

Building communities by mapping the assets and strengths that lie within and beyond: An Asset-Based Community Development model in HMP Kirkham and HMP Wymott.

MUSGROVE, Amy <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4760-6179>> and BEST, David
Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:
<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/25296/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

MUSGROVE, Amy and BEST, David (2019). Building communities by mapping the assets and strengths that lie within and beyond: An Asset-Based Community Development model in HMP Kirkham and HMP Wymott. *Prison Service Journal*.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Building communities by mapping the assets and strengths that lie within and beyond: An Asset-Based Community Development model in HMP Kirkham and HMP Wymott.

Authors

Amy Musgrove (Department of Law and Criminology, Sheffield Hallam University)

Professor David Best (Centre for Regional Economic Social Research, Sheffield Hallam University)

Abstract

The development of the initiative of a Rehabilitative Culture initiative in UK prisons is consistent with a wider switch in health and justice towards strengths-based approaches to rehabilitation and reintegration. One component of this approach is called Asset Based Community Development which is based on a set of techniques for mapping and mobilising community assets. In this paper we describe asset-mapping work in two prisons in the North-West of England, HMP Wymott and HMP Kirkham. The project engaged three populations - prison staff, external partners and prisoners in a series of workshops to build resources and to create a group of 'community connectors'. This partnership approach generates hope and trust and builds the potential for effective joint working to increase wellbeing and reduce isolation in prison.

Key Words

Prison; Asset-Based Community Development; Rehabilitative Culture; Recovery; Capital; Desistance

Introduction:

There is evidence that the strongest predictors of recovery from addiction and desistance from offending are engaging in pro-social networks that help to generate positive identities and that support engagement in a range of meaningful activities. This allows individuals to develop new personal and social recovery capital (the 'resources' that people need to accrue to manage effective rehabilitation) and to access resources in their local community that will protect them against relapse and returning to the same social networks, while breaking down exclusions and stigmatising attitudes that may prevent them from doing so. Likewise, for desistance from offending, there is a recognition that this is a process over time that relies on informal social ties and opportunities for employment and personal growth (Maruna and Farrell, 2004; McNeill, 2014). These models and ideas have been developed in an emerging partnership between HMP Kirkham, HMP Wymott and Sheffield Hallam University. The shared ethos is around a strengths-based continuity of care approach to rehabilitation, using a relational framework that is based on building connections and mobilising resources to afford more sustainable and effective opportunities for reintegration for prisoners approaching completion of their sentences. The model also relies on building hope and building resources within the prison. The current project demonstrates the viability of asset mapping and shows a rich diversity of assets accessible in both establishments and provides a frame for using this approach to build trust and strengths-based working in prisons.

Background:

In many instances imprisonment does not reduce reoffending. Imprisonment separates individuals from their support networks, affects their employment and housing status and creates stigma and negative labels associated with their situation. This generates issues for reintegration and rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is a key aspect of criminal justice in England and Wales (Ministry of Justice, 2013), but in 2013 the Ministry of Justice also made a commitment to create real continuity between custody and community (Ministry of Justice, 2013). A recent report by the Public Accounts Committee has recently described the 'rehabilitation revolution' as still having a long way to go (Public Accounts Committee, 2018), with the overall proven reoffending rate at 29.4% between April and June 2016 normally fluctuating between 29% and 32% (Ministry of Justice, 2018). Alongside this, there is an increasing number of prisons that have been recently highlighted as unacceptable, with reports of self-inflicted deaths, unsanitary conditions and poor mental health in HMP Nottingham, Humber, Liverpool, Woodhill and more (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, 2018). Self-harm rates are rising and in 2017 reached a record high of over forty-two thousand, up by 12% on the previous year along with 70 suicides in the same period (Ministry of Justice, 2018). This combined with a lack of social contact, and the resulting loneliness that accompanies it, have been cited as some of the hardest aspects of being incarcerated (Sykes, 1958), along with trouble lives only exasperates problems further (Social Exclusion Unit Report, 2002).

Focusing on rehabilitation requires institutions to have processes and activities in place to support individuals. These processes and activities will explore opportunities to change their life course; assess their past and address their futures needs; and taking on challenges which will help them to reintegrate into the community. By allowing access to such opportunities the system provides an environment for change but this cannot be seen in a prison only. Prisons are not a silo for the rehabilitation of prisoners. Rehabilitation has to bridge between the community and the prison and have some continuity (Ministry of Justice, 2013).

