Technical Appendices CFO Hamlet HMP Drake Hall

Peer mentor & peer involvement roles in prison study series 2024

Dr Katherine Albertson

Contents

Technical Appendices CFO Hamlet HMP Drake Hall 1
Section 1: Introduction and background to the study 1
Aims of HMPPS's Creating Future Opportunities programme 1
CFO wing model objectives 1
Monitoring and informing information gaps 1
Situating our study's approach 2
Our integrated research questions 2
Section 2: Methods 4
1:1 and collective focus group interviews 4
Collective workshops 5
Ethnographic observation 5
Mapping social capital building potential 5
Ethical approval, data management and site visit protocol 6
Section 2: Data collection and final sample profile 7
HMP Drake Hall data collection 7
HMP Drake Hall sample 7
Resident engagement (n=138) 7
1:1 Interviews (n=26) 7
Resident interview profile (n=12) 7
Peer involvement role experience profile 7
Staff interviews (n=11) 8
Collective workshops & Focus groups (n=8) 8
Collective resident activities (n=5) 8
Mapping data generated (n=16) 8
Ethnographic observation sample (n= 10) 9
Social capital building potential indicator 9
Data analysis 9
Section 3: References 11

Section 1: Introduction and background to the study

This technical report contains the background to, the methods used, and sample details associated with one of the four 'Peer mentor & peer involvement roles in prison' study findings report series, specifically:

- Albertson, K. (2024c) CFO Hamlets Peer mentor initiative at HMP Drake Hall.

Aims of HMPPS's Creating Future Opportunities programme

Creating Future Opportunities (CFO) is part of His Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (HMPPS) and part funded by the European Social Fund. CFO have piloted a Community Activity Hub model for people who have been released from prison and/or are engaging with Probation to facilitate building a healthier, more stable and fulfilling life. A developmental aim of the overall CFO programme was to pilot the creation of similarly dedicated spaces on prison wings, with a welcoming atmosphere and a rehabilitative community culture. CFO's wing model is designed to both complement and advance core HMPPS provision, better preparing people in custody to make positive contributions to their wing community. With specialist professional staff, and meaningful activities with which to engage alongside peer involvement role opportunities, the CFO wing model aims to provide a sense of collectiveness which will encourage those in custody to focus their efforts towards realising crime free pro-social futures.

CFO wing model objectives

The key objectives of the CFO Wing model are to:

- **Facilitate a 'community' environment** where participants are given the tools to help reflect on their own personal situation and contribute to both the wing and wider prison community.
- **Foster supportive relations** between residents with external agency staff, HMPPS CFO Specialist prison officers and each other to enhance transitional opportunities to contribute to reducing reoffending trajectories.
- **Enable opportunities for residents to give back** to their wing community via peer involvement role pathways to enhancing engagement with the CFO Wing model and contributing to forging positive relational connections across the wing by providing support to wider non-engaging wing residents.
- **Create a safe, comfortable, and supportive living environment**, enhancing a sense of belonging, hope, and positively impacting on the social climate of the wing.

Monitoring and informing information gaps

Existing HMPPS CFO monitoring is in place, which focusses on largely quantitative short, medium, and longer-term data capture providing evidence of the overall effectiveness of the CFO wing model programme. CFO identified a requirement for a more data informed understanding of the potential of the peer mentor role in particular to inform future commissioning good practice guidance. An expression of interest was issued for an independent qualitative evaluation designed to improve understanding of the operational

delivery of the range of peer involvement role delivery models utilised across CFO's four wing pilot sites at HMPs Risley, High Down, Drake Hall, and Holme House.

Situating our study's approach

A research team led by Sheffield Hallam University was successful in securing the commissioned qualitative study. The issued study-brief emphasised both mapping and action research-linked developmental activities to be conducted with stakeholders at each of the four CFO wing pilot sites. The ultimate aim of this study is to provide data informed and theoretically underpinned recommendations to inform:

- further embedding of the peer involvement element of delivery at each pilot site.
- future CFO wing model commissioning good practice guidance.

