclusion. In: Dwyer, P. and Shaw, S. (eds.) *An Introduction to Social Policy*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.26-37.

Walker, K. and Bowen, E. (2015) Mentoring serial and high-risk perpetrators of intimate partner violence in the community: Engagement and initiating change. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health* [Online]. 25(4): 299-313. DOI: 10.1002/cbm.1964 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].

- Walters, G.D. (2016) Friends, cognition, and delinquency: Proactive and reactive criminal thinking as mediators of the peer influence and peer selection effects among male delinquents. *Justice Quarterly*. 33(6): 1055-1079.
- Ward, T. (2011) Human rights and dignity in offender rehabilitation. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice* [Online]. 11(2/3): 103-123. DOI: 10.1080/15228932.2011.537580 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Ward, T. and Brown, M. (2004) The good lives model and conceptual issues in offender rehabilitation. *Psychology, Crime & Law*. 10(3): 243-257.
- Ward, T. and Mauna, S. (2007) *Rehabilitation: Beyond the Risk Assessment Paradigm*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Ward, T. and Laws, D.R. (2010) Desistance from sex offending: Motivating change, enriching practice. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health* [Online]. 9(1): 11-23. DOI: 10.1080/14999011003791598 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Waskul, D.D. and Vannini, P. (2006) *Body/Embodiment: Symbolic Interaction and the Sociology of the Body*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing.
- Watt, N. (2010) Cameron promises power for the ‘man and woman on the street’. *The Guardian* [Online]. 19th July 2010
Available at: <<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2010/jul/19/david-cameron-big-society-cuts>> [Accessed: 24th October 2018].
- Weaver, B. and McNeill, F. (2007) *Giving Up Crime: Directions for Policy* [Online]. Available at: <https://www.sccjr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2008/11/Giving_Up_Crime_tcm8-2569.pdf> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Weaver, B. and McNeill, F. (2010) Travelling hopefully: Desistance research and probation practice. In: Brayford, J., Cowe, F. and Deering, J. (eds.) *What Else Works?: Creative Work with Offenders*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.36-60.
- Weaver, A. and Weaver, B. (2013) Autobiography, empirical research and critical theory in desistance: A view from the inside out. *Probation Journal*. 60(3): 259-277.
- Wermink, H., Apel, R., Nieuwbeerta, P. and Blokland, A.A.J. (2012) The incapacitation effect of first-time imprisonment: A matched samples comparison. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. 29(4): 579-600.

- Whited, W.H., Wagar, L., Mandracchia, J.T. and Morgan, R.D. (2014) Partners or partners in crime? The relationship between criminal associates and criminogenic thinking. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*. 61(5): 491-507.
- Wikström, P-O.H. and Treiber, K. (2006) What drives persistent offending?: The neglected and unexplored role of the social environment. In: Savage, J. (ed.) *The Development of Persistent Criminality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp.389-422.
- Wilhelm, M.O. and Bekkers, R. (2010) Helping behavior, dispositional empathic concern, and the principle of care. *Social Psychology Quarterly* [Online]. 73(1): 11-32. DOI: 10.1177/0190272510361435
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Wilkinson, S. (1998) Focus groups in feminist research: Power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning. *Women's Studies International Forum* [Online]. 21(1): 111-25. DOI: 10.1016/S0277-5395(97)00080-0
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Wilkinson, S. (1999) Focus group methodology: A review. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* [Online]. 1(3): 181-203. DOI: 10.1080/13645579.1998.10846874
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2009) *The Spirit Level: Why Greater Equality Makes Societies Stronger*. New York, U.S.A.: Bloomsbury Press.
- Williams, F. (2001) In and beyond New Labour: Towards a new political ethics of care. *Critical Social Policy*. 21(4): 467-493.
- Williams, B. (2005) *Victims of Crime and Community Justice*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Williams, R.N. and Gantt, E.E. (2013) Psychology and the death of aspiration. *Theory & Psychology* [Online]. 23(2): 184-204. DOI: 10.1177/0959354313478326
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Williams, K., Poyser, J. and Hopkins, K. (2012) *Accommodation, Homelessness and Reoffending of Prisoners: Results from the Surveying Prisoner Crime Reduction (SPCR) Survey* (3/12) [Online]. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/278806/homelessness-reoffending-prisoners.pdf
[Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Wilson, J. (2000) Volunteering. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 26(1): 215-240.

- Wilson, W. (2017) *Housing Support for Ex-offenders (England and Wales (2989)* [Online]. Available at: <http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN02989/SN02989.pdf> [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Wilson, J. and Musick, M. (2000) The effects of volunteering on the volunteer. *Law and Contemporary Problems* [Online]. 62(4): 141-168. DOI: 10.2307/1192270 [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Wlezien, C. (2004) Patterns of representation: Dynamics of public preferences and policy. *The Journal of Politics* [Online]. 66(1): 1-24. DOI: 10.1046/j.1468-2508.2004.00139.x [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Wolch, J. (1990) *The Shadow State: Government and Voluntary Sector in Transition*. New York, U.S.A.: The Foundation Centre.
- Wolff, J. (2008) Equality and social justice. In: McKinnon, C. (ed.) *Issues in Political Theory*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp.99-120.
- Wooditch, A., Tang, L.L. and Taxman, F.S. (2014) Which criminogenic need changes are most important in promoting desistance from crime and substance use? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 41(3): 276-299.
- Wootton, B. (1962) Social science and social pathology. *Philosophy*. 37: 165-175.
- Worrall, A. and Corcoran, M. (2015) Integrated offender management: A microcosm of central and local criminal justice policy turbulence. In: Wasik, M. and Santatzoglou, S. (eds.) *The Management of Change in Criminal Justice: Who Knows Best?* London: Palgrave Macmillan. pp.259-274.
- Wright, M. (1991) *Justice for Victims and Offenders: A Restorative Response to Crime*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Wright, M. (1999) *Restoring Respect for Justice: A Symposium*. 2nd ed. Hampshire: Waterside Press.
- Wright, M. (2013) Could a restorative system of justice be more civilised than a punitive one? In: Cornwell, D., Blad, J. and Wright, M. (eds.) *Civilising Criminal Justice: An International Restorative Agenda for Penal Reform*. Hampshire: Waterside Press Limited. pp.381-408.
- Wright, K.A. and Cesar, G.T. (2013) Toward a more complete model of offender reintegration: Linking the individual-, community-, and system-level components of recidivism. *Victims & Offenders*. 8(4): 373-398.