In order for prisoners to successfully reintegrate back into the community support and access to groups which are positive are essential. Rehabilitation does not "happen" in prison; it may start there but in order to create a successful model of rehabilitation, efforts and initiatives have to bridge from the secure environment to the community. Recovery research on social networks has established that one of the strongest predictors of addiction recovery occurred when individuals sort networks supportive of recovery (Longabaugh, *et al.*, 2010; Best *et al.*, 2012). Those who feel connected to others in a community are more likely to desist from crime. Social networks that help desistance include extended family, mutual aid groups, clubs and cultural or religious groups (Farrall, 2004). What this suggests is that group membership exerts a powerful influence on identity with the transition to prosocial groups having positive effects for health, wellbeing and community engagement (Haslam *et al.*, 2018). However, these pro-social connections do not just materialise by themselves. They have to be facilitated and supported in most cases, and continuity from prison to the community is essential in order for effective pathways to emerge. Developing connections and relationships with individuals who model pro-social behaviours has been shown to have the capacity to exert a level of informal social control, helping to mediate ex-offenders' actions through the development of a relationship considered or recognised as not worth jeopardising; creating a level of accountability (Sampon and Laub, 1993; Rex, 1999). Communities willing to support and enhance social connectedness will enhance recovery and desistance and this should be a key consideration for facilitators of reintegration and rehabilitation.

A recent project at HMP Kirkham titled "Kirkham Family Connectors" (KFC) was based on the principles of Asset Based Community Development (ABCD: the identification of assets that exist in the community; (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993) and Assertive Linkage (Best *et al.*, 2018; Hall *et al.*, in press). Asset-based community development offers guidance on how communities can identify resources and utilise these resources to create stronger communities by linking local groups and activities together to support marginalised and disadvantaged groups. By identifying resources you not only support individuals' social integration but most importantly you support community growth. This is particularly important for people in recovery and those attempting to desist from crime as they make positive links to community resources which in turn increases their social and personal capital. People often do not just find their own way. Assertively linking individuals to these resources is a key element to success for both the individual, the connector (the one who creates the link) and the community as it provides the process through which individuals are encouraged, prepared and supported to engage in community groups.

The project aimed to identify what each prisoner's skills and strengths were, what enthused and engaged them, and created partnerships with family members to create accessible pathways to resources that are available in their lived communities. KFC was a partnership approach between prison staff, families and prisoners, outside agencies and the project team where the group developed and supported each other thereby creating a strong alliance to one another. This project was unique in that it created a learning environment whereby stakeholders acquired assets from each other and shared pathways that aimed to help other stakeholders engage and then stay engaged in groups and activities. This network of assets and support systems benefitted a range of stakeholders and supported positive engagement and emerging sense of hope and group cohesion (Hall *et al.*, in press). The evaluation data of the programme was overwhelmingly positive, generating hope and a sense of partnership among stakeholders - staff, prisoners and families - and also a sense of coming together and working together that generated group cohesion and a sense of shared goals (Best *et al.*, 2018; Hall *et al.*, in press).

This paper builds on the KFC project and discusses the continuing work being done around building social capital for prisoners and growing their network of assets in order to support their reintegration into the community post-release. By focusing on building and strengthening resources available to prisoners you can have an impact on their desistance from crime and further imprisonment (Mann, Howard and Tew 2018; Farrall, 2004; Maruna, 2001). There are two main academic origins for models of social capital, one from France and one from the USA. In the American context, social capital was characterised as a resource that individuals can draw upon but it goes beyond a one-way transaction and includes a commitment to the group where the resources are drawn from and a two-way interaction between the individual and the group, in other words, both have to benefit from the interaction (Putnam, 2000). So in this sense, social capital is a bond between parties which generates resources, duties and responsibilities between the parties involved, and is about the power of connection and social engagement. Earlier the French sociologist Bourdieu (1985) had maintained that social networks are an invaluable asset and the relationships established are based on trust and tolerance (for a longer discussion of this, see Hall and Best in this volume). Social capital should be thought of as a way creating strong connections and networks, and that these connections and networks are built on solid foundations which comprise trust, hope and mutuality for one another. De Silva *et al.*, (2005) claims that there are several parts to social capital (1) *the density of community and personal networks*; (2) *civic engagement and participation*; (3) *a sense of belonging in the community*; (4) *reciprocity and cooperation with fellow citizens*, and (5) *trust in the community* and so fits with the idea that this is can be measured. This encapsulates a lot of the work previously done but summarises succinctly the key elements of social capital.