Peer involvement initiatives have been identified as valuable resources supporting individual change trajectories, and resettlement planning in the criminal justice sector (HMPPS, 2016; 2019; Fletcher and Batty 2012; Hucklesby and Wincup, 2014; South et al., 2017; Buck, 2020). Peer support roles in the criminal justice system have however proved difficult to evaluate as non-standardised interventions which are "human relationship operating within a formal setting" (Lenkens, et al., 2023, p 3). Previous studies have however predominantly focussed on establishing the impact of performing peer support roles on recidivism outcomes (cf. Nixon, 2022), and generally focussing on the micro-dynamics of (ex-) offenders acting in peer mentor roles to those just released from custody (cf. Buck, 2020). Reflecting this reality, our study was designed to be a pragmatic, more integrated and participative piece of work to be conducted with all the stakeholders making up the custodial community. Under-pinned by this critical realist approach to the four CFO wing model pilot sites, our study was essentially designed to illuminate "what works, how, in which conditions and for whom" (Lenkens, et al., 2023, p 4). This findings report is one of the five 'Peer mentor & peer involvement roles in prison' reporting outputs generated as a result of this study (Albertson, 2024a-e).

Our integrated research questions

Recent peer involvement roles in the criminal justice sector focussed literature highlights day-to-day operational challenges, difficulties providing effective training, on-going monitoring, and relational development as key challenges to delivery in environments where control and punishment dominate (Gosling and Buck, 2015: Buck, 2019: 2021; Brown and Ross, 2010; Maguire et al., 2010; South et al., 2012; Wong and Horan, 2021). Informed by these academic studies in the field, this study was designed to address specific questions to illuminate more integrated connections across the custodial setting:

Table: Integrated research questions

Strategic and operational	Does, and if so, in what way, does the phased model of delivery contribute to achieving overarching CFO Wing model aims and specifically, how do peer involvement roles fit into these phases?
	How does the delivery of the peer involvement element relate or contribute to the wider CFO Wing model programme?
Impact and environment	Do the pilot sites provide a suitable environment to deliver relational strength-based peer involvement role pathways in prison?
	How do Peer involvement role holders operate on a day-to-day basis?

	What, if any is the impact of these roles on all stakeholders?
Interpersonal and relational	What is the peer involvement training, supervision, and progression journey?
	What is the experience of those supported by peer involvement role holders?
	Are there any key attributes that indicate any particular suitability for peer involvement roles in prison setting?
Structural, policy and regime level	What strategies, policies, organisational infrastructures, prison regimes, training, and/or environmental factors can be identified as working most effectively with (or impeding) the effective delivery of peer involvement initiatives in prison?
	What are the critical success factors and areas of good practice lessons from those with experience of delivering peer involvement pilots in prison?

Section 2: Methods

Underpinned by the principle of co-production (McCulloch, 2021) our approach to the study design was aimed at involving a wider range of stakeholders from across the custodial community setting. Underlined by our integrated approach to three distinct levels at which the CFO's wing model objectives seek to effect positive transformation, at:

1. Individual wing resident's relational and interaction level.
2. Collective wing community social climate and horizontal social capital building opportunity level.
3. Vertical social capital building opportunity levels affecting change in wider prison culture, social climate, practice and policy.

1:1 and collective focus group interviews

Semi-structured 1:1 interview schedules were designed to ascertain the nature of respondents' interaction with the CFO wing model and establish their perspectives on the selected Peer involvement role initiative. The schedule was designed to prompt respondents to share views regarding the suitability of the prison environment for the variety of peer involvement roles available, and seeking informed assessments and recommendations to inform the delivery of future peer involvement initiatives were sought. Focus groups as a research method are a group interview used in applied research designs (Morgan, 1997; Krueger and Casey, 2000). Three distinct focus group schedules were specifically designed to generate co-produced data findings to meet the peer involvement role initiative development aspirations of our study.