- Yeung, A.B. (2004) The octagon model of volunteer motivation: Results of a phenomenological analysis. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* [Online]. 15(1): 21-46. DOI: 10.1023/B:VOLU.0000023632.89728.ff [Accessed: 8th August 2018].
- Yin, R.K. (2003) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods*. 4th ed. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated.
- Yonai, S., Levine, S.Z. and Glicksohn, J. (2015) Trajectories of crime and familial characteristics: A longitudinal national population-based study. *Crime & Delinquency*. 61(7): 927-949.
- Zehr, H. (1990) *Changing Lenses*. Pennsylvania, U.S.A.: Herald Press.
- Zehr, H. (2015) *The Little Book of Restorative Justice*. Delaware, U.S.A.: Good Books.
- Zehr, H. and Mika, H. (2003) Fundamental concepts of restorative justice. In: McLaughlin, E., Fergusson, R., Hughes, G. and Westmarland, L. (eds.) *Restorative Justice: Critical Issues*. London: SAGE Publications Limited. pp.40-43.
- Zellerer, E. and Cannon, J.B. (2002) Restorative justice, reparation and the Southside project. In: Karp, D.R. and Clear, T.R. (eds.) *What is Community Justice?: Case Studies of Restorative Justice and Community Supervision*. California, U.S.A.: SAGE Publications Incorporated. pp.89-108.
- Zernova, M. and Wright, M. (2007) Alternative visions of restorative justice. In: Johnstone, G. and Van Ness, D.W. (eds.) *Handbook of Restorative Justice*. Devon: Willan Publishing. pp.91-108.
- Zoutewelle-Terovan, M.V., Van der Geest, V., Bijleveld, C. and Liefbroer, A.C. (2014) Associations in criminal behaviour for married males and females at high risk of offending. *European Journal of Criminology*. 11(3): 340-360.

Appendices

Appendix A

Participant Information Sheet

Research Title:

‘The roles, motivations, and capacities of the community in the desistance process: A case study of the Knowsley area’.

Researcher:

Wayne Campbell; School of Law in the Faculty of Arts, Professional, and Social Studies.

I would appreciate if you would be willing to participate in the following research study that will form the basis of my PhD dissertation project. The research is being constructed, funded, and led by me, Wayne Campbell, a Postgraduate Research Student studying at Liverpool John Moores University, under the guidance of my Director of Studies Dr Matthew Millings; Senior Lecturer in Criminal Justice at Liverpool John Moores University. Before deciding whether you will participate, could you please spend a few moments of your time reading the following information carefully. If there is anything, you do not understand or require more information upon, please contact the researcher at any time. I must stress that in order to be eligible to participate in the research you must be aged eighteen or over and currently be a mentor at MALS, having been so for at least six-months.

The aim of the research:

Current theoretical knowledge and political understanding advocates that communities throughout society have a definitive role in the successful ability for ex-prisoners to desist from re-offending. Yet despite the increasing opportunities and powers presented to communities, which enable them to take responsibility and become involved at the forefront of supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their re-offending. Neither existing theoretical research studies, nor political legislation have examined and discovered whether individuals are motivated and capable of performing these roles in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their likelihood to re-offend. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to identify and speak to individuals throughout the spectrum of roles a person can play in processes of desistance. This includes individual's representative of the voluntary and community sector (VCS), statutory agencies of the public and private sectors, and lay participants within communities. The aim of engaging with those who are either currently active or inactively involved in these roles at the frontline of supporting ex-prisoners, serves to contribute to the minimal knowledge and understanding of the motivations and capacities that influence the roles people undertake, and how they are able to perform. Conducting this research will therefore lead to a greater awareness of what is necessary to increase the motivations and capacities of individuals to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their likelihood of re-offending.

Why have I been chosen?:

Recently you verbally expressed your desire to MALS's Senior Manager Sue that you would be willing to participate in this research study. However, there are two necessary requirements you must meet if you are going to participate. You must be aged eighteen or

over, and you must currently be a mentor at MALS, and have been so for at least six-months. Even if you meet these criteria in order to participate, I must emphasise that it is your decision and your decision alone as to whether or not you choose to participate in this research as it is completely voluntary.

If you decided to withdraw from the research study at any time you are free to do so, do not need to specify a reason for doing so, and no negative consequences would result from the decision you chose. However, in the interest of decency you would only have a maximum of fourteen days after completing the interview to withdraw. To withdraw, you would be required to either contact myself, Wayne Campbell, or alternatively contact Dr Matthew Millings; both of our details can be found at the end of the Participant Information Sheet.

What am I required to do if I choose to participate?:

You would be required to be interviewed alone by me within a safe and secure room at the premises of MALS. If you do not feel confident that you would be able to freely disclose your responses to my questions within this location. You can request that your interview take place within an alternative safe and secure room located upon the premises of Liverpool John Moores University. The total expected time the interview would last for would be no longer than ninety minutes, and this would be your entire involvement within the research study. The interview would be informal, involving you discussing primarily your motivations for deciding to become a mentor, as well as elaborating upon your role and responsibilities as a mentor. There is not a pre-determined set of questions that you are required to answer, therefore you are allowed to include and elaborate upon any issues as you see fit throughout the course of the interview.

