

Challenges and opportunities for ex-offender support through community nursing

ESHARETURI, Cyril and SERRANT, Laura <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9382-9859>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:
<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/18762/>

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

ESHARETURI, Cyril and SERRANT, Laura (2018). Challenges and opportunities for ex-offender support through community nursing. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 62 (14), 4642-4654.

Copyright and re-use policy

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

TITLE PAGE

Challenges and Opportunities for Ex-offender Support Through Community Nursing

Running Head: Supporting ex-offenders through Community Nursing

ABSTRACT

This study was a qualitative case study underpinned by 'The Silences Framework' aimed at mapping the ex-offender health pathway towards identifying 'touch points' in the community for the delivery of a nurse led intervention.

Participants meeting the study inclusion criteria were quantitatively ranked based on poor health. Participants scoring the lowest and confirming their ranking through a confirmation of a health condition were selected as cases and interviewed over six months. Individuals in the professional networks of offenders contextualized emergent themes.

The study indicated that pre-release, offenders were not prepared in prison for the continuity in access to healthcare in the community. On-release, reintegration preparation did not routinely enquire whether offenders were still registered with a general practitioner or had the agency to register self in the community. Participants identified the site of post-release supervision as the 'touch point' where a nurse led intervention could be delivered.

Keywords: Nurse led, Ex-offenders, Offender health, The Silences Framework, Continuity in access to healthcare

Acknowledgement: the Burdett Trust for Nursing funded the study

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest

AUTHOR DETAILS

Author 1 - Dr Cyril Eshareturi

PhD MPH PGCE BSC

Public Health Course Leader

University of Suffolk

Waterfront Building

19 Neptune Quay

Ipswich IP4 1QJ

C.Eshareturi@uos.ac.uk

Author – 2 Professor Laura Serrant

PhD MA BA RGN PGCE

Professor of Nursing

Centre for Health and Social Care Research

Room F617, Robert Winston Building

Sheffield Hallam University

L.Serrant@shu.ac.uk

INTRODUCTION

Offenders on release in England and Wales use health services in a crisis led way, are socially excluded and hard to reach (Rennie, Senior & Shaw, 2009; Norman, 2010; NHS Commissioning Board, 2013; Byng, Quinn & Sheaff, 2014). Whilst health services in prison is freely available, connecting released offenders with community health services as a health excluded group in need of tailored support is not prioritized (Van den Bergh, Gatherer, Fraserb & Mollera, 2011; Eshareturi, Serrant-Green & Bayliss-Pratt, 2014). In response to this, the aim of this study was to map the released offender health pathway towards identifying 'touch points' in the community where nurse led interventions could be delivered.

In line with the ethos of transparency, it is important that a declaration is made on how ex-offenders were defined. It is acknowledged that the meaning conveyed by the term 'offender' is not precise as it also refers to individuals who have committed an offence but may not have been incarcerated. However, we have used the terms 'released offenders' and 'ex-offenders' interchangeably in referring to individuals who have been released into the community after a period of incarceration.

METHOD

Theoretical framework

The study was theoretically underpinned by The Silences Framework (TSF), which is a framework suited for researching issues that are silent from practice, under researched and hidden from policy discourse (Serrant-Green, 2011). The Silences Framework is an anti-essentialist framework that is designed to explore individual areas of experience by valuing individual interpretations of events (Serrant-Green,

2011). An interpretative research paradigm which views the truth as multiple realities that are socially constructed by the individuals researched was adopted. This construed the concept of truth as a relative construct and posited that ex-offenders irrespective of prior imprisonment all have their own unique experience of what they call truth, thus deconstructing every invocation of experience as contextual and historically situated.

This approach further aligns itself within the criticalist paradigm to conducting research which endorses an action-oriented methodology. This 'action' could take the form of redressing power imbalances which could give voice to individuals who were previously marginalized by policy or practice (Serrant-Green, 2010), which indeed, is the case with ex-offender health. Nonetheless, in adopting both an anti-essentialist perspective and a criticalist paradigm, TSF as adopted was focused on exploring the marginalized nature of ex-offender health in order to uncover hidden perspectives with regards to community based delivery of a nurse led service.

