

**Developing social capital in probation practice by drawing on non-criminal justice community spaces and places: A tool for strategy and practice**

ALBERTSON, Katherine <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7708-1775>> and  
PHILLIPS, Jake <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7606-6423>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:  
<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/35903/>

---

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

**Citation:**

ALBERTSON, Katherine and PHILLIPS, Jake (2025). Developing social capital in probation practice by drawing on non-criminal justice community spaces and places: A tool for strategy and practice. Probation Journal. [Article]

---

**Copyright and re-use policy**

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

## **Developing social capital in probation practice by drawing on non-criminal justice community spaces and places: A tool for strategy and practice.**

Katherine Albertson and Jake Phillips

There has been a lot of discussion around the importance of probation practitioners working to support the building of social capital of those with whom they work, and the topic has been a regular feature in *Probation Journal* over the years (Mills and Codd, 2008; Bosker et al, 2013; Wilson, 2014; Best et al., 2018; Nicholson and Mckeown, 2021; Canton, 2024). Social rehabilitation remains one of probation's core tenants (Burke et al., 2022), and its active co-production with local communities has long been identified as key to good probation practice (McNeill and Whyte, 2007; Senior and Ward, 2016). In other words, probation cannot and should not do this type of work alone. Rather, probation's task is to work with local communities and local agencies by linking into existing opportunities to build social capital in pro-social groups in the communities where probationers reside (Nugent and Shinkel, 2016; Senior and Ward, 2016). That said, it is often the case that having an awareness of and signposting is difficult due to the siloed nature of probation work which has retreated from the communities it serves over recent years.

### **Probation and social capital**

The importance of building social capital will make intuitive sense to many probation practitioners, as facilitating a sense of belonging and active participation in wider pro-social networks, or social capital, is key to sustaining desistance trajectories (McNeill and Whyte, 2007; Farrall, 2013; Weaver, 2015; McNeill and Schinkel, 2024). However, little guidance or practical examples of how probation practitioners and, perhaps more importantly, services can go about identifying, assessing and strategically embedding this kind of provision have been provided. Good practice pinpointing what exactly social capital building opportunities look like on the ground are scarce.

Our 1-page Social Capital Building template is designed to kick start conversations with staff, service users, wider community groups and other agencies operating in the vicinity, to guide good practice and ultimately stimulate localised social capital building opportunity mapping,

directory development and future gap filling efforts in probation. Our tool can be used by people working in probation such as strategic leaders, people with specific specialist lead roles or front-line practitioners, and will benefit from the input of service users local knowledge and experience.

Our own studies that led to the development of this tool, include: An evaluation of a third sector recovery support initiative in the community (Albertson et al., 2017; Albertson and Hall, 2019); Research conducted in six community hubs, ranging from those run totally independently of probation to a reporting centre (Phillips et al., 2020a; 2020b); The identification of core constituents indicative of agency-desistance enabling structures (Albertson et al., 2022); The identification of structural mechanisms sustaining engagement in a mutual aid group (Albertson and Albertson, 2023); and most recently an evaluation of peer involvement role support infrastructures in custody (Albertson, 2024a-c). Ultimately, engaging in these activities has made us realise that it is vital to highlight that prioritising building social capital in probation practice necessitates drawing on strength-based resources from other spaces and places. Strengths-based approaches are “about enabling people to find the best solutions for themselves” (Department of Health and Social Care, 2019). Underpinned by our own body of work, the aim of this practice note then, is to help probation to get a more practical sense of what strengths-based, pro-social social capital building opportunities look like ‘on the ground’ outside the immediacy of what the Probation Service delivers.

Probation practice commonly involves drawing on individual therapeutic, family, romantic and parenthood-linked relational resources to support desistance trajectories for those they manage (see, Rex, 1999; Mills and Codd, 2008). In contrast, our distinct focus here is to share a helpful device to support the identification (and mapping) of geographic-specific collective and communal, largely non-criminal justice opportunities to build social capital. In other words - opportunities that exist independently of individual or familial resources and that are neither mandated nor delivered or controlled by probation. The pro-social community-based resources we are focussing on identifying here are characterised by being delivered in stigma-avoiding spaces, to non-offending community members and therefore represent sustainable

social capital building opportunities both during and beyond the end of probation orders (see, Albertson, et al., 2022).