Are there any risks involved should I choose to participate?:

There are no risks or costs involved in choosing to participate in this research; the only minor inconvenience for you may be taking the time to complete the interview. The benefit to you as a participant is that it would enable you to have your voice heard and taken into consideration. Allowing you to freely express your personal insight and opinions upon this aspect of criminal justice which has to date been vaguely researched. For your contributions will improve knowledge and understanding of the motivations and capacities that influence the roles people undertake, and how they are able to perform. Moreover, through conducting this research will lead to a greater awareness of what is necessary to increase the motivations and capacities of other individuals to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their likelihood of re-offending.

How would my participation remain anonymous and confidential?:

Before deciding whether or not you will participate, I can guarantee you that all personal information you provide will remain both anonymous and confidential during and after the research study has concluded. Your anonymity will be maintained, because voice recordings and notes taken during the course of your interview will not refer to you by your name;

instead you will be supplied a pseudonym and will be referred to this throughout. Although MALS will be aware of the volunteer mentors who participated in the research study, again I would like to make clear that all information you divulge during the interview will remain anonymous. As it will be impossible to trace the information acquired to the person who provided it, given that you will never be referred to by your name. Furthermore, when I disseminate the completed research, any reference that is made within the text to any information you personally expressed during your interview, will be noted as being said by your given pseudonym, ensuring that any details are kept anonymous.

Your participation in the research will remain confidential as the only people who will have access to the research study will be myself, and my academic supervisors at LJMU. I guarantee any personal information from you will remain confidential, as it will be kept private and secure in both paper and electronic form. Any hard copies of personal data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet upon LJMU premises throughout the duration of the research project when they are not in use, and your personal data will never be taken off LJMU premises. All electronic forms of personal data will be stored solely upon my exclusive hard drive upon the LJMU network, which is password protected and only accessible by me. Electronic versions of your personal information will never be stored upon any portable media device, and/or stored upon a home or personal computer. Any and all data collected throughout the research project will be retained and stored for no longer than five years. After which, I, and LJMU, can assure you that all paper and electronic documents will be terminated. Once my PhD dissertation project has been completed and submitted you are more than welcome to request a summarising copy of the research findings, which can be obtained by contacting me directly, or my Director of Studies. If you are unhappy and concerned about the way this research is being conducted, please do not hesitate to contact the Chair of LJMU Research Ethics Committee, Dr Sue Spiers; Email: s.spiers@ljmu.ac.uk Tel: 0151 904 6476.

Thank you for your time it has been greatly appreciated. You will now be required to complete a consent form before proceeding with the interview. The following are the contact details for my Director of Studies and myself;

- Primary Researcher, Wayne Campbell; E-mail: W.Campbell@2008.ljmu.ac.uk
- Director of Studies, Dr Matthew Millings; E-mail: M.N.Millings@ljmu.ac.uk
Tel: 0151 231 3932

Appendix B

Participant Information Sheet

Research Title:

‘The roles, motivations, and capacities of the community in the desistance process: A case study of the Knowsley area’.

Researcher:

Wayne Campbell; School of Law in the Faculty of Arts, Professional, and Social Studies.

I would appreciate if you would be willing to participate in the following research study that will form the basis of my PhD dissertation project. The research is being constructed, funded, and led by me, Wayne Campbell, a Postgraduate Research Student studying at Liverpool John Moores University, under the guidance of my Director of Studies Dr Matthew Millings; Senior Lecturer in Criminal Justice at Liverpool John Moores University. Before deciding whether you will participate, could you please spend a few moments of your time reading the following information carefully. If there is anything, you do not understand or require more information upon, please contact the researcher at any time. I must stress that in order to be eligible to participate in this research you must be aged eighteen or over, and you must have been in your current position within your organisation for at least twelve-months.

The aim of the research:

Current theoretical knowledge and political understanding advocates that communities throughout society have a definitive role in the successful ability for ex-prisoners to desist from re-offending. Yet despite the increasing opportunities and powers presented to communities, which enable them to take responsibility and become involved at the forefront of supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their re-offending. Neither existing theoretical research studies, nor political legislation have examined and discovered whether individuals are motivated and capable of performing these roles in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their likelihood to re-offend. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to identify and speak to individuals throughout the spectrum of roles a person can play in processes of desistance. This includes individual's representative of the voluntary and community sector (VCS), statutory agencies of the public and private sectors, and lay participants within communities. The aim of engaging with those who are either currently active or inactively involved in these roles at the frontline of supporting ex-prisoners, serves to contribute to the minimal knowledge and understanding of the motivations and capacities that influence the roles people undertake, and how they are able to perform. Conducting this research will therefore lead to a greater awareness of what is necessary to increase the motivations and capacities of individuals to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their likelihood of re-offending.

Why have I been chosen?:

Recently you verbally expressed your desire to me personally that you would be willing to participate in this research study. However, there are two necessary requirements you must meet if you are going to participate. You must be aged eighteen or over, and you must have

been in your current position/role within your organisation for at least twelve-months. Even if you meet these criteria in order to participate, I must emphasise that it is your decision and your decision alone as to whether or not you choose to participate in this research as it is completely voluntary.

If you decided to withdraw from the research study at any time you are free to do so, do not need to specify a reason for doing so, and no negative consequences would result from the decision you chose. However, in the interest of decency you would only have a maximum of fourteen days after completing the interview to withdraw. To withdraw, you would be required to either contact myself, Wayne Campbell, or alternatively contact Dr Matthew Millings; both of our details can be found at the end of the Participant Information Sheet.