This marginalized nature was explored through the concept of marginal discourses. Marginal discourses are categorized as such as they are positioned as removed from what society considers as 'normal' and consequently minimally prioritized in policy (Foucault, 1972; Ifekwunigwe, 1997; Afshar & Maynard, 2000). In contradiction to hegemonic discourses, these discourses owe their importance predominantly to the harshness by which they are marginalized and opposed by mainstream society (Tremain, 2008). The study was closely aligned with this concept as it located marginal discourses in how policy and practice addressed the health needs of ex-offenders. On the one hand, health policy in England and Wales does not recognize ex-offenders as a group in need of unique support on release from prison. On the other hand, there is a lack of statutory backing to enable practitioners to identify and

care for these individuals as a unique group on release from prisons into their local communities (Eshareturi, Serrant-Green, Galbraith & Glynn, 2015). Therefore, their exclusion from policy and practice justifies their categorization as marginalized.

Study design

The study was conducted in England and entitled 'Mapping The Offender Health Pathway: Challenges and Opportunities for Support Through Community Nursing'. It was commissioned by The Burdett Trust for Nursing with ethics approval received from the University of Wolverhampton School of Health and Wellbeing Ethics Committee and the Ministry of Justice via the National Offender Management Service. As articulated in the ethics application, the aim of the study was to map the released offender health pathway in order to identify 'touch points' in the community where nurse led interventions could be delivered. The study key question was: 'Where and how can health interventions be provided by nurses to released offenders now living in the community'? In answering this question, the study was designed to map the released offender health pathway towards identifying points in the community where nurse led interventions could be delivered in a manner and way which would be ethical, non-stigmatising and agreeable to offenders in the community.

The study was a qualitative collective case study which employed a quantitative, and parallel qualitative methods in collecting data. The RAND 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36) 1.0 Questionnaire was used as a source of baseline data in identifying individuals in poor health (Rand, 2013). The target population of the study were statutory released offenders now living in the community. This population was recruited from the Local Probation Trust and accessed via their case officers. The

study was introduced to participants by their case officers in the first instance, and subsequently by the researcher to individuals who expressed interest to participate.

The inclusion criteria for recruitment were:

- Participants must have been sentenced to between 2-8 years in prison and prior to release would have spent between 1-4 years in prison. These inclusion criteria was informed by the research officer of the Probation Trust who advised that these category of offenders were those who were most likely to have had a license condition imposed on them which will require maintaining contact with the service for over six months after release.
- Participants could be either male or female and must be above the age of 19 which will be their present age at recruitment if they had spent at least 1 year in prison and became incarcerated at 18 which is the age of legal responsibility in the UK.

A total of 58 individuals met the study inclusion criteria. Consent to engage in the study was received from 26 of them. The questionnaires were administered in person by a researcher over the course of four months and were ranked on the basis of poor health. On administering and subsequently ranking the questionnaires using the rand scoring tool (RAND, 2013), only eight individuals self-identified as having a health problem which was corroborated by their low ranked scores (below 50). Consequently, these eight individuals (silent voices) were selected as cases to be followed up prospectively for six months.

On identification of cases, semi-structured interviews were conducted in the first instance and exploratory interviews conducted subsequently over the course of the next five months towards identifying touch points where nurse led interventions could be provided to ex-offenders in the community. The themes which emerged from the

semi-structured interview of an individual case informed the range of topics which were covered in the first exploratory interview with that case. Thereafter, the themes generated from each exploratory interview informed the issues explored in the next exploratory interview. At the end of the follow up of each case at six months, a semi structured interview informed by the themes which emerged from the exploratory interviews of all cases was conducted – ‘silence dialogue’. The intent of this interview (Silence dialogue) was to ensure that the themes which had emerged from following up cases over the course of the preceding six months were indeed representative of their views. These interviews at conclusion of follow up led to the emergence of themes that informed the questions asked in the semi-structured interviews of individuals in the social, health and criminal justice network of offenders - collective dialogue.

The recruitment strategy adopted was designed in alignment with the ethos of the Silences Framework, situating study participants at the centre of the research (Serrant-Green, 2011). Accordingly, the 8 cases selected were included as a consequence of self-identifying a health problem. Towards ensuring that the views of offenders did not get lost in the interpretation of the researcher, the silence dialogue was conducted in order to ensure that the themes uncovered were reflective of the views of the offenders (Serrant-Green, 2011). This is in line with the anti-essentialist tenant of the study (Williams & May, 1996). The rationale for having the collective dialogue was in keeping with the criticalist underpinning of The Silences Framework which advocates the explanation of experience through interpretation (Scott, 1991). This dialogue enabled the contextualisation of the research findings in the reality of current service delivery.