We have developed this theoretically informed template to be broad enough to be applied in both criminal justice and non-criminal justice contexts. Our tool is designed to be used flexibly and relationally – with one template to be filled in for each potential opportunity site - to ultimately build up to generating a local social capital building resource directory which probation practitioners can use for signposting and informing the work they do with people on probation. Importantly, this is a resource that begins with, continually incorporates and builds, both on and from, the localised knowledge, experience and aspirations of those on probation, professional staff, and local community organisations and members. In accordance with the principles of co-production, our tool development is designed as a response to the growing recognition that “the progression of meaningful and effective service outcomes, in any sector, depends on an interplay of effort, activity and commitment between service ‘users’, ‘providers’ and communities” (McCulloch, 2015, p 41; see Albertson et al., 2022; Albertson and Albertson, 2023). Successful probation practice has the relational co-production of rehabilitation within local communities at its core (McNeill and Whyte, 2007; Senior and Ward, 2016) and the formal application of applying Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) approaches in probation is attracting contemporary attention (Russell, 2010; Nicholson and Mckeown, 2021). Similarly, our aspiration is for this template to be useful for senior leaders in probation to support social capital building Asset Based Mapping activities, to map pro-social community resources available in their locality. Thus, our template is designed as both strengths-based and “applicable to any intervention, setting, type or level of need and profession” (Department of Health and Social Care, 2019, p 29).

### **Desistance and social capital frameworks underpinning tool development**

Developing a sense of belonging to and active participation in non-offending networks, communities, and wider civic society are widely acknowledged as key to sustaining desistance (McNeill and Whyte, 2007; Farrall, 2013; King, 2013). However, few practical or applicable examples of the real-world mechanisms by which social capital building resource pathways are mobilised for people enmeshed in the criminal justice system have been shared. One of the authors faced this significant omission, and was quite frankly at a loss, when asked to evaluate

a community initiative aimed at building social capital. The subsequent mixed methods evaluation did identify longitudinal beneficial impacts on those engaging with the initiative (Albertson et al., 2017). Subsequent empirical research helped us to generate a more practical sense of the different structurally facilitated relational mechanisms by which the benefits of social capital building accrued (Albertson, et al., 2022). However, it took an inductive secondary analysis of qualitative data to identify the different spheres in which social capital building occurred, which was enabled by us adopting a relational desistance lens (Nugent and Schinkel, 2016). Our qualitative findings were correlated with a review of empirical desistance studies identifying different spheres where social capital resources reside and we thus integrated our findings with social capital theory frameworks (Albertson and Albertson, 2023).

In essence, our social capital building template presented here distinguishes between the different spheres in which the three different forms of social capital operate (McNeill and Whyte, 2007; Albertson and Albertson, 2023):

- Bonding social capital signifies social ties being made between people in similar circumstances. We found this type of social capital occurring within the close, intimate friendship forming micro-relations sphere;
- Bridging social capital denotes relational networks with those socially similar, but more distant ties. We found this being built within the wider community or meso-relational context;
- Linking social capital indicates relational connections with those who are rather more socially dissimilar to ourselves. We saw interactions such as this in more macro-interactions in the civic decision-making relational sphere.

Having differentiated between the three different spheres where social capital resources reside, how each sphere relates to the next was found to be largely sequential, but not in every case. In essence, we suggest moving between these spheres of social capital building opportunities is best thought of as centring on meeting the interests and aspirations of, in this case, the person on probation. Thus, we found some people:

- simply wanted to make some pro-social mates they could hang out with (often to replace the offending friends they had lost in order to desist), so their aspirations were

met in full within the micro, horizontal “Bonding” social capital building sphere activities outlined in our template (and see, Nugent and Schinkel, 2016).

- became more invested in their local communities, organising activities, recruiting others and forging wider connections with other local meaningful groups and becoming ambassadors and volunteers. In this way, some social capital building aspirations were met in full within the meso “Bridging” social capital sphere activities outlined in our tool below.
- became committed interest group advocates, actively representing their interest groups experience in more civic decision-influencing contexts. By realising their newly discovered skills (and passions) could become part of a realistic career trajectory, some people’s social capital building aspirations required more vertical opportunities to interact in the macro “Linking” social capital sphere of our template.

For more specific detail about the theoretical integration underpinning our template please read Albertson et al., (2022) and Albertson and Albertson (2023). That said, whilst it is useful to think more broadly about bonding, bridging and linking spheres of social capital, put simply - our aim here is rather to provide a tool that:

- Illuminates nuance in the types of opportunities and activities representing extended social capital building spheres so that probation can pin-point where it is being offered already, on the ground, in their own locality
- Begins to assess whether or not probation is facilitating pathways into this range of opportunities for those they manage

As active researchers we have frequently adapted the template to examine a range of different collective contexts. It has proved a useful data collection tool, but more significantly it has been a useful discussion prompt when engaging with both criminal justice and non-criminal justice agencies, staff and service users alike. One of the most memorable discussions involved utilising the template’s content to provide an independently run Community Hub Manager with an evidence-based rationale to back up their idea of facilitating a current service user seat on their steering group (see Linking social capital sphere in tool below).