The academic research conducted on social capital has rapidly expanded in recent times but has also provided the basis for novel ideas. One such idea is recovery capital (discussed in the paper by Best and Hall in this volume) which is based on many of the core aspects of social capital but is focused on those with addiction (Granfield and Cloud, 1999). This model established by Granfield and Cloud focused on inter-personal resources, intra-personal resources and wider resources available within the community which will support an individual recovery (Best and Laudet, 2010). This has been revolutionary in the way professionals working in the addictions field have been available to think about an individual's recovery and how they might be best supported in their journey. Best and Laudet (2010) outlined three key components of recovery capital:

- *Personal recovery capital which refers to the personal skills, capabilities and resources the individual possesses. The key resources are self-esteem, self-efficacy, communication skills, coping skills and resilience.*
- *Social recovery capital which refers to the social supports the individual can draw upon to support their recovery journey.*
- *Community recovery capital refers to the contextual factors of recovery in two senses. In the first sense it is about opportunities to access houses that are safe in neighbourhoods that the person can engage with and opportunities for training and employment. The second type of community recovery capital is specific to addiction and refers to the pathways to recovery support. This includes high quality and evidence-based specialist addiction treatment but also involves the availability of community recovery support groups and viable and strong connections between specialist treatment and the opportunity for continuity of care in the community. (Best and Laudet, 2010)*

The growth of capital, social or recovery does not happen overnight. Social capital is something which is aided by individuals and groups around those who are most vulnerable. Resources are available to support the growth of one's capital but to vulnerable individuals, like prisoners, the challenges of accessing these resources are complex and difficult. The resources they have had access to to-date are often negative and can be destructive to their recovery and growth of pro-social capital which means they are barriers to their desistance and recovery. In order to support a change, the process of recovery from addiction and desistance from crime needs to be socially mediated and requires support that focuses on building personal strengths and resources whilst encouraging engagement with wider community groups (Pillay, Best and Lubman, 2014) with the assumption of reciprocal engagement and benefit (Best *et al.*, 2015).

Reintegration for prisoners can be very difficult. They serve their time and are released back into the community that has always supported them but these support networks may well be the negative networks that will only continue to create barriers for these individuals reintegration into mainstream society (Boehm, 2014; Heidemann, Cederbaum and Martinez, 2014). Low mutual trust levels between ex-prisoners and pro-social groups can lead to fear of rejection and increased perceptions of stigma, preventing access to socially supportive resources and capital (Niewiadomska and Fell, 2015). The vicious cycle is a difficult one to break as bonds become destabilised; instability in the prisoners lives is inherent and this can create mistrust and weak societal bonds (McNeill, 2014). In an attempt to bridge the gap between prison and the pro-social groups and support networks is one which this project at HMP Kirkham and HMP Wymott is attempting to do. Not all prisoners have access to strong family bonds, pro-social groups or know how to transition back to the community and change their own landscape. This programme of work supports prisoners to build capital and improve their access to groups and resources mutually benefitting all. A strengths-based, positive approach is the most appropriate model for this nature of prisoner reintegration, based on the idea of building on existing and generating new social and community capital; meaning that bridging programmes are so critical in supporting the transition from prison to the community. This is designed not only to support the individuals' own rehabilitation but also to build strengths and resources in the participating prisons.

The strengths based approach being utilised in this programme of work is known as ABCD: Asset-Based Community Development. The academic origins of the work are based on the work of Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) and the idea that communities hold considerable resource and that mobilising these resources empowers communities and increases human connections, with considerable benefits to public health and community wellbeing. Success requires the engagement of community connectors (McKnight and Block, 2010) who are the human bridges between vulnerable populations and community resources. There is support for a model of building social and community capital by linking into resources that exist in the community and utilising these to support the reintegration and rehabilitation pathways for prisoners about to be released into the community (Best *et al.*, 2018; this approach is discussed in more detail by Hall and Best in this volume). Assets are the skills, knowledge, strengths of individuals and the resources within communities and organisations that people value; for example, practical skills, knowledge, interests, passions, networks, connections, groups, associations, organisations, physical, environmental and economic resources.

By connecting with the resources that are available you can encourage the growth of social and recovery capital (and not just for those suffering from addiction but for a wider group of excluded people) which allows individuals to create a turning point in their current lifestyles meaning that alternative pathways can be sort. If this spreads within a community, particularly one which is secure, it can quickly lead to a change in mind-set of the majority, to a culture of trust and shared goals and values. By promoting the development of social networks, enhancing environmental assets, supporting community engagement, it is possible to nurture a resilient community of prisoners, staff, family and local community. The process of mapping assets is itself positive and generates momentum, positive social identity and a commitment and belonging.