Data analysis

Data generated from the administered questionnaires were analysed using the scoring tool of the RAND 36-Item Short Form Health Survey 1.0. (RAND, 2013). Only the general health subscale was used and internal construct validity was checked with the aid of a question aimed at checking if indeed the scores generated by the analysis of the questionnaires were corroborated by participants' construction of their own health. Qualitative data generated from both the semi-structured and exploratory interviews were analysed thematically in order to identify and report patterns of meaning (Braun and Clarke, 2006). These analyses were also supported by the use of participants' verbatim quotations which were assigned pseudonyms in order to ensure anonymity.

RESULTS

Before release

Participants indicate that offenders receive good treatment for their health conditions while in prison. However, while access to health practitioners in prison was good, the delivery of health interventions in prison was inconsistent and varied from the immediate provision of services to the non-delivery of services. Importantly, participants maintain that even when offenders received treatment for a health condition in prison, the interaction with the health practitioner and the treatment received did not prepare them for ensuring continuity in access to healthcare on release:

They had me on Warfarin for my whole sentence and I were better in prison than I were in the community, if I'm being honest, because they monitored me more. Every three to four days I've been monitored in prison. Silence dialogue

- Offender

Most of the time people get access to treatment in prison. I don't think that it is then backed up in terms of them being educated or making it clear on how they can access such support on release. I think there's an assumption that people will register with the doctor, maybe an expectation that they know what they've been taking before and I don't think that's always there. Collective dialogue - Probation Officer

In the past 12 months I was an A&E sister so I had a lot of experience with ex-offenders coming into the A&E department and a lot of them have got nowhere else to go, they've come here because we're the last resort and they haven't got access to medical care. They need the drugs because they were put on a drug rehab programme in prison which was not followed up when they've been released from prison. Collective dialogue - Acute Trust Nurse

On release

The on-release period was considered to begin in the immediate weeks preceding release. Participants indicate that offenders had little or no on-release support aimed at preparing them for accessing health services in the community. Whilst some prisons provide on-release information to enable individuals to access healthcare in the community, it was uncovered that this practice is not statutory and varies across the prison establishment. Furthermore, on-release preparation for access to a General Practitioner (GP) appears not to be consistent:

Between open prison and coming out? No. And I had high blood pressure, respiratory problems, asthma and stuff like that and Mirtazapine for depression. And it was like "Have you got enough meds for the next 30

days?" It wasn't "Where are you staying? Here's the number for a local GP" or anything like that. Silence dialogue - Offender

I had someone in the walk-in centre the other day who hadn't registered with a GP, been out of jail for a few months and he quite happily told me. I asked him 'Why haven't you got a GP?' and he said 'I've just come out of jail'.

Collective dialogue - Acute Trust Nurse

Clients with physical health needs I found as I say, they've been given the medication in the morning, given a couple of tablets and said "Right there you go, go and see your GP when you're released" and that's not always easy very often clients can't get an appointment for a long time or they've disengaged with the GP and they're not registered anywhere or they've moved to a different area. Collective dialogue - Probation Officer

Nurse led service

Whilst it was uncovered that some offenders on release had the agency to navigate and access health services post release without help, it was clear from the narrative of the study participants that most offenders would need help in navigating the health system on release. Participants maintained that a nurse led service could help released offenders navigate and access health services post release from prison if such a service was easily accessible:

Everybody coming out of prison on license has to come to the probation Office, and perhaps they could have an office set up for a nurse so they can register with a doctor because in prison the facility is not there and some

offenders might go to a different area so they've got no doctor, no nurse.

Silence dialogue - Offender

That would be good because then the nurse could do an initial assessment as to what that person's needs are and then they could be signposted to services in the community because there can be a bit of a gap there, so probably having a nurse here would encourage them, would act as the bridge between here and the GP. Collective dialogue - Probation Officer

With regards to the ideal location for the provision of such a service and where they felt health information could be provided on release, participants were unanimous in agreement that the site of post release supervision would be ideal for the location of such a service:

It has to be something quite local, I would say from my standpoint it's what you're comfortable with. Because, you've been here once, it's marginally comfortable than going to new places. Silence dialogue - Offender

When participants were asked how they would prefer a nurse led service to be provided, they maintained that they would like such a service to be run as an appointment service or a drop in centre. In support of a drop in centre participants comments were influenced by the nature of their 'struggles' on release:

I think a drop-in because they're going to make an appointment and they ain't going to come. Because a lot of people coming out of prison are just living day to day aren't they? And they're just waiting to go back to be honest. Well half the people that come out of prison I'd say end up back in within a few months. So a drop-in centre will definitely be best I think. Silence dialogue - Offender