It is these very discussions that prompted us as authors to share the tool as a practice note in *Probation Journal*. We suggest criminal justice practitioners would benefit from thinking about social capital resources as sustainable and tangible collective connection resources that more often than not, already exist in the community. People on probation can therefore be alerted to a wider range of opportunity pathways that may change the direction of their lives, or through which they begin to situate themselves differently by reconfiguring their own relationships with, and to, families, communities and the state (Farrall et al., 2010; Weaver, 2013).

### **The Social Capital Building template**

Our tool is a social capital building template that we have used to record qualitatively generated observational data to understand the extent to which non-criminal justice collective groupings work can be said to currently facilitate, and/or identify further opportunities that could be strategically supported to provide practical opportunities to build social capital. Over time it has become clear to us - through discussions with criminal justice practitioners, and non-criminal justice third sector, geographic community stakeholders and a range of service users - that this template could be adapted and applied to help probation identify, map, assess and compare a range of existing and/or potential social capital building opportunities available in their locality.

Fig. 1: Social Capital Building template

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Social Capital Building template</b></p> <p>The template below enables probation and pro-social community clubs, projects, initiatives &amp; services to ascertain the extent to which both their services and wider non-criminal justice-focussed resources in the community can be described as evidencing opportunities to build alternative pro-social social capital building activities that contribute to supporting desistance:</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Please insert relevant examples in the third Information/Evidence column below:</b></p>
---

Three spheres of social capital building activity	Social capital building process model elements <i>Opportunities to:</i>	<i>Information/Evidence:</i>
<b>Bonding social capital</b> Immediate, intimate sphere (Micro)	Regularly associate in strengths-based (not sanctions-based), enabling and meaningful activity group/club where pro-social close friends can be made	<i>E.g., Pro-social community clubs &amp; groups (gardening, reading, local history, Fishing, Neighbourhood), Mutual aid, courses or awareness-raising or training?</i>
	Engage in reflective, capacity building & problem-solving focussed activities in a trusted group/club/community setting	<i>E.g., Opportunities to provide talks/information/recruit others into the club/service/initiative/agency?</i>
<b>Bridging social capital</b> Local community setting (Meso)	Contribute to core delivery of activities as trusted service user/club/community asset	<i>E.g., Opportunities to organise club/community events, activities, campaigns, tasks and/or activities</i>
	Engage in reciprocative and generative activities as member of pro-social club/service/community group	<i>E.g. Opportunities (&amp; training) available to expand &amp; formalise by accreditation for volunteering, mentoring or, peer mentoring roles</i>
<b>Linking social capital</b> Decision-influencing civic settings (Macro)	Represent, propose, and advocate community/club membership generated ideas and aspirations and contribute to internal service/club/community group improvement forums	<i>E.g. Is there a service user's Group to join? Are there opportunities to represent the club/service/community users internal service improvements and/or in outward facing communications strategies?</i>
	Represent the club's/services'/community groups 'lived or living experience' and contribute to more strategic improvement planning, practice & policy making decision-influencing settings	<i>E.g. Service User slot on club/service's/community groups' Steering Group/AGM or Service user consultation activity forum to inform strategic improvement planning? Provide presentation/talk to lead organisation collective/other stakeholder agencies?</i>



## **Conclusion**

It is anticipated that probation leaders can use this one-page tool to prompt an Asset Based Community Development approach (Russell, 2010; Nicholson and Mckeown, 2021) to begin to identify ways in which they – or others - can strategically facilitate pathways into social capital building opportunities within their locality. This will then allow for the identification of gaps in social capital building opportunities that probation can draw into their practice. As a collective resource, this tool can also be added to by probation practitioners and current service users accessing promising community initiatives. Probation practitioners can make people on probation aware of these wider opportunities that are available to them.

We hope that this will be useful in illustrating where local social capital building resources lie, whilst any gaps evident across the spheres wherein social capital building opportunities can be facilitated can be targeted. As such, once this activity is completed for each local group, initiative, service or club, completed template contents can be drawn together, both to form a local directory, but also to enable comparison across the locality. This means informed choices can then be made in and across regions for probation to consider additional commissioning to support any social capital building developmental decisions to fill any local social capital building opportunity gaps.

## **Declaration of conflicting interests**

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## **Funding**

This Practice Note contains no data. No financial support was received for the writing of this article.

## **ORCID iD**

Dr Katherine Albertson is Associate Professor in Criminology, Institute of Law and Justice, Sheffield Hallam University, Orchid ID: 0000-0001-7708-1775.

Dr Jake Phillips is Associate Professor in Criminology and Director of the MSt Applied Penology at the University of Cambridge, Orchid ID: 0000-0002-7606-6423.