Identifying the assets within a community is an important phase for ABCD work but it is only the start of the process. Once you have identified assets within a community, you have to then find a way of bridging between the identified resources and assets and those who need them and to build sustainable and mutually beneficial relations between these parties. McKnight and Block (2010) identify this "bridge" (in its lived form) as a 'Community Connector', characterised as a person who can mobilise the assets identified, and who has knowledge of and status within the community. It is important not to think about the vulnerable individuals as simply draining the resources of a community, but that they are contributing to a dynamic and evolving set of assets and resources. Positively thinking, everyone has something to offer and this is how ABCD can work in the longer term, where ABCD is seen as a positive sum game. By mobilising community capital and engaging individuals and their assets communities only grow stronger, as the bonds to vulnerable groups develop and the community is enriched as a result. The community becomes stronger and more self-reliant every time local residents, and particularly the "strangers" (vulnerable populations, for example, prisoners) within, are linked with others within the community (Kretzmann and McKnight, 1993). This approach looks at what each person can offer. This is what Putnam (2000) referred to as bridging capital - the bonds that emerge between groups previously unconnected. It is a positive approach, which is based on the strengths of each individual, and it assumes a contagion of strengths based on engagement and a resulting spread of trust and hope. By seeking to establish what each person can bring, it seeks to focus on the strengths of each individual and look to support those who may be less able at this time but by focusing on what they have to offer and not how much, means that trust, hope and a sense of connection is built within the community.

Project Aims and Methodology

The intention of this programme of work is to build on the KFC project and the partnerships generated from it, and to continue to build a body of strengths-based community engagement. The aim is to engage prison staff in a strengths-based approach which builds on elements of their work that work well yet could work better; and through assertively linking the prisoner to productive and meaningful activities and the linked prosocial groups in turn aids their transition back to the community. This programme will utilise existing resources from within the setting (either HMP Kirkham and HMY Wymott) and support prisoners to access these groups through prison staff and peer mentor involvement, and by engagement with agencies who operate within the prison setting. It is hoped that this approach will inspire prison staff to positively engage with the concept of ABCD and agree to be connectors for the project. These relationships between the prisoners and the staff provide the basis for bonding capital and bridging capital between the prisoners, the staff and community.

What we initially did:

1. Preparatory work with senior staff in each prison, and clarify our vision for the work
2. Identified what the assets are in HMP Kirkham and HMP Wymott. There are three types to be identified - 1. People; 2. Informal groups and associations; and, 3. Formal organisations.
3. We looked at assets inside the prison, outside the prison and that bridge the gap from inside to outside
4. Once the assets were identified, we aimed to establish whether the resources exist in the community, in the prison, or across both settings.

This exercise was conducted with the staff and partners at both establishments.

The Settings and Sample

HMP Kirkham is an adult male Category D open prison in the North West of England (near Preston), holding over 650 prisoners. The prison is focused on rehabilitation and reintegration upon release, with numerous programmes and initiatives being deployed. The prison has an established commitment to trialling new ideas and promoting reintegration into the community. The sample were recruited by the Governor putting out an expression of interest for people to attend an event and participate in a workshop. A flyer was developed so that staff knew about the aims of the project and the approach it would take. This went out to internal staff members but also to staff of organisations who provide a service within the prison but may not be directly employed by HMPPS. HMP Kirkham had 52 people in attendance. 22 of these were from external partners and 30 were Kirkham staff. After the initial introduction, two people left because they did not think it was relevant to them leaving 50 participants for the workshop activities.

HMP Wymott is an adult male Category C training prison in the North West of England (near Preston), holding over 1100 prisoners. The prison is focused on rehabilitation of sex offenders, has a therapeutic community as well as supporting mainstream category C prisoners (approximately half of the prisoners are sex offenders). The prison is open to seeking new ways of working in order to improve the rehabilitation of its offenders but also to create a rehabilitative culture amongst its staff. The sample was recruited in the same way as HMP Kirkham, but all the staff were internally employed. HMP Wymott had 52 people in attendance; all staff remained for the session.

The programme design was based on the previous work done in the KFC project at HMP Kirkham, but the lead researcher has had previous experience of undertaking community development projects in Australia with the Salvation Army (Best *et al.*, 2015), and with the courts in Melbourne, Australia (Best, Savic and Daley, 2016). Following on from the successful family connectors project (KFC) at HMP Kirkham it was agreed that additional strengths based work should be conducted at HMP Kirkham with a wider pool of staff involved. The Governor at HMP Kirkham, during the running of the KFC project, was redeployed to HMP Wymott so it was agreed that both establishments would participate in this programme of work. The rationale for this project is based on the work by Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) who developed a model of working which supports an inclusive community whose assets are made available and excluded groups are encouraged to participate in order to improve the community as a whole.