Participants posit in this context that this format recognises the lived realities of ex-offenders on release (chaotic lifestyle) while concurrently trying to imbibe them with the agency to navigate health services independently:

I think it's a case of doing both to be honest. I think to allow people to drop in would be good because there is that chaos in their life and in the initial parts and they've got lots of other stressors that they will see as more important in their life than their health which is fair enough. But then also if you are then building the rapport and looking at case managing someone even if it's a case of you do the primary care bit for them but case manage the secondary care appointments for them to make sure that they aren't getting dropped off waiting lists and they are getting access to stuff. I think it would be a provision of appointments for that to make sure that you're able to spend the time to be able to do that. Collective dialogue - Offender Health Commissioner.

Importantly, participants were unanimous in maintaining that any provided service must endeavour to operate on an advisory basis as a 'sign-posting service:

Some sort of advisory at probation because a lot of the time you don't know whether to go to the doctors, go to the hospital or just sit it out and hope it gets better do you? Do you understand what I mean? And that's where a lot of the issues are. Silence dialogue - Offender

This was corroborated in the collective dialogue. Participants in this dialogue maintained that the provision of the service as an advisory and not a treatment service was in line with the ethos of not fueling dependence on the probation trust and not duplicating existing services which already exist in the community:

I think the treatment services are there and actually, its navigating people through the system. So my work with the commissioning group in (named area) would tell me that there are sufficient treatment routes but because we're not clear of what the routes are and how we navigate offenders through those routes, I think if we provided a treatment service we'd be duplicating what's already there. So it's advice and guidance stuff I think that's necessary.

Collective dialogue - Probation Local Delivery Unit Head

DISCUSSION

Available evidence suggests that there is a lack of pre-release preparation aimed at facilitating the continuity in access to healthcare for offenders on release from prison (Care Quality Commission and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons, 2010, Byng et al., Dyer and Biddle, 2013). It is posited here that every contact with a health practitioner in prison needs to be supported with information which could enable the offender to continue to access healthcare on release from prison. This will be particularly useful for 'revolving door offenders' who indicate that while they find the experience of imprisonment unpleasant, they recognise and use imprisonment as a period for the uptake of health interventions (Sainsbury Centre, 2008, Howerton, Burnett, Byng & Campbell, 2009).

The intent of on-release support has traditionally been aligned with the pressing practical problems faced by offenders such as housing and income and accordingly, interventions have been focused on addressing these structural needs. This is driven by recognition that unresolved practical problems are closely related with reoffending (Maguire & Raynor, 2006, Moore, 2011). Consequently, the lack of on-release support oriented towards accessing healthcare in the community supports the

assertion of the study participants that on-release support was received for addressing their practical structural needs but that this was not replicated in the context of health.

Treatment for conditions diagnosed in prison currently varies considerably with on-release preparation for accessing care not dependent on any clinical guidance (Forrester et al., 2013, NICE, 2014). Moreover, the provision of on-release support is further compromised by the overcrowded nature of UK prisons which mitigates against the application of good practices across the prison establishment (Prison Reform Trust, 2014). Indeed, the very notion of on-release support is challenged by the practice of moving offenders with little notice between prison wings and across prisons to manage overcrowding and the consequent risks which this triggers (Prison Reform Trust, 2014). The findings indicating that on-release preparation did not routinely include enquiry as to whether an individual was registered with a GP or had the agency to self-register is supported by available evidence. The evidence available indicates that although we know that around half of prisoners had no GP before they came into custody (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002), preparation for access to a GP on-release does occur, but not on a regular basis nor for all offenders across the prison establishment (Byng et al., 2012). This preparation predominantly entails prison healthcare contacting the offender's GP with some discharge information. However, a study looking at the continuity in access to healthcare uncovered no evidence to suggest that records that were sent to community GP's from prisons were indeed received by these GP's (Byng et al., 2012).

Registering offenders with a GP on release should happen routinely for all offenders and the lack thereof contravenes the prison service order on the continuity in access to healthcare (HM Prison Service, 2006). This order mandates that prison healthcare

service must help offenders register with a GP in the community where it is uncovered that an offender is not presently registered with a GP. Yet, from the narratives of the study participants, it is obvious that the importance of working with offenders prior to release and on-release cannot be overemphasised as this has the potential to enable the offender to plan and prepare for their continuity in access to health services in the community. However, it is clear that in practice this does not happen, and from the evidence collated herein, it is safe to posit that offenders do not feel that they get enough support to plan for what will happen after they are released with regards to their health. This underpins the need for a nurse led service aimed at facilitating the continuity in access to healthcare for offenders on release through promoting health in the community and signposting offenders into healthcare providers as required.