1. **A Participative Evaluation** focus group (Reason and Bradbury, 2001) schedule was designed to identify what wing community residents felt they needed to live a more fulfilling life in prison. This included capturing facilitators and barriers to ascertain to what extent participants felt the selected peer involvement element of the CFO wing model assisted in realising their aspirations.
2. **A "Wing Community & Relational climate mapping"** focus group schedule was designed (Wasserman et al., 1994), to map the relationships available on a prison wing. Going on to facilitate a collectively generated adaptation of Kelly's (1995; 1991) 'Role Construct Repertory test'[1], to generate a sense of the value of these relationships to the wing community.
3. **A "Peer Support role mapping & Infrastructure"** focus group schedule was devised for the host prisons' Prisoner Council. This was designed to map, characterise, and distinguish between peer involvement roles available across the prison. This schedule was designed in order to establish the extent of establishment infrastructure available to facilitate and embed further peer involvement role developments at each site.

[1] We retained Kelly's (1955/1991) 'Elements' and 'Constructs' but adapted the scoring mechanism with successive dichotomies between n Elements. Kelly applied the grid to individuals, whereas we wanted to map group/wing community level data. Each construct was taken sequentially, enabling a visual snapshot of the range and significance of the relationships and peer involvement roles that existed on the wings. The five constructs selected were: Knowledgeable; Trusted; Supportive; Honest; and Power to change. Numerical "Most to least" prioritisation data was interactively attained from the ensuing discussions and debates and agreed upon by the participants in each group setting before being inputted as numerical data.

Collective workshops

Two interactive workshop schedules were specifically designed, informed by our action-research and theory-informed approach to study design (Jackson and Mazzel, 2018). Workshops are distinguished from focus group methods in that they are a collective space for questions and ideas, developing solutions and supporting collective groups decision making in a group setting (Faulk et al., 2006). Reflecting the distinctly collective, participatory, and developmental aims and underscoring our co-production approach to our study aims (Kemmis et al., 2014) we designed:

- **An Appreciative Inquiry** workshop (Coghlan et al., 2003) schedule to conduct with the CFO staff team to establish the specific peer involvement delivery model and focus attention on expanding the good practice lessons learnt during this pilot delivery phase as generated by the delivery team.
- A **Findings Validation & Recommendations Feasibility** workshop (McKeganey and Bloor, 1981) schedule for delivery to both staff and wing resident groups. This activity was designed to sense-check that stakeholders in our study recognised the emerging findings as describing something they had experience of, and to check-in regarding the formative recommendations we were proposing. After these workshops we made appropriate adjustments based on these interactive workshops.

Ethnographic observation

Ethnographic observation of the CFO Wing model's core activities programme and engagement with evaluation workshops was designed to illuminate participant behaviours in real time (Drake et al., 2015). A flexible ethnographic observation template was designed for this study, containing simple descriptive observation prompts, for example: "Journey to delivery location from wing"; "Numbers in attendance"; "Spatial notes: Noise; Smells; Light; Equipment; Room set-up", etc. At an interactional observational level, this method facilitated consideration of social context and meanings generated at the collective level to provide a basis from which to assess the suitability of the wing and prison environment for the selected peer involvement initiatives.

Mapping social capital building potential

A qualitative "Social capital building 'potential' data capture tool" was used (see, Albertson and Albertson, 2022; Albertson et al., 2022; Albertson, 2021). This templated tool was applied to establish the CFO peer involvement pilot's current contribution and identify potential future pathways into horizontal and vertical social capital building opportunities. This tool was applied to highlight each pilot site's social capital building opportunities for their wing residents in general and the specified peer involvement role holders in particular. The lengthy fieldwork site visits conducted at each pilot site meant the research team were able to observe, collate and extract social capital building examples alongside identifying future potential developmental opportunities. Both the template and site-specific social capital building-linked findings are presented in the main report.

Ethical approval, data management and site visit protocol

Ethical clearance for this study was provided by the HMPPS National Research Committee (NRC Ref. 2023-012+2023-238) and Sheffield Hallam University Ethics Committee (No. ER49795291). Data Management plans, Data Sharing agreements and "On-site visit Protocol" documentation were agreed with CFO and shared with wing model pilot site teams. All respondents in this study were provided with a Project Information sheet to retain and a Consent form to sign for each of the separate data collection activities engaged in. Post-transcription, only the respondents original 'position indicator' (e.g., Peer Mentor/Staff role title) remained attached to the raw primary data post-transcription as all data were pseudonymised[2].

[2] Pseudonymisation is a data management and de-identification procedure by which personally identifiable information fields within a data record are replaced by artificial identifiers, or pseudonyms.