Design

The process of mapping the assets across the two establishments started with the staff (subsequent workshops with prisoners will be reported in future publications). The rationale for this is that they will be the bridge, or the connectors, to many of the assets within the community. The workshop ran for two hours and started with an introduction to the principles underpinning this work. After this prison staff were placed into five groups. The groups needed to be small enough in size so that everyone had a chance to speak in the allotted time and but that there was a sufficient number that the range of roles was diverse enough. The aim was then to identify what assets the prison community currently have or have ever had in five areas:

- employment, training and education;
- sport, recreation, arts and culture;
- recovery groups, and other forms of peer activity;
- volunteering and participation in a range of community activities; and
- other

The small groups worked together to identifying assets that they thought they had access to via the prison setting. The groups were told that they should focusing on things that worked well or things which could work much better - what we did not want was a list of failing things but a list of assets which the staff felt were positive and good resources to use. They had to classify them as internal assets, external assets or assets that crossed over both internally and externally. The small groups fed back their ideas and on each of the headings.

In the final part of the session the concept of connectors and assertive linkage were introduced and explained. The benefits of assertive linkage were stressed as important and mutually beneficial to both the connector and the individual. Staff were asked to consider what the strengths and skills they thought a connectors might have and secondly, what the challenges are for becoming a connector. After the session, staff were asked to sign up to the next session which is about becoming a connector. It was important that only staff wishing to pursue this further and supporting the project signed up to be a connector.

Evaluation Data

Summary

A total of 104 people started the sessions across the two establishments. The staff who attended the sessions held a diverse range of roles from senior staff at Governor grade, health care staff, prisoner officers working on the wings and drugs workers to external partners. The internal staff were made up of senior staff at Governor grade, probation staff, prisoner officers working on the wings etc. The external partners were from organisations who work closely with Kirkham in a resettlement capacity; for example, employers, church groups and CRCs.

It is not enough to simply have strong assets; individuals need to be supported to access these assets and one of the most effective ways of doing this is assertively linking individual with assets. Of the 102 individuals who stayed for the full session 32 staff (61%) at HMP Kirkham agreed to continue with the work and become community connectors. At HMP Wymott, 25 staff (48%) agreed to continue with the work and become community connectors. This was overwhelmingly positive that so many staff were committed to supporting prisoners build social and recovery capital. This

suggests the importance of strengths-based working to prison staff and the potential for this kind of activity to motivate and connect staff committed to the improvement and wellbeing of the prison

ASSETS

The 52 attendees were divided in 5 groups and asked to consider all the assets they thought they had or were available at HMP Wymott. The staff at Wymott identified a total of 291 assets available at the prison, many of which were internal assets (n = 169). Figure 1 shows the number of assets from each group under each category from HMP Wymott. These are not unique assets but assets which each group identified under the given headings. HMP Wymott was able to identify more assets than HMP Kirkham, both in total and average. The 50 attendees at HMP Kirkham were also divided into 5 groups. They identified a total of 228 assets available to the prison, many of which were bridging assets (n = 112), to resources in the community around the prison. Again, these are not unique assets but assets which each group identified under the given headings. Figure 2 shows the number of assets from each group under each category from HMP Kirkham.

Figure 1: HMP Wymott Assets

| | Sport and Recreation | Employment, Training and Education | Mutual Aid | Community and Volunteering | Other | TOTAL ASSETS | AVERAGE ASSETS |
|---|----------------------|------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|-------|--------------|----------------|
| AVERAGE ASSETS PER GROUP: Inside Prison | 6.4 | 7.4 | 11 | 9 | 0 | | 8.45 |
| TOTAL ASSETS FROM ALL FIVE GROUPS: Inside Prison | 32 | 37 | 55 | 45 | 0 | 169 | 33.8 |
| AVERAGE ASSETS PER GROUP: Outside Prison | 3.8 | 3.8 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 0 | | 3.15 |
| TOTAL ASSETS FROM ALL FIVE GROUPS: Outside Prison | 19 | 19 | 14 | 11 | 0 | 63 | 12.6 |
| AVERAGE ASSETS PER GROUP: Bridging / Both | 3.8 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 0 | | 2.95 |
| TOTAL ASSETS FROM ALL FIVE GROUPS: Bridging / Both | 19 | 18 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 59 | 11.8 |
| TOTAL ASSETS | | | | | | 291 | 58.2 |