What am I required to do if I choose to participate?:

You would be required to be interviewed alone by me within a room of your choosing at your organisations premises. If you do not feel confident that you would be able to freely disclose your responses to my questions within this location. You can request that your interview take place within an alternative safe and secure room located upon the premises of Liverpool John Moores University. The total expected time the interview would last for would be no longer than ninety minutes, and this would be your entire involvement within the research study. The interview would be informal, involving you discussing primarily your motivations for becoming involved in a role within offender management, as well as elaborating upon your role and responsibilities as a member of Knowsley's IOM team. There is not a pre-determined set of questions that you are required to answer, therefore you are allowed to include and elaborate upon any issues as you see fit throughout the course of the interview.

Are there any risks involved should I choose to participate?:

There are no risks or costs involved in choosing to participate in this research; the only minor inconvenience for you may be taking the time to complete the interview. The benefit to you as a participant is that it would enable you to have your voice heard and taken into consideration. Allowing you to freely express your personal insight and opinions upon this aspect of criminal justice which has to date been vaguely researched. For your contributions will improve knowledge and understanding of the motivations and capacities that influence the roles people undertake, and how they are able to perform. Moreover, through conducting this research will lead to a greater awareness of what is necessary to increase the motivations and capacities of other individuals to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their likelihood of re-offending.

How would my participation remain anonymous and confidential?:

Before deciding whether or not you will participate, I can guarantee you that all personal information you provide will remain both anonymous and confidential during and after the research study has concluded. Your anonymity will be maintained, because voice recordings and notes taken during the course of your interview will not refer to you by your name;

instead you will be supplied a pseudonym and will be referred to this throughout. Although your employers will be aware who participated in the research study, again I would like to make clear that all information you divulge during the interview will remain anonymous. As it will be impossible to trace the information acquired to the person who provided it, given that you will never be referred to by your name. Furthermore, when I disseminate the completed research, any reference that is made within the text to any information you personally expressed during your interview, will be noted as being said by your given pseudonym, ensuring that any details are kept anonymous.

Your participation in the research will remain confidential as the only people who will have access to the research study will be myself and my academic supervisors at LJMU. I guarantee any personal information from you will remain confidential, as it will be kept private and secure in both paper and electronic form. Any hard copies of personal data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet upon LJMU premises throughout the duration of the research project when they are not in use, and your personal data will never be taken off LJMU premises. All electronic forms of personal data will be stored solely upon my exclusive hard drive upon the LJMU network, which is password protected and only accessible by me. Electronic versions of your personal information will never be stored upon any portable media device, and/or stored upon a home or personal computer. Any and all data collected throughout the research project will be retained and stored for no longer than five years. After which, I, and LJMU, can assure you that all paper and electronic documents will be terminated. Once my PhD dissertation project has been completed and submitted you are more than welcome to request a summarising copy of the research findings, which can be obtained by contacting me directly, or my Director of Studies. If you are unhappy and concerned about the way this research is being conducted, please do not hesitate to contact the Chair of LJMU Research Ethics Committee, Dr Sue Spiers; Email: s.spiers@ljmu.ac.uk Tel: 0151 904 6476.

Thank you for your time it has been greatly appreciated. You will now be required to complete a consent form before proceeding with the interview. The following are the contact details for my Director of Studies and myself;

- Primary Researcher, Wayne Campbell; E-mail: W.Campbell@2008.ljmu.ac.uk
- Director of Studies, Dr Matthew Millings; E-mail: M.N.Millings@ljmu.ac.uk
Tel: 0151 231 3932

Appendix C

Participant Information Sheet

Research Title:

‘The roles, motivations, and capacities of the community in the desistance process: A case study of the Knowsley area’.

Researcher:

Wayne Campbell; School of Law in the Faculty of Arts, Professional, and Social Studies.

I would appreciate if you would be willing to participate in the following research study that will form the basis of my PhD dissertation project. The research is being constructed, funded, and led by me, Wayne Campbell, a Postgraduate Research Student studying at Liverpool John Moores University, under the guidance of my Director of Studies Dr Matthew Millings; Senior Lecturer in Criminal Justice at Liverpool John Moores University. Before deciding whether you will participate, could you please spend a few moments of your time reading the following information carefully. If there is anything, you do not understand or require more information upon, please contact the researcher at any time. I must stress that in order to be eligible to participate in the research you must be aged eighteen or over.

The aim of the research:

Current theoretical knowledge and political understanding advocates that communities throughout society have a definitive role in the successful ability for ex-prisoners to desist from re-offending. Yet despite the increasing opportunities and powers presented to communities, which enable them to take responsibility and become involved at the forefront of supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their re-offending. Neither existing theoretical research studies, nor political legislation have examined and discovered whether individuals are motivated and capable of performing these roles in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their likelihood to re-offend. Therefore, the purpose of this research is to identify and speak to individuals throughout the spectrum of roles a person can play in processes of desistance. This includes individual's representative of the voluntary and community sector (VCS), statutory agencies of the public and private sectors, and lay participants within communities. The aim of engaging with those who are either currently active or inactively involved in these roles at the frontline of supporting ex-prisoners, serves to contribute to the minimal knowledge and understanding of the motivations and capacities that influence the roles people undertake, and how they are able to perform. Performing this research will therefore lead to a greater awareness of what is necessary to increase the motivations and capacities of individuals to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their likelihood of re-offending.

Why have I been chosen?:

Recently you verbally expressed your desire to me personally that you would be willing to participate in this research study. However, there is one necessary requirement you must meet if you are going to participate, and that is you must be aged eighteen or over. Even if you meet the criterion in order to participate, I must emphasise that it is your decision and your

decision alone as to whether or not you choose to participate in this research as it is completely voluntary.