Section 3: Data collection and final sample profile

HMP Drake Hall data collection

Two, three-day long data collection visits were conducted at HMP Drake Hall between September and December 2023 by two members of the research team. The vast majority of professional staff interviews were conducted on-line via Teams.

HMP Drake Hall sample

Resident engagement (n=138)

Our study engaged with a total of 138 currently serving residents at HMP Drake Hall. CFO House block residents were recruited into the study and volunteered to engage in the core fieldwork activities (1:1 interview, Ethnographic observation, Workshop). Participation for some individuals involved engaging in all three activities and some, one only. HMP Drake Hall's Prisoner Council members volunteered to attend a "Peer Support & Infrastructure Mapping" workshop via the prison Governor leading Prisoner Council arrangements. The details of the resident participation in our study are featured in the table below. Multiple attendance is not distinguished.

Table: Resident engagement

Prisoner Council workshop attendees	Ethnographic Observation engagement	Workshop engagement	1:1 Interviews	Total
10	78	38	12	138

1:1 Interviews (n=26)

A total of 26 interviews were undertaken with stakeholders at the HMP Drake Hall. Of the interviews undertaken, 12 were conducted with CFO wing residents, and 14 staff.

Table: Interview sample at HMP Drake Hall

Residents	Staff	Total
12	14	26

Resident interview profile (n=12)

Of the total residents' interviews (n=12), 6 were conducted with CFO site-specific peer involvement role holders. Of these, 4 were acting in these peer mentor roles on the Hamlet, and 2 were not currently utilising their qualification attained in previous establishments.

Table: Resident interview sample

Peer involvement role holders	Residents participating in CFO activities	Wider wing residents: Not participating	Sub-totals
6	4	2	12

Peer involvement role experience profile

In addition, half of the interview sample (6/12) highlighted a wealth of experience in a variety of other peer support roles.

Table: Resident peer support experience profile

Peer involvement role holders	Residents participating	Wider wing residents not participating	Peer involvement role experience (multiples).
6 Peer mentors[3]	4	2	6

Staff interviews (n=11)

Of the total of staff interviews (n=11), 6 were undertaken with operational delivery staff team members, including external partner delivery staff, and 5 with strategic HMPS, CFO and Prime contractor staff.

Table: Staff interview sample

CFO Delivery staff team	Strategic HMPS, CFO+ Prime + Sub-contracted staff	Total
6	5	11

Collective workshops & Focus groups (n=8)

A total of 8 data collection focus groups and participatory workshops with three different stakeholder groups were conducted at the Hamlet.

Table: Workshop profile

Resident workshops & focus groups	Staff workshop & Focus group	Prisoner Council focus group	Total
5	2	1	8

Collective resident activities (n=5)

Of the 5 Hamlet resident workshops and focus groups conducted, 2 were Community and relational mapping focus groups, 2 were participative evaluation focus groups and 1 was a Findings validation and Recommendation workshop.

Table: Beneficiary workshop profile

Participative Evaluation focus group	Community & relational mapping focus group	Findings & recommendations validation workshop	Total
2	2	1	5

Mapping data generated (n=16)

Visual mapping data was generated via the 2 Community & relational mapping focus groups featured above and included individual relational maps. One prison-wide map was generated via the Prisoner Council focus group conducted:

Table: Prison-wide, Wing Community, and Individual maps generated

[3] All serving Life sentences.

Prison-wide Peer involvement role & Infrastructure mapping	Wing community & relational priority[4] mapping	Individual relational maps	Total
1 Prisoner Council generated map	2 maps[5]	13 maps	16

Ethnographic observation sample (n= 10)

Ethnographic observation of 10 beneficiary sessions were conducted at HMP Drake Hall.

Table: Ethnographic observations

CFO Course sessions	Wing Community activities	Evaluation workshop activities	Total
3	2	5	10

Social capital building potential indicator

The lengthy data collection at HMP Drake Hall meant that we were able to observe, collate and extract social capital building examples alongside identifying future potential developmental opportunities. This data was captured utilising an existing qualitative social capital building- template (see, Albertson, 2021; Albertson and Albertson, 2022; Albertson et al., 2022). Both the template and findings are presented in the main report's findings section.