Figure 2: HMP Kirkham Assets

| | Sport and Recreation | Employment, Training and Education | Mutual Aid | Community and Volunteering | Other | TOTAL ASSETS | AVERAGE ASSETS |
|---|----------------------|------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|-------|--------------|----------------|
| AVERAGE ASSETS PER GROUP: Inside Prison | 3 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 5 | 0 | | 2.95 |
| TOTAL ASSETS FROM ALL FIVE GROUPS: Inside Prison | 15 | 16 | 18 | 10 | 0 | 59 | 11.8 |
| AVERAGE ASSETS PER GROUP: Outside Prison | 3.6 | 3.2 | 1.6 | 3 | 0 | | 2.28 |
| TOTAL ASSETS FROM ALL FIVE GROUPS: Outside Prison | 18 | 16 | 8 | 15 | 0 | 57 | 11.4 |
| AVERAGE ASSETS PER GROUP: Bridging / Both | 6.2 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 5.8 | 0 | | 4.48 |
| TOTAL ASSETS FROM ALL FIVE GROUPS: Bridging / Both | 31 | 24 | 28 | 29 | 0 | 112 | 22.4 |
| TOTAL ASSETS | | | | | | 228 | 45.6 |

What is most interesting is how staff identified these assets. HMP Wymott have more assets from within the prison setting (an average of 33.8 equating to 58% of their total assets) whereas HMP Kirkham have a much stronger bond with the bridging assets they identified (an average of 22.4 equating to 46% of their total assets). HMP Kirkham were far more balanced about the assets they identified from within (30%) and outside (24%) of the prison setting too. HMP Wymott staff were far more internally focused and this is reflected in the assets they identified from outside (22%) and bridging (20%). This reflects the type of establishment they are as Kirkham is an open prison, has lower risk individuals housed there and are therefore seeking a much more integrated approach with the communities which surrounds the establishment in order to provide successful opportunities for recovery and desistance. HMP Wymott is a more secure environment which houses individuals who are deemed to be more at risk than HMP Kirkham and therefore focused on providing a safe and secure environment as its priority. What this has meant is that they have to rely on their own internal resources to support their prisoners, what is reflected in the assets identified and how they have classified them. For example, Wymott has high numbers for both mutual aid and community and volunteering dominate inside the prison but not outside or bridging/both. This

needs further exploration but Wymott appeared to be an insular establishment providing lots of its own services and therefore could explain this.

Figure 3: Examples of the types of Assets Identified by the groups

The types of assets that were identified in each category are as follows:

| | Sport and Recreation | Employment, Training and Education | Mutual Aid | Community and Volunteering |
|--------------------|--|---|--|--|
| HMP Kirkham | gym, library, allotments, conservation areas, farm, rambling, bowling green, cookery | library, C2W, apprenticeships, workshops, recycling lives, Volunteer, distance learning, adult learning, residential training | AA, NA, DARS, GA, Mental Health services, Chapel, staff | Charity shops, community bus, church groups, Family days, flower show, farm shop, veterans in custody, coffee mornings |
| HMP Wymott | library, gym, football/rugby, sports day, yoga, music club, bowling green, drama | vocational training, ACHIEVE, learn direct, workshops, job centre, apprenticeships | Samaritans, listeners, AA, Pipe, TC, NA, salvation army, Chapel, GA, mental health, building futures | church groups, family days, family forum, charity shops, shelter, Samaritans |

None of the groups used the "other" category. This will be discounted from further studies. What was clear from the data was the number of unique assets identified - at HMP Wymott only 4 of the assets were identified by all 5 groups. At HMP Kirkham only 3 of the total number of assets were identified by all the groups. Due to the breadth of knowledge of the staff at the workshops it was clear that they all came with their own knowledge and experience of many different assets. Some of the resources overlapped in the way different groups labelled them so as part of the data entry process we merged overlapping resources and below is a table which outlines the total number of assets within each category.

Figure 4: Total number of assets within each category after overlapping assets were removed.

| | HMP Kirkham | HMP Wymott |
|---|-------------|------------|
| Sport and Recreation | 35 | 44 |
| Education, Training and Employment | 40 | 44 |
| Mutual Aid | 29 | 51 |
| Peer, Community and Volunteering | 37 | 47 |

CONNECTORS

In the final part of the session staff were introduced to the concept of community connectors and asked to consider what the strengths and skills they have to be connectors and secondly, what the challenges are for becoming a connector. Staff were simply asked to create a list of strengths and a list of challenges. Two clear categories emerged from the way that staff had created their lists on strengths and challenges. They had focused on challenges and strengths for themselves as individual connectors but also institutional issues which may aid or create a barrier to becoming a successful connector. Some examples of these are outlined in the table below:

Figure 5: Examples of the Strengths and Challenges of becoming a connector.

| | Strengths | Challenges |
|----------|--|--|
| Personal | open-mindedness, patience, non-judgmental, | emotional, close mindedness, time, social norms/values |