If you decided to withdraw from the research study at any time you are free to do so, do not need to specify a reason for doing so, and no negative consequences would result from the decision you chose. However, in the interest of decency you would only have a maximum of fourteen days after completing the focus group to withdraw. To withdraw, you would be required to either contact myself, Wayne Campbell, or alternatively contact Dr Matthew Millings; both of our details can be found at the end of the Participant Information Sheet.

What am I required to do if I choose to participate?:

You would be required to be a member of a focus group that would include yourself and a further three - four participants. This focus group would be facilitated by me within a mutually agreed upon location, convenient for all participants to access and attend. In anticipation that a location for the focus group cannot be mutually agreed upon. The focus group will alternatively take place within a safe and secure room located upon the premises of Liverpool John Moores University. The total expected time the focus group would last for would be no longer than two hours, and this would be your entire involvement within the research study. There is not a pre-determined set of questions that you are required to answer, therefore you are allowed to include and elaborate upon any issues as you see fit throughout the course of the focus group. I will propose a theme or question, then whether you wished to freely comment and provide your opinions upon the theme or question, or comment upon the responses given by other members of the group is your decision.

Are there any risks involved should I choose to participate?:

There are no risks or costs involved in choosing to participate in this research; the only minor inconvenience for you may be taking the time to complete the focus group. The benefit to you as a participant is that it would enable you to have your voice heard and taken into consideration. Allowing you to freely express your personal insight and opinions upon this aspect of criminal justice which has to date been vaguely researched. For your contributions will improve knowledge and understanding of the motivations and capacities that influence the roles people undertake, and how they are able to perform. Moreover, through conducting this research will lead to a greater awareness of what is necessary to increase the motivations and capacities of other individuals to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their likelihood of re-offending.

How would my participation remain anonymous and confidential?:

Before deciding whether or not you will participate, I must remind you that given the focus group is not conducted anonymously, all information and personal data you decide to give would be in the presence of other participants, but this is at your discretion. Other than myself and those participants within your focus group, efforts will be made to strengthen the anonymity and confidentiality of all personal information both during and after the study has

concluded. Your anonymity will be supported because voice recordings and notes taken during the course of your focus group will not refer to you by your name. Alternatively, you will choose a pseudonym and will be referred to this throughout. In addition you will be given a name tag to wear stating the name of your pseudonym to remind fellow participants. Furthermore, when I disseminate the completed research, any reference that is made within the text to any information you personally expressed during your focus group, will be noted as being said by your given pseudonym, strengthening the capacity for your details to remain anonymous.

Your participation in the research will remain confidential as the only people who will have access to the research study will be myself and my academic supervisors at LJMU. However I must stress that although all of the information you provide will remain confidential, this will be unless you reveal within the focus group an intention to harm yourself and/or another individual, or likewise reveal the intention to plan and/or commit an act of Terrorism. In the event that you were to disclose such information I would be obliged to inform the relevant authorities about your remarks. Similarly, although the intention of the research is not to discuss any theme that might be sensitive, embarrassing, or upsetting. If at any stage during or following the research study you were to become affected by anything discussed, please contact me and I can provide you with the details of relevant organisations that will be able to assist in providing you necessary support.

Other than in the above instance, I guarantee any personal information from you will remain confidential, as it will be kept private and secure in both paper and electronic form. Any hard copies of personal data will be stored in a locked filing cabinet upon LJMU premises throughout the duration of the research project when they are not in use, and your personal data will never be taken off LJMU premises. All electronic forms of personal data will be stored solely upon my exclusive hard drive upon the LJMU network, which is password protected and only accessible by me. Electronic versions of your personal information will never be stored upon any portable media device, and/or stored upon a home or personal computer. Any and all data collected throughout the research project will be retained and stored for no longer than five years. After which, I, and LJMU, can assure you that all paper and electronic documents will be terminated. Once my PhD dissertation project has been completed and submitted you are more than welcome to request a summarising copy of the research findings, which can be obtained by contacting me directly, or my Director of Studies. If you are unhappy and concerned about the way this research is being conducted, please do not hesitate to contact the Chair of LJMU Research Ethics Committee, Dr Sue Spiers; Email: s.spiers@ljmu.ac.uk Tel: 0151 904 6476.

Thank you for your time it has been greatly appreciated. You will now be required to complete a consent form before proceeding with the focus group. The following are the contact details for my Director of Studies and myself;

- Primary Researcher, Wayne Campbell; Email: W.Campbell@2008.ljmu.ac.uk
- Director of Studies, Dr Matthew Millings; Email: M.N.Millings@ljmu.ac.uk
Tel: 0151 231 3932

Appendix D

Researcher's Address

Researcher's Telephone Number

Researcher's E-mail Address

Respondent's Address

Date

Dear Sir/Madam,

my name is Wayne Campbell; I am a PhD student at Liverpool John Moores University. I am writing to you as I am looking to conduct research which would form the basis of my thesis entitled, "*The roles, motivations, and capacities of the community in the desistance process: A case study of the Knowsley area*". I am specifically seeking to conduct interviews with individuals within (*Insert name of organisation*) who would be willing to participate. These one-on-one interviews would last no longer than ninety minutes, with their purpose to explore the motivations and capacities that influence the role they perform as volunteer mentors to formerly incarcerated individuals. I must stress that at no point does this research seek to diminish (*Insert name of organisation*) credentials. For this research is invested in obtaining the insight of volunteer mentors actively involved in supporting ex-prisoners navigate the challenges associated with their re-entry into society. With the aim of generating knowledge and understanding of how to better motivate and facilitate greater societal involvement in supporting ex-prisoners and to reduce their potential to re-offend.

Thank you for your time, and should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me and/or see the attached participant information sheet.