Data analysis

Interview transcripts and observational data were subjected to a thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2019). We adopted a pragmatic deductive approach (Braun and Clarke, 2006), and analysed the data according to the themes embedded in the core evaluation questions. Each interview transcript was read and re-read, and relevant data systematically inserted into a CFO wing model site-specific Excel Workbook. The Excel workbook was pre-populated with appropriate anonymised sample profile details. Data extracts were inserted into 10 separate tabs/sheets, labelled as: "Day-to-day; Peer involvement; Peer Support; and Peer Mentor attributes; Impact; Most benefit; Suitability prison; Peer role-over phased activities; Peer Supporter training; Strength & weaknesses; and Improvements/ Recommendations". In this way, peer involvement role holders, those they support, wider wing residents and staff generated data remained distinguished to allow for clarity of any distinctions made depending on the 'original structural position' of the data source. The same systematic approach was adopted towards the analysis of the ethnographic observation researcher note data. The analysis of the mapping workshop generated data involved extracting successive dichotomies numerical data. On completion, this approach to data analysis enabled us to move into compare, contrast, and typology formation phases of analysis for reporting purposes. The analysis of peer involvement attributes involved each cited attribute per interview transcript being inserted into a further Excel Workbook sheet. These attributes were

[4] Generated with an adaption of Kelly's grid & successive dichotomies approach to capturing numerical prioritisation data, based on identifying "Most to least" relations from: Knowledgeable; Trusted; Supportive; Honest; and Power to change things.

[5] Generated by 13 residents of the Hamlet.

assigned to an inductively generated typology of ten key prison-context-based generic peer involvement, peer support and peer mentor role-specific attributes. A “simple content analysis” (Neuendorf, 2017, p5) was conducted in order to identify the order of attribute typology prioritisation at each pilot site.

Section 4: References

Albertson, K. (2024a) CFO Discovery wings Peer mentor initiative at HMP Risley.

Albertson, K. (2024b) CFO Community Living Units Ambassador initiative at HMP High Down.

Albertson, K. (2024c) CFO Hamlets Peer mentor initiative at HMP Drake Hall.

Albertson, K. (2024d) CFO Endurance wings Peer mentor initiative at HMP Holme House.

Albertson, K. (2024e) HMPPS CFO Commissioning guidance: Peer mentor & peer involvement roles in prison.

Albertson, K., & Albertson, K. (2023). Social capital, mutual aid and desistance: a theoretically integrated process model. *The British Journal of Criminology*, *63*(5), 1255-1273.

Albertson, K., Phillips, J., Fowler, A., & Collinson, B. (2022). Who owns desistance? A triad of agency enabling social structures in the desistance process. Theoretical Criminology, 26(1), 153-172.

Albertson, K. (2021) Social capital building supporting the desistance process, HM Inspectorate of Probation Academic Insights 2021/06.

Albertson, K., Goodwin, S., and Rainbow, J. (forthcoming) Mentoring and Femtoring in prison.

Albertson, K. (forthcoming) What is and is not peer mentoring in prison.

Bennett, J., and Shuker, R. (2018). Hope, harmony and humanity: creating a positive social climate in a democratic therapeutic community prison and the implications for penal practice. Journal of Criminal Psychology, 8(1), 44-57.

Braun, V., and Clarke, V. (2019). Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. Qualitative research in sport, exercise, and health, 11(4), 589-597.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative research in psychology, 3, 77-101.

Brown, M., & Ross, S. (2010). Mentoring, social capital and desistance: A study of women released from prison. Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 43(1), 31-50.

Brosens, D. (2019). Prisoners' participation and involvement in prison life: Examining the possibilities and boundaries. European Journal of Criminology, 16(4), 466-485.

Buck, G., Corcoran, M., & Worrall, A. (2015). Gendered dynamics of mentoring. In Women and Criminal Justice (pp. 153-172). Policy Press.

Buck, G. (2018). The core conditions of peer mentoring. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, *18*(2), 190-206.

Buck, G. (2019). Politicisation or professionalisation? Exploring divergent aims within UK voluntary sector peer mentoring. The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice, 58(3), 349-365.