## References

- Albertson, K. (2024). *HMPPS CFO Commissioning guidance Peer mentor & peer involvement roles in prison* (Peer Roles in Prison Report Series) [Commissioning Brief].  
<https://www.creatingfutureopportunities.gov.uk/publications-prison-study-series/>
- 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* (Research & Analysis Bulletin No. 2021/06). HM Inspectorate of Probation.
- Albertson, K., & Hall, L. (2019). Building social capital to encourage desistance: Lessons from a veteran-specific project, in (Eds) Raynor, P., McNeill, F., Ugwudike, P., Taxman, F., Trotter, C., & Graham, H. *The Routledge Companion to Rehabilitative Work in Criminal Justice*, Routledge.
- Albertson, K., Best, D., Pinkney, A., Murphy, T., Irving, J., & Stevenson, J. (2017). *"It's not just about recovery": The Right Turn Veteran-Specific Recovery Service Evaluation*, Sheffield Hallam University: Helena Kennedy Centre for International Justice:  
<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/16021/1/Albertson%20et%20al%20Right%20Turn%20evaluation%20final%20report%20June%202017%20%28p%29.pdf>
- Best, D., Musgrove, A., & Hall, L. (2018). The bridge between social identity and community capital on the path to recovery and desistance. *Probation Journal*, 65(4), 394–406.
- Bosker, J., Witteman, C., & Hermanns, J. (2013). Do intervention plans meet criteria for effective practice to reduce recidivism? How probation officers forget about social capital and basic needs. *European Journal of Probation*, 5(1), 65–85.
- Burke, L., Carr, N., Cluley, E., Collett, S., & McNeill, F. (2022). *Reimagining Probation Practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Canton, R. (2024). Probation as social work. *Probation Journal*, 71(3): 214–233.
- Department of Health and Social Care (2019). *Strengths-based approach: Practice Framework and Practice Handbook*: Available at:  
[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/778134/stengths-based-approach-practice-framework-and-handbook.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/778134/stengths-based-approach-practice-framework-and-handbook.pdf)  
(accessed 16 February 2025).
- Farrall, S., Bottoms, A., & Shapland, J. (2010). Social structures and desistance from crime. *European Journal of Criminology*, 7(6): 546–570.

- Farrall, S. (2013). Social capital and offender reintegration: Making probation desistance focused. In: Maruna, S., and Immarigeon, R. (eds) *After Crime and Punishment*. Routledge, pp. 57–82.
- King, S. (2013). Assisted desistance and experiences of probation supervision. *Probation Journal*, 60(2): 136–151.
- Phillips, J., Albertson, K., Collinson, B., & Fowler, A. (2020a). Delivering desistance-focused probation in community hubs: Five key ingredients. *Probation Journal*, 67(3), 264-282.
- Phillips, J., Albertson, K., Collinson, B., & Fowler, A. (2020b). *The role of community hubs in helping to deliver probation services and support desistance* (Research & Analysis Bulletin No. 2020/02). HM Inspectorate of Probation.
- McCulloch, T. (2015). Beyond compliance: Participation, co-production and change in justice sanctions. *European Journal of Probation*, 7(1), 40-57.
- McNeill, F., & Whyte, B. (2007). *Reducing reoffending*. Willan.
- McNeill, F., & Schinkel, M. (2024). Tertiary or relational desistance: Contested belonging. *International Journal of Criminal Justice*, 6(1): 47–74.
- Mills, A., & Codd, H. (2008). Prisoners' families and offender management: Mobilizing social capital. *Probation Journal*, 55(1), 9–24.
- Nicholson, D., & Mckeown, M. (2021). Bringing community wealth building to justice: back to a mutual future for probation? *British Journal of Community Justice* 17(2): 150–168.
- Nugent, B., & Schinkel, M. (2016). The pains of desistance. *Criminology & Criminal Justice* 16(5): 568–584.
- Rex, S. (1999). Desistance from Offending: Experiences of Probation. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 366–383.
- Russell, C. (2010). Making the case for an asset-based community development (abcd) approach to probation: From reformation to transformation. *Irish Probation Journal*, 7: 119-132.
- Senior, P., & Ward, D. (2016). The essence of probation. *British Journal of Community Justice*, 14(1), 9.
- Weaver, B. (2015) *Offending and Desistance: The Importance of Social Relations*. Routledge.
- Weaver, B. (2013) Desistance, Reflexivity and Relationality: A case study. *European Journal of Probation*, 5(3): 71–88.
- Wilson, H.B. (2014). Criminal justice? Using a social capital theory to evaluate probation-managed drug policy. *Probation Journal*, 61(1): 60–78.