Yours sincerely,

WAYNE CAMPBELL

Appendix E

Consent Form

Research Study:

‘The roles, motivations, and capacities of the community in the desistance process: A case study of the Knowsley area’.

Researcher:

Wayne Campbell; School of Law in the Faculty of Arts, Professional, and Social Studies.

Please tick
to confirm

- | | | |
|----|---|--------------------------|
| 1. | I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the above study, and that I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had those questions answered. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. | I understand that my participation in the study is completely voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time, without giving a reason, and that I will not face any negative consequences as a result. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | I am aged eighteen or over and currently am, and have been a mentor for at least six-months. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. | I understand that any personal information, as well as any contributions I have made to the study will remain anonymous.
I am also aware of who has access to the study, how my personal information will be stored, and for how long my personal information will be stored for prior to termination. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. | I agree to take part in the above study. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

.....
Name of Participant
(Print in BLOCK Capitals)

.....
Signature

.....
Date

.....
Name of Researcher

.....
Signature

.....
Date

Appendix F

Interview schedule – Sample group one

Name	Title/Position	Semi-structured interview	
		Date Conducted	Duration
Sue	Senior Manager and Mentor	22/10/2014	54 minutes
Owen	Senior Manager and Mentor	24/10/2014	67 minutes
Jean	Volunteer Mentor	30/10/2014	57 minutes
Rachel	Volunteer Mentor	03/11/2014	56 minutes
Bill	Volunteer Mentor	03/11/2014	55 minutes
Laura	Volunteer Mentor	04/11/2014	61 minutes
Marge	Volunteer Mentor	06/11/2014	63 minutes

Appendix G

Researcher's Address

Researcher's Telephone Number

Researcher's E-mail Address

Respondent's Address

Date

Dear Sir/Madam,

my name is Wayne Campbell; I am a PhD student at Liverpool John Moores University. I am writing to you as I am looking to conduct research which would form the basis of my thesis entitled, "*The roles, motivations, and capacities of the community in the desistance process: A case study of the Knowsley area*". I am specifically seeking to conduct interviews with individuals within (*Insert name of organisation*) who would be willing to participate. These one-on-one interviews would last no longer than ninety minutes, with their purpose to explore the motivations and capacities that influence the role they perform in the supervision and management of ex-prisoners. As well as establish the extent to which the role of communities are considered at the frontline of rehabilitative service delivery. I must stress that at no point does this research seek to diminish (*Insert name of organisation*) credentials. For this research is invested in obtaining the insight of professional stakeholders actively involved in processes of desistance. With the aim of generating knowledge and understanding of how to better motivate and facilitate greater societal involvement in supporting ex-prisoners and to reduce their potential to re-offend.

Thank you for your time, and should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me and/or see the attached participant information sheet.

Yours sincerely,

WAYNE CAMPBELL

Appendix H

Consent Form

Research Study:

‘The roles, motivations, and capacities of the community in the desistance process: A case study of the Knowsley area’.

Researcher:

Wayne Campbell; School of Law in the Faculty of Arts, Professional, and Social Studies.

Please tick
to confirm

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the above study, and that I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had those questions answered. ☐
2. I understand that my participation in the study is completely voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time, without giving a reason, and that I will not face any negative consequences as a result. ☐
3. I am aged eighteen or over, and have been in my current position for at least twelve-months. ☐
4. I understand that any personal information, as well as any contributions I have made to the study will remain anonymous. I am also aware of who has access to the study, how my personal information will be stored, and for how long my personal information will be stored for prior to termination. ☐
5. I agree to take part in the above study. ☐

.....
Name of Participant
(Print in BLOCK Capitals)

.....
Signature

.....
Date

.....
Name of Researcher

.....
Signature

.....
Date

Appendix I

Interview schedule – Sample group two

Name	Title/Position	Organisation	Semi-structured interview	
			Date Conducted	Duration
April	Senior Manager	Crime Reduction Initiatives	08/07/2015	56 minutes
Dan	Police Sergeant	Merseyside Police service	09/07/2015	52 minutes
Ellie	Community Safety Manager	Knowsley Council	20/07/2015	67 minutes
Lisa	Housing Officer	Knowsley Housing Trust	27/07/2015	63 minutes
Poppy	Senior Manager	Knowsley Housing Trust	27/07/2015	64 minutes
Clive	Senior Probation Officer	Merseyside Community Rehabilitation Company	05/08/2015	62 minutes
Steve	Senior Manager	Crime Reduction Initiatives	11/08/2015	69 minutes
Derek	Community Safety Manager	Knowsley Council	13/08/2015	62 minutes
Stephanie	Safer Communities Senior Supervisor	Knowsley Council	13/08/2015	69 minutes
Paul	Safer Communities Senior Supervisor	Knowsley Council	27/08/2015	64 minutes
Tim	Stronger Families Senior Coordinator	Knowsley Council	27/08/2015	60 minutes
Elsie	Employability Officer	JobCentre Plus	17/09/2015	59 minutes

Helen	Executive Manager	Merseyside Community Rehabilitation Company	24/09/2015	64 minutes
Hannah	Police Constable	Merseyside Police service	02/10/2015	55 minutes
Bob	Police Constable	Merseyside Police service	02/10/2015	57 minutes
Peter	Prison Governor	Undisclosed prison in the North West of England	04/11/2015	66 minutes

Appendix J

Would you like to take part in a Research Study?

Hello, my name is Wayne Campbell; a Postgraduate Research Student at Liverpool John Moores University. I would appreciate it if you would be willing to participate in the following research study, which will form the basis of my PhD dissertation project, titled...

‘The roles, motivations, and capacities of the community in the desistance process: A case study of the Knowsley area’.