Buck, G. (2021). Mentoring and Peer Mentoring. HM Inspectorate of Probation, April.

Buck, G. (2020). Peer mentoring in criminal justice. Routledge.

Coghlan, A. T., Preskill, H., & Tzavaras Catsambas, T. (2003). An overview of appreciative inquiry in evaluation. New directions for evaluation, 2003(100), 5-22.
Crewe, B., Hulley, S., & Wright, S. (2017). The gendered pains of life imprisonment. *British Journal of Criminology*, *57*(6), 1359-1378.

Crewe, B. (2012). The prisoner society: Power, adaptation and social life in an English prison. OUP Oxford.

Crewe, B., Schliehe, A., & Przybylska, D. A. (2023). 'It causes a lot of problems': Relational ambiguities and dynamics between prisoners and staff in a women's prison. European Journal of Criminology, 20(3), 925-946.

Drake, D. H., Earle, R., & Sloan, J. (Eds.). (2015). *The Palgrave handbook of prison ethnography* (pp. 252-270). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Falk I., Guenther J., Lambert T., Johnstone K. (2006, September 4-7). Role of evaluation in assessing and developing communication and governance processes in an evidence-based policy development/implementation environment. [Paper presentation]. AES International Conference, Darwin, Northern Territory, Australia. https://espace.cdu.edu.au/view/cdu:2445 (Accessed 12/12/2023).

Farrall, S. (2013). Social capital and offender reintegration: Making probation desistance focused. In After crime and punishment (pp. 57-82). Willan.

Fletcher, D., & Batty, E. (2012). Offender peer interventions: what do we know? https://www.shu.ac.uk/centre-regional-economic-social-research/projects/all-projects/offender-peer-interventions-what-do-we-know (accessed 12/10/22).

Fox, K. J. (2015). Theorizing community integration as desistance-promotion. Criminal justice and behavior, 42(1), 82-94.

Fox, K. J. (2016). Civic commitment: Promoting desistance through community integration. Punishment & Society, 18(1), 68-94.

Gosling, H. and Buck, G. (2015). 'Mentoring: Crossing boundaries with care?', Criminal Justice Matters, 99(1), pp. 22–23.

Henderson, M., & Meek, R. (2024). Peer Mentoring in a Women's Prisons as a Form of Social Rehabilitation Through Crime Desistance. In Social Rehabilitation and Criminal Justice (pp. 303-318). Routledge.

Her Majesty's Prison and Probation Service (2019) Mentoring services for people in prison and on probation: A summary of evidence relating to the effectiveness of mentoring services for people in prison and on probation. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/mentoring-services-for-people-in-prison-and-on-probation#contents (accessed 12/10/22).

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (2016) Life in prison: Peer support, A findings paper, https://www.justiceinspectorates.gov.uk/hmiprisons/inspections/life-in-prison-peer-support/Accessed 06/06/23.

Hucklesby, A., & Wincup, E. (2014). Assistance, support and monitoring? The paradoxes of mentoring adults in the criminal justice system. Journal of Social Policy, 43(2), 373-390.

Jackson A., Mazzei L. (2018). Thinking with theory: A new analytic for qualitative inquiry. In Denzin N., Lincoln Y. (Eds.), The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (5th ed., pp. 717–737). SAGE.

Kelly, G. (1955). "The repertory test". The psychology of personal constructs. Vol. 1. A theory of personality. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. pp. 219–266.

Kelly, G. (1991) [1955]. "The repertory test". The psychology of personal constructs. Vol. 1. A theory of personality. London; New York: Routledge in association with the Centre for Personal Construct Psychology. pp. 152–188.

Kemmis S., McTaggart R., Nixon R. (2014). The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research. Springer.

Kjellstrand, J., Matulis, J., Jackson, A., Smith, J., & Eddy, J. M. (2023). The importance of positive social support during re-entry from prison: examining the role of volunteer mentoring. International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology, 67(5), 567-587.

Krueger, R., and Casey, M. (2000) Focus groups: a practical guide for applied research (3rd ed) Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage.