CONCLUSION: IMPLICATIONS FOR NURSING

Irrefutably, a sad reality in England and Wales is that incarceration improves access to healthcare which is not continued on release (Jarrett, Adeyemi & Huggins, 2006; Byng et al., 2012; Byng et al., 2014). Following incarceration, the continuity in access to healthcare must be prioritized. It is recognized that offenders on release are more likely to engage with health facing community interventions if these are designed to concurrently address their structural needs (Byng et al., 2012). This underpins the need to facilitate continuity in access to healthcare after incarceration through delivering health interventions in settings ex-offenders now living in the community visit for other services.

A study on the provision of a nurse led addiction service in three probation hostels in England indicated that the provision of a nurse to orchestrate care for supervisees

led to a reduction in heroin use within the hostels (Payne, 2001). Whilst this study was limited by the fact that a control group was not included, the study nonetheless indicated that the nurse led service contributed to significant improvement in the health of supervisees as the intervention led to an associated reduction in the use of heroin within the premises.

Internationally, the use of a nurse led intervention in facilitating the continuity in access to healthcare for offenders on release from prison has also been demonstrated. A randomised control trial on nursing case management towards hepatitis A and B vaccine completion among 600 recently released offenders in the United States indicated that nursing intervention improved vaccine completion in the community (Nyamathi, 2015). Similarly, a study investigating the transitional healthcare for offenders released from United States prisons indicated that the majority of transitional healthcare planning was coordinated by registered nurses and that this planning enhanced continuity of care by decreasing acute-care episodes, controlling the spread of communicable diseases, increasing access, and reducing the financial burden to the health economy (Flanagan, 2004).

The findings of this study corroborated by the aforementioned studies indicate that nurses are well placed in the community as a conduit for facilitating the continuity in access to healthcare for offenders following incarceration. Consequently, the use of nurses in promoting and facilitating health access in the community for offenders following incarceration is a strategy that could improve both the life and health chances of these individuals through reducing offender health marginalization as a consequence of increasing access to healthcare.

REFERENCES

- Afshar, H., & Maynard, M. (2000) Gender and ethnicity at the millennium: From margin to centre. *Ethnicity Racial Study*, 23(5) 805–819.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101
- Brooker, C., Fox, C., Barrett, P., & Syson-Nibbs, L. A. (2008) *Health needs assessment of offenders on probation caseloads in Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire*. Retrieved from http://eprints.lincoln.ac.uk/2534/1/Probation_HNA.pdf. 2008
- Byng, R., Quinn, C., & Sheaff, R. (2014) A new causal model of access and continuity for marginalised groups. *International Journal of Integrated Care*, 14(1), 48-49.
- Byng, R., Quinn, C., Sheaff, R., Samele, C., Duggan, S., Harrison, D., Owens, C., Smithson, P., Wright, C., Annison, J., Brown, C., Taylor, R., Henley, W., Qureshi, A., Shenton, D., Porter, I., Warrington, C., & Campbell, J. (2012) *Care for offenders, continuity of access*. London: NIHR Service Delivery and Organisation programme.
- Care Quality Commission and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2010) *Commissioning healthcare in prisons 2008/09*. London: CQC and HMI Prisons, 2010.
- Dyer, W., & Biddle, P. (2013) Prison health discharge planning - evidence of an integrated care pathway or the end of the road? *Social Policy and Society*, 12(4), 521 – 532.

Eshareturi, C., Serrant-Green, L., & Bayliss-Pratt, L. (2014) The case for nurses as central providers of health and social care services for ex-offenders: a discussion paper. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 70(5), 1030-1039.

Eshareturi, C., Serrant-Green, L., Galbraith, V. E., & Glynn, M. (2015) Silence of a scream: application of the silences framework to provision of nurse led interventions for ex-offenders. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 20(3), 218–231.

Flanagan, N. A. (2004) Transitional health care for offenders being released from United States prisons. *Canadian Journal of Nursing Research*, 36(2), 38-58.

Forrester, A., Exworthy, T., Olumoroti, O., Sessay, M., Parrot, J., Spencer, S., & Whyte, S. (2013) Variations in prison mental health services in England and Wales, *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 36(3-4), 326-332.