Political discourse advocates that communities throughout society have a definitive role in the success or failure of ex-prisoners re-offending. However, despite the increased opportunities for communities to become involved in supporting ex-prisoners post-release. There is limited research that involves listening to the voices of the communities ex-prisoners will re-enter, to discover their feelings upon playing a role. This research study therefore aims to establish whether communities are motivated and capable of supporting ex-prisoners, and why.

If you would like to take part in this research study you must be aged 18 or over, and will be a member of a focus group facilitated by me, which would include yourself and a further three – four participants. The focus group would be your opportunity to voice your individual experiences and attitudes, helping towards addressing the research's aims.

If you would like to confirm your intention to participate in this research study, or simply would like further information, please take a copy of my email address below for you to contact me.

[illegible]

W.Campbell@2008.ljmu.ac.uk

Wayne Campbell

W.Campbell@2008.ljmu.ac.uk

Wayne Campbell

W.Campbell@2008.ljmu.ac.uk

Wayne Campbell

W.Campbell@2008.ljmu.ac.uk

Wayne Campbell

W.Campbell@2008.ljmu.ac.uk

Wayne Campbell

W.Campbell@2008.ljmu.ac.uk

Wayne Campbell

W.Campbell@2008.limu.ac.uk

Wayne Campbell

W.Campbell@2008.limu.ac.uk

Wayne Campbell

W.Campbell@2008.limu.ac.uk

Wayne Campbell

W.Campbell@2008.limu.ac.uk

Appendix K

Researcher's Address

Researcher's Telephone Number

Researcher's E-mail Address

Respondent's Address

Date

Dear Sir/Madam,

my name is Wayne Campbell; I am a PhD student at Liverpool John Moores University. I am writing to you as I am looking to conduct research which would form the basis of my thesis entitled, "*The roles, motivations, and capacities of the community in the desistance process: A case study of the Knowsley area*". I am specifically seeking to conduct focus groups with individuals within (*Insert name of community group*) who would be willing to participate. These focus groups would last no longer than two hours, with their purpose to explore the role communities feel they should play in the rehabilitation, re-integration, and re-settlement of ex-prisoners. Seeking to establish the extent they are (if at all) motivated and capable of engaging with the increasing opportunities and powers presented to them by the State, which enable communities to take responsibility and become involved at the forefront of supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their re-offending. I must stress that at no point does this research seek to diminish (*Insert name of community group*) credentials. For this research is invested in obtaining the motivations and capacities of those representative of the informal, passive, and organic roles an individual can play in the desistance process of ex-prisoners. With the aim of generating knowledge and understanding of how to better motivate and facilitate greater societal involvement in supporting ex-prisoners and to reduce their potential to re-offend.

Thank you for your time, and should you require any further information please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely,

WAYNE CAMPBELL

Appendix L

Consent Form

Research Study:

‘The roles, motivations, and capacities of the community in the desistance process: A case study of the Knowsley area’.

Researcher:

Wayne Campbell; School of Law in the Faculty of Arts, Professional, and Social Studies.

Please tick
to confirm

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the above study, and that I have had the opportunity to ask questions and have had those questions answered. ☐
2. I understand that my participation in the study is completely voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time, without giving a reason, and that I will not face any negative consequences as a result. ☐
3. I am aged eighteen or over. ☐
4. I understand that any personal information, as well as any contributions I have made to the study will remain anonymous, except from those participants within my focus group. I am also aware of who has access to the study, how my personal information will be stored, and for how long my personal information will be stored for prior to termination. ☐
5. I agree to take part in the above study. ☐

.....
Name of Participant
(Print in BLOCK Capitals)

.....
Signature

.....
Date

.....
Name of Researcher

.....
Signature

.....
Date

Appendix M

Interview schedule – Sample group three

Location	Name	Focus group	
		Date Conducted	Duration
Huyton	Simon Whitney Jean Chris David	05/10/2015	96 minutes
Huyton (Two)	Ian Alan Dawn Daniel Anne	14/12/2015	94 minutes
Kirkby	Emma Penelope Rachael Tony	29/11/2015	102 minutes
Kirkby (Two)	Dolly Joe Tom Frank Julia	27/10/2015	88 minutes
Prescot	Colin Ken Helen Keith Catherine	07/12/2015	97 minutes
Prescot (Two)	Peter Matt Sarah	19/11/2015	94 minutes

	Jo		
Stockbridge Village	Edna Darren Anna Christine	14/01/2016	99 minutes
Stockbridge Village (Two)	Adam Deborah Billy Brad	02/02/2016	91 minutes
Halewood	Stan Samantha Pat Steph John	25/01/2016	101 minutes
Whiston	David Paul Steven Alan	28/01/2016	86 minutes
Cronton	Sophie Audrey Elizabeth John Bob	15/02/2016	88 minutes

Appendix N

Sample group one – Semi-structured interview questions/themes

- Why did you decide to become a mentor?
 - What influenced/interested/motivated your involvement?
 - Has mentoring lived up to your expectations, the mentees, the time and emotional investment?
 - What is your role, what experience do you believe you bring to the role?
 - Do you believe you need certain skills/attributes/qualities to be a mentor? If so, which are necessary?
 - Is there any reason(s) as to why someone should not be allowed to become a mentor, and why?
- Do you think there is anything that could be done to help improve mentoring interventions to tackle re-offending?
 - What do you think mentors offer clients that can be considered as different from mainstream criminal justice provisions, and why?
 - Are we seeing an increase or fall in the numbers of people looking to become volunteer mentors at MALS, and what do you attribute these trends to?
 - Are you seeing a greater or reduced motivation by mentees to address and tackle their likelihood of re-offending, and why?
 - Do you believe there is a shortage of charitable organisations such as MALS which aim to support ex-prisoners in processes of desistance?
 - What differentiates MALS from other penal VCS organisations?
- What motivates you to remain as a mentor?
 - In what ways do you think you have gained/developed through being a mentor, and why?
 - Have your attitudes/opinions of ex-prisoners altered since becoming a mentor, and why?
 - Do you believe you have a good relationship with your mentees, and why?
 - Do you think ex-prisoners have to voluntarily enter mentoring schemes in order for the relationship to work, and why?