Lafferty, L., Treloar, C., Butler, T., Guthrie, J., & Chambers, G. M. (2016). Unlocking dimensions of social capital in the prison setting. *Health & justice*, *4*(1), 1-12.

Lafferty, L., Chambers, G. M., Guthrie, J., Butler, T., & Treloar, C. (2018). Measuring social capital in the prison setting: lessons learned from the inmate social capital questionnaire. *Journal of Correctional Health Care*, *24*(4), 407-417.

Lenkens, M., van Lenthe, F. J., Schenk, L., Sentse, M., Severiens, S., Engbersen, G., & Nagelhout, G. E. (2023). Experiential peer support and desistance from crime: a systematic realist literature review. Psychology, Crime & Law, 1-31.

Levenson, J., & Farrant, F. (2002). Unlocking potential: active citizenship and volunteering by prisoners. Probation Journal, 49(3), 195-204.

Maguire M, Holloway K, Liddle M, et al. (2010) Evaluation of the Transitional Support Scheme: Final Report to the Welsh Assembly Government, Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government (accessed 12 Nov 22).

Maruna, S., & LeBel, T. P. (2012). 4 The desistance paradigm in correctional practice: from programmes to lives. In Offender supervision (pp. 91-114). Willan.

McCulloch, T. (2021). Co-producing desistance? The role of peer support. The Palgrave Handbook of Co-Production of Public Services and Outcomes, 409-426.

McKeganey, N. P., & Bloor, M. J. (1981). On the retrieval of sociological descriptions: respondent validation and the critical case of ethnomethodology. International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy, 1(3), 58-69.

McNeill, F. (2012). Four forms of 'offender' rehabilitation: Towards an interdisciplinary perspective. Legal and Criminological Psychology, 17(1), 18-36.

Messina, N., & Zwart, E. (2021). Breaking the silence and healing trauma for incarcerated women: Peer-facilitated delivery of a brief intervention. MOJ Women's Health, 10(1), 8-16.

Mills, A., & Codd, H. (2008). Prisoners' families and offender management: Mobilizing social capital. Probation Journal, 55(1), 9-24.

Morgan, D. (1997) Focus groups and qualitative research. Newbury Park (CA): Sage.

Nixon, S. (2023). The dynamics of peer support work in a UK adult male prison: A way of performing positive masculinities? Incarceration, 4, 26326663231169903.

Nixon, S. (2020). 'Giving back and getting on with my life': peer mentoring, desistance and recovery of ex-offenders. Probation Journal, 67(1), 47-64.

Nixon, S. (2020). The emotional labour of prison Listeners. In Emotional Labour in Criminal Justice and Criminology (pp. 208-220). Routledge.

Nugent, B., & Schinkel, M. (2016). The pains of desistance. Criminology & Criminal Justice, 16(5), 568-584.

Neuendorf, K. A. (2017). The content analysis guidebook. Sage.

Reason, P. and Bradbury, H. (2001) Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice. London: Sage.

South, J., Woodall, J., Kinsella, K., Dixey, R., Penson, B., and de Viggiani, N. (2012). Peers in Prison Settings (PiPS) Expert Symposium. In Peers in Prison Settings (PiPS) Expert Symposium Conference Proceedings. Leeds Beckett University. Pp 1-15.

South, J., Bagnall, A. M., & Woodall, J. (2017). Developing a typology for peer education and peer support delivered by prisoners. Journal of Correctional Health Care, 23(2), 214-229.

Walker S. and Worrall A. (2000), 'Life as a Woman: The Gendered Pains of Indeterminate Imprisonment', Prison Service Journal, 132.

Wasserman, S., and Faust, K. (1994) Social network analysis: methods and applications. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University.

Wong, K., & Horan, R. (2021). Mentoring: Can you get too much of a 'good thing'? Proposing enhancements to the 'effectiveness framework' the England and Wales Prison and Probation Service. European Journal of Probation, 13(3), 207-225.

Sheffield Hallam University

CFO Hamlet Peer mentor initiative at HMP Drake Hall

ALBERTSON, Katherine <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7708-1775>

Available from the Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

https://shura.shu.ac.uk/33713/

Copyright and re-use policy

Please visit https://shura.shu.ac.uk/33713/ and http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html for further details about copyright and re-use permissions.