Foucault, M (1972) *The archaeology of knowledge*. 1st ed. London: Tavistock Publications.

HM Prison Service (2006) *Continuity of healthcare for prisoners*. Prison Service Order 3050, London: HM Prison Service.

Howerton, A., Burnett, R., Byng, R., & Campbell, J. (2009) The consolations of going back to prison: what 'revolving door' prisoners think of their prospects. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 48(5), 439-461.

Ifekwunigwe, J. O. (1997) *Diaspora's daughters, Africa's orphans? On lineage, authenticity and 'mixed race' identity*. In: Mirza HS (ed.) *Black British Feminism: A Reader*," London: Routledge.

- Jarrett, N. C., Adeyemi, S. A., & Huggins, T. (2006) Bridging the gap: providing healthcare to newly released men. *Journal of Healthcare for the Poor and Underserved*, 17(1), 70-80.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000) *Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions and emerging confluences*. 2000. In N. K. Denzin, and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), "Handbook of Qualitative Research," 2nd ed. California: Sage Publications.
- Maguire, M., & Raynor, P. (2006) How the resettlement of prisoners promotes desistance from crime: Or does it? *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6(1), 19-38.
- Moore, R. (2011) Beyond the prison walls: Some thoughts on prisoner 'resettlement' in England and Wales. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 12(2), 129-147.
- NHS Commissioning Board (2013). *Securing Excellence in Commissioning for Offender Health*. Retrieved from <http://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/offender-comm-fags.pdf>.
- NICE (2014) *Physical health of people in prison draft scope for consultation*. Retrieved from <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/gid-cgwave0729/documents/physical-health-of-people-in-prison-draft-scope2>.
- Norman, A. (2010) Improving offender healthcare. *British Journal of Nursing*, 19(2), 1387.
- Nyamathi A., Salem, B. E., Zhang, S., Farabee, D., Hall, B., Khalilifard, F., & Leake, B. (2015) Nursing case management, peer coaching, and hepatitis a and B vaccine completion among homeless men recently released on parole: randomized clinical trial. *Nursing Research*, 64(3), 177–189.

Patterson, E. J. (2010) Incarcerating death: an analysis of mortality in United States' state correctional facilities. *Demography*, 47(3), 587–607.

Payne, S. (2001) The provision of addiction services in probation hostels: a new approach. *Journal of Substance Use*, 6(3), 183-188.

Peate, I. (2011) Protecting the health of offenders in prison and other places of detention. *British Journal of Community Nursing*, 16(9), 450-454.

Plugge, E., Pari, A., Ahmed, A., Maxwell, J., & Holland, S. (2014) When prison is 'easier': Probationers' perceptions of health and wellbeing. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, 10(1), 38-46.

Prison Reform Trust (2014) *Bromley briefings prison fact-file*. Retrieved from: <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Publications/Factfile>.

RAND (2013) RAND 36-Item Health Survey 1.0 Questionnaire Items. Retrieved from: https://www.rand.org/health/surveys_tools/mos/36-item-short-form/survey-instrument.html

Rennie, C., Senior, J., & Shaw, J. (2009). The future is offender health: evidencing mainstream health services throughout the offender pathway. *Criminal Behavior and Mental Health*, 19(1), 1-8.

Sainsbury Centre (2008) *On the outside: continuity of care for people leaving prison*. Retrieved from <https://www.centreformentalhealth.org.uk/on-the-outside>.

Scott, J. (1991) The evidence of experience. *Critical Inquiry*, 17(1), 773–779.

- Serrant-Green, L. (2011) The sound of 'silence': a framework for researching sensitive issues or marginalised perspectives in health. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 16(4), 347–360.
- Social Exclusion Unit (2002) *Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners*. London: Social Exclusion Unit.
- Till, A., Forrester A., & Exworthy, T. (2014) The development of equivalence as a mechanism to improve prison healthcare. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 107(5), 179-182.
- Tremain, S. (2008) *Foucault and the government of disability*. 4th ed. Michigan: Michigan University Press.
- Van den Bergh, B. A., Gatherer, A., Fraserb, A., & Mollera, L. (2011) Imprisonment and women's health: concerns about gender sensitivity, human rights and public health. *Bulletin World Health Organisation*, 89(9), 689–694.
- Wildeman, C. (2012) Imprisonment and (inequality in) population health. *Social Science Research*, 41(1), 74–91.
- Williams, M. & May, T. (1996) *Introduction to the Philosophy of Social Research*. 1st ed. London: UCL Press