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| | positivity, resilience, empathy, hopeful, confidence, stamina, pro-social, strong minded, understanding, life experience, compassion, imaginative, enthusiastic, persuasive, persistent, supportive, determination, perseverance, charisma, friendly, good listener, sense of humour, courage, faith, tactful, interpersonal skills, reliable, inspirational, caring, vision | being let down, lack of interest, mavericks, demanding, crisis management, denial, pessimistic, disability, language barriers, no knowledge, indifference, environment, peer pressure, lack of trust, dictate rather than listen, lack of consistency, stability, motivation, stigma, educational ability, personal problems, lethargy |
| Institutional | communication, committed, training, sentence planning, acknowledgement, colleagues/team | different agendas, time, resources, staff, operational pressures, waiting times, rules/regulations, expensive, red tape, logistics, agendas, finance, structure, personnel, policy changes, national funding, lack of employability options, public perception, revolving door |

At HMP Kirkham and Wymott staff had considered their own strengths and challenges but also institutional strengths and challenges: 68 challenges and 83 strengths were identified and 6 organisational strengths and 20 organisational challenges came out of this analysis. Staff were overwhelming positive about the characteristics they thought they had to connect others to the assets available but were equally critical of themselves too.

What we intend to do next:

1. Conduct a similar exercise (points 1 and 2 above) with prisoners at both establishments.
2. Identify a project team and project partners, and agree on a co-production process.
3. To identify community connectors who can provide links to these assets and bring them together to support and train them in this role
4. To mobilise this set of assets to support the process of implementation
5. To monitor and evaluate the success of the process and to assess its impact on the wellbeing of prisoners

CONCLUSIONS

Building an environment that is supportive of change and a positive place to be is especially difficult in a secure environment such as a prison. Changing the culture of a system the size of the prison system in the UK is something which has to develop over many years but these changes often start small, and are most likely to succeed and endure if multiple stakeholders can be actively engaged in the process. The culture is made up of ideas, behaviours and attitudes as well as the physical environment. The culture is something which we create as individuals and as communities, which means we have responsibility for it. If the culture is dominated by a deficit model, for example, then our behaviour, attitudes etc either accept this culture and this will be based on mistrust and a lack of community wellbeing and growth. It's comparable to the Broken Windows Theory introduced by Wilson and Kelling in 1982 which describes how an environment where there are visible signs of crime, anti-social behaviour and disorder creates a culture of acceptance to this type of behaviour meaning that it suddenly becomes justified to behave in this way and for this behaviour to spread.

If a prison wishes to change its culture and seek a positive, strengths-based approach to the prisoners housed there then it needs to change the way its thinking. This starts with the employees that work there, supporting a rehabilitative culture. Rehabilitative culture is found most strongly in the relationships between the staff and the prisoners (Mann, Howard and Tew 2018), and by the

engagement of the prison with the outside world. By having a small but committed group of staff, managers, partners and prisoners who are working towards a rehabilitative culture and environment the more likely you are to see bigger changes in the culture, and these changes are more likely to be enduring.

Active engagement with a community is a strong predictor of desistance (Farrell, 2014) and of recovery (Best and Lubman, 2012) so by involving oneself in pro-social groups will only increase your chances of reintegration. Programmes for prisoners that support pathways back into a supportive community will help to create sustainable recovery and desistance. In addition to this if you have community connectors who are willing to support you make the connections with pro-social groups it will not only ensure variety in what is available, but having individuals there who are willing and able to support you in a positive way (Pillay, Best and Lubman, 2014) will only contribute to the prisoners success.

By providing prisoners with a supportive environment where trust can be fostered a sense of belonging can develop (McNeill, 2014); this way prisoners' build their social capital and are better placed to recovery and desist upon release.

Although the work that is presented here is preliminary, it is consistent with a strengths-based approach to establishing a rehabilitative culture through building a commitment to shared goals achieved through celebration and building of strengths, and establishing a culture of growth and trust. This is not a panacea for the problems faced by prisons, but a method of building enthusiasm and activity to promote values and cultures consistent with effective pathways to desistance and reintegration.