- Are more ex-prisoners showing an interest in being mentored, and what do you attribute this too, and why?
- What do you believe is required to increase the motivations of communities to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their chances of re-offending, and why?
 - Do you believe volunteering for a VCS organisation such as MALS should be made compulsory, and why?
 - Do you believe there is the potential for yourself to encourage greater levels of positive public involvement in processes of desistance? Instilling your values in others and encouraging proactive participation.
 - Do you believe there is more the State could be doing to encourage community involvement in processes of desistance, and why?
- What do you believe would enhance your capacities to perform the role of mentor, and why?
 - Are there personal and/or operational factors that inhibit your capacity to perform your role?
 - Did you receive any training/guidance from MALS in preparation for your role?
What did this consist of and was it sufficient?
 - What are some of the challenges mentees state they experience as they attempt to re-integrate and re-settle?
 - As a mentor how able do you feel you can address these concerns, and why?
 - How has marketisation/contestability influenced your role as a mentor?
 - How has partnership with Knowsley's IOM affected the operational capacity of MALS?
- What do you believe is required to increase the capacity of communities to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their chances of re-offending, and why?
 - How important a role do you think communities have in whether an ex-prisoners re-integration and re-settlement is successful?
 - How does the environment of Knowsley affect community engagement in processes of desistance?

Appendix O

Sample group two – Semi-structured interview questions/themes

- When and why did you decide to become involved in offender management?
 - What influenced/interested/motivated your involvement?
 - Have your experiences lived up to your expectations, the service users, the pressures and emotional investment?
 - What is your role and has this changed/developed in line with transformations to policy?
 - How has partnership/multi-agency working impacted upon your role? The advantages and difficulties associated with being a member of Knowsley's IOM upon your operational capacity.
- How are communities considered in the delivery of offender management in Knowsley?
 - Who or what do you assign responsibility upon for reducing rates of recidivism?
 - Should communities have a greater involvement in the re-integration and re-settlement of ex-prisoners? Should powers and responsibility be devolved or remain the remit of professionals, and why?
 - Does the VCS provide a ready outlet for lay participants from communities to become engaged in processes of desistance, and why?
- What do you consider are the foremost challenges ex-prisoners in Knowsley experience as they (re-)join communities, and why?
 - What improvements do you recommend could be implemented in order to address said challenges and difficulties ex-prisoners encounter?
 - How do you manage the competing needs/interests of service users and communities in you day-to-day work?
 - How are relationships maintained in practice with fellow practitioners and/or organisations with differing approaches to service users and communities?
- What motivates you to remain as a practitioner within offender management?
 - In what ways do you think you have gained/developed through being a practitioner, and why?

- Have your attitudes/opinions of ex-prisoners altered since beginning your role in offender management, and why?
 - Do you believe you have a good relationship with the service users you supervise and manage, and why?
 - Do the levels of support you provide to service users under your supervision and management differentiate? How do you manage/balance personal and organisational approaches to service users?
- What do you believe is required to increase the motivations of communities to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their chances of re-offending, and why?
 - Do you believe volunteering is a viable opportunity for encouraging community involvement in processes of desistance?
 - Do you believe there is the potential for yourself to encourage greater levels of positive public involvement in processes of desistance? Instilling your values in others and encouraging proactive participation.
 - What difficulties exist in motivating communal involvement, and why?
 - Do you believe there is more the public could be doing to take responsibility for supporting ex-prisoners? Is it society's moral and civic duty to forgive those who offend?
- What do you believe would enhance your capacities to perform your role in offender management, and why?
 - Are there personal and/or operational factors that inhibit your capacity to perform your role?
 - What are some of the challenges service users' state they experience as they attempt to re-integrate and re-settle?
 - How able do you feel you can address these concerns, and why?
- What do you believe is required to increase the capacity of communities to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their chances of re-offending, and why?
 - How important a role do you think communities have in whether an ex-prisoners re-integration and re-settlement is successful?
 - How does the environment of Knowsley affect community engagement in processes of desistance?

Appendix P

Sample group three - Focus group questions/themes

- What to you is a community, and why?
 - Explore feelings of safety, belonging, what are these attributable to?
 - Have/are communities open to development?
 - What factors obstruct cohesion?
 - Where do offenders fall into this?

- What role do you believe the community has in supporting ex-prisoners, and why?
 - Gauge the sense of awareness communities have of available opportunities.
 - Feelings of responsibility for supporting their return into society post-release.
 - Are the severity/category of offence(s) committed, the victim(s), whether the offender is known to the area, all contributing factors?
 - The challenges and advantages to be earned in supporting ex-prisoners (re-)joining the community.

- What would increase your motivations to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their chances of re-offending, and why?
 - Enhanced awareness of opportunities to become involved, the definitive role of communities upon ex-prisoner success, support from statutory agencies?
 - What do you believe motivates those individuals who play an active role in supporting ex-prisoners, and why?

- What would increase your capacity to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners to reduce their chances of re-offending, and why?
 - What are the skills/attributes/qualities a person requires to become engaged in supporting ex-prisoners reduce their re-offending?
 - Is there an association between capacities and motivations to play a role?
 - Why do you believe the State has sought to encourage community representation in providing rehabilitative support to ex-prisoners?
 - Are responsibilities and powers welcomed?
 - Can re-offending be reduced without community involvement, and how?