Bibliography

- Best, D. and Laudet, A. (2010) The potential of recovery capital. London: RSA.
- Best, D., Gow, J., Knox, T., Taylor, A., Groshkova, T., & White, W. (2012). Mapping the recovery stories of drinkers and drug users in Glasgow: Quality of life and its associations with measures of recovery capital. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 31, 334–341. doi:10.1111/j.1465-3362.2011.00321.x
- Best, D. W. & Lubman, D. I. (2012). The recovery paradigm: A model of hope and change for alcohol and drug addiction. *Australian Family Physician*, 41:8 593-597
- Best, D., Savic, M. & Daley, P. (2016) The wellbeing of Alcohol and Other Drug counsellors in Australia: Strengths, Risks and Implications, *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*, 34 (2), 223-232.
- Best, D., Beckwith, M., Haslam, C., Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., Mawson, E., & Lubman, D. I. (2015). Overcoming alcohol and other drug addiction as a process of social identity transition: The Social Identity Model of Recovery (SIMOR), *Addiction Research & Theory*, 1-13. DOI: 10.3109/16066359.2015.1075980
- Best, D., Hall, L. and Musgrove, A. (2018) The bridge between social identity and community capital on the path to recovery and desistance. *Probation Journal*. DOI: 10.1177/1264550518790677
- Boehm, S. (2014). Exploring the roles of redemption, agency, and motivation in two groups of high-risk felony probations. *Journal of Qualitative Criminal Justice and Criminology*, 2, 268–298.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985) 'The Forms of Capital', In J. G. Richardson (ed) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. New York: Greenwood.
- De Silva, M., McKenzie, M., Harpham, T. and Huttly, S. (2005) Social capital and mental illness: A systematic review, *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 59, 619-627.
- Farrall (2004) 'Social Capital and Offender Reintegration: Making Probation Desistance Focussed', in Maruna & Immarigeon (Eds) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Granfield, R., & Cloud, W. (1999). *Coming clean: Overcoming addiction without treatment*. New York, NY: New York University Press
- Hall, L. Best, D., Ogden-Webb, C., Dixon, J. and Heslop, R (in press) Building Bridges to the Community: The Kirkham Family Connectors (KFC) Prison Programme. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*
- Haslam, S. A., McMahon, C., Cruwys, T., Haslam, C., Jetten, J., & Steffens, N. K. (2018). Social cure, what social cure? The propensity to underestimate the importance of social factors for health. *Social Science & Medicine*, 198, 14-21.
- Heidemann, G., Cederbaum, J., & Martinez, S. (2014). "We Walk Through It Together": The Importance of Peer Support for Formerly Incarcerated Women's Success. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 53(7), 522-542.

HM Inspectorate of Prisons Reports (2018). January to June. Accessed from:

<https://www.justiceinspectors.gov.uk/hmiprisons/media/press-releases/>

Kretzmann J. & McKnight J. (1993). Building communities from the inside out: A path toward finding and mobilising a community's assets. Skokie, IL: ACTA Publications.

Longabaugh, R., Wirtz, P. W., Zywiak, W. H., & O'Malley, S. S. (2010). Network support as a prognostic indicator of drinking outcomes: The COMBINE study. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 71(6), 837.

Mann, R., Howard, F. and Tew, J. (2018). What is a rehabilitative prison culture?. In *Prison Service Journal*. Accessed from:

<https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/sites/crimeandjustice.org.uk/files/PSJ%20235%20January%202018.pdf>

Maruna, S. (2001) *Making good: How ex-convicts reform and rebuild their lives*, Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Maruna, S. & Farrall, S. (2004) Desistance from crime: A theoretical reformulation. *Kolner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 43, 171-194. McNeill, 2014

McKnight, J. & Block P. (2010). *The abundant community: Awakening the power of families and neighbourhoods*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc.

Ministry of Justice (2013) *Transforming Rehabilitation: A Strategy for Reform*

<https://consult.justice.gov.uk/digital-communications/transforming-rehabilitation/results/transforming-rehabilitation-response.pdf>

Ministry of Justice (April 2018) *Proven Reoffending Statistics Quarterly Bulletin, April 2016 to June 2016*

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/702789/proven_reoffending_bulletin_April_to_June_16.pdf

Niewiadomska, I. & Fel, S. (2015). The Importance of Family Support in the Process of the Adjustment of Current and Former Prisoners. *The Person and the Challenges*, 5:2, 165-179, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15633/pch.1529>

Pillay, I. Best, D. & Lubman, D. I. (2014). Exploring Clinician Attitudes to Addiction Recovery in Victoria, Australia. *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly*. 32 (4). 375-392

Public Accounts Committee, (2018). *Government contracts for Community Rehabilitation Companies*. Twenty-Seventh Report of Session 2017-19. Accessed from:

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201719/cmselect/cmpubacc/897/897.pdf> 26/03/2018

Putnam, R. D. (2000) *Bowling Alone.: The collapse and revival of American community*. London: Simon & Schuster.

Rex, S. (1999) 'Desistance from offending: Experiences of Probation', *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38 (4): 366- 383.

Sampson, R. J. and Laub, J. H. (1993) *Crime in the Making: Pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) (2002) *Reducing Re-offending by Ex-Prisoners: A Report by the Social Exclusion Unit*. London: ODPM/SEU.

Sykes, G. (1958). *The society of captives: A study of a maximum security prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.