

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Rowe, Michael, Irving, Adele and Soppitt, Sarah (2018) The legitimacy of offender management programmes in a post-TR landscape. *Safer Communities*, 17 (2). pp. 69-80. ISSN 1757-8043

Published by: Emerald

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1108/sc-07-2017-0028> <<https://doi.org/10.1108/sc-07-2017-0028>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/33140/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



UniversityLibrary



Northumbria
University
NEWCASTLE



Narratives of Legitimacy among Desistance Service Users

Journal:	<i>Safer Communities</i>
Manuscript ID	SC-07-2017-0028.R1
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Desistance, offender perspectives, community sentences, Transforming Rehabilitation, Legitimacy, Offender narratives

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Safer Communities

Introduction

Unprecedented in respect of the scale and pace at which the reforms have been implemented (Amison et al, 2014), the full impact of the Transforming Rehabilitation (TR) 'revolution', introduced into the probation service in England and Wales, is yet to become clear. Proponents argued TR widens the range of service providers, and so promotes innovation and efficiency, drives down costs and reduces recidivism (Ministry of Justice, 2013). Opponents, including many from the National Probation Service (NPS) and related staff associations, stressed that the reforms would provide lucrative opportunities for private sector corporations to profit, via the Payment-by-Results (PBR) model, from working with low-risk clients but leave a much reduced public sector to deal only with high-risk offenders (Annison et al, 2014). Irrespective of viewpoint, however, commentators agree that TR is the most significant reform of the probation system since the introduction of the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) in 2003. McNeil (2013) argued that TR 'is really about disestablishing probation'. This is true in organisational terms since the NPS lost much work to new Community Rehabilitation Companies (CRCs), but it does not necessarily follow that the management and supervision of offenders will be radically changed in terms of priorities, modalities and mentalities. As others have argued (Garland, 2005; Newburn, 2003), in focusing upon innovation, policy-makers, commentators often overlook the considerable continuity that characterises policy developments in the criminal justice sector.

Distinguishing between continuity and change, however, is challenging. To some extent, TR can be considered to significantly extend, rather than introduce the privatisation of the criminal justice sector (Annison et al, 2014). Twenty years ago, a study quoted a senior officer's observation that 'the Probation Service has absorbed the politics of punishment, entered the market place, mirrored the private sector [and] taken its managers through a grand renaming ceremony' (Wallis, 1997, cited in Garland, 2001: 177). While the earlier epoch of reform did not extend to wholesale privatisation,

1
2
3 principles of private sector discipline in the form of New Public Management have been present for a
4 considerable time (Paterson, 2007). In addition, many of the reforms instigated under TR offer the
5 prospect of a greater role for third sector agencies, and so reinvent historical arrangements whereby
6 volunteers were engaged in offender rehabilitation (Mair and Burke, 2011: 117-118). Other barriers to
7 assessing the impact of TR can be identified from the public policy literature on implementation failure.
8 Key among these is the 'law of unintended consequences', where the outcomes of policy reform either
9 fail to materialise as intended or transpire only partially or belatedly (Dunleavy and Hood, 1994). In
10 public administration in general, and criminal justice policy-making specifically, there is a significant
11 body of literature which suggests that caution should be exercised in predicting the impact of TR on the
12 basis of a literal reading of the policy itself (Howlett, 2012; Boylan and Mocan, 2014; Ruggiero, 2010).
13 The agency of organisations and personnel is likely to result in elements of the programme being
14 resisted or ameliorated. Indeed, several studies examining the micro-contexts of probation practice
15 doubt that the enforcement policy introduced through *A New Choreography* (National Probation
16 Service/Home Office, 2001) produced a culture of enforcement. Ugwudike (2008) found substantial
17 deviation from official policies and guidance governing enforcement, which Robinson and Ugwudike
18 (2012) suggested indicated that 'tough' enforcement policies suffered a legitimacy deficit at the
19 frontline. Although TR might be detrimental to the professional status of officers (Robinson, 2013) and
20 the capacity of staff to implement policy on their own terms might be reduced, it is likely to continue.
21 This has been the experience in the practice of crime prevention and community safety more widely
22 (Hughes, 2007). For these reasons, it is difficult to identify future directions in the organisation and
23 philosophy of offender management and probation with a high degree of certainty.

24
25
26 To date, much of the debate and analysis surrounding TR has focused on organisational
27 restructuring, the professional culture of probation, the introduction of PBR and associated challenges
28 such as the attribution of outcomes, the dynamic nature of risk and potential recidivism, and moral and
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ethical debates about private profit from punishment. However, the impact of TR on desistance –
4
5 particularly from the perspectives of service users – has been largely neglected; this is despite Vaughan’s
6
7 (2007) argument that service users need to be understood as ‘active agents’ within desistance
8
9 programmes. Furthermore, as the concepts of effectiveness and compliance are ‘inextricably linked’
10
11 (Bottoms, 2001: 89, cited in Robinson and McNeill, 2008), it is surprising that discussions of TR have
12
13 neglected the impact of new models of supervision on this topic. To rectify this, this article considers the
14
15 impacts of service user-practitioner relationships and service user perceptions of the authenticity and
16
17 legitimacy of offender management programmes, delivered both pre- and post- TR, to narratives of
18
19 desistance. In doing so, it considers potential implications for wider debates about the current re-
20
21 shaping of the criminal justice system. The article will begin with a review of literature regarding the role
22
23 of service user-practitioner relationships to perceptions of legitimacy, the nature of compliance and re-
24
25 offending behaviour. Following this, a brief outline of the methodology of the study will be provided.
26
27 Research findings are then used to analyse the potential implications of TR for compliance and
28
29 desistance. This is done in terms of firstly, the authenticity, instrumentality and legitimacy of
30
31 relationships with practitioners and secondly, perceptions of various offender management
32
33 programmes. Drawing upon McNeill and Robinson’s (2013: 116) concept of ‘liquid legitimacy’ –
34
35 reflecting the ways in which legitimacy ‘changes its forms and shapes as a community sanction is
36
37 negotiated, constructed, contested and reconstructed by the various actors and audiences involved’ – it
38
39 is argued that relationships between service users and supervisory officers seem not to be based upon
40
41 perceptions of the sectoral status of programmes, but instead upon their philosophy, delivery style, and
42
43 perceived characteristic of staff. In that sense, the creation of a more diverse landscape under TR in
44
45 terms of organisations involved in the delivery of desistance programmes – particularly third sector
46
47 organisations – might be beneficial for offender engagement and desistance. On the other hand,
48
49 however, proposals to deliver offender management via remote technology such as satellites (Travis,
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2016), kiosks or call-centres, may preclude the development of positive relationships between service
4
5 users and providers and so be detrimental to trust, authenticity and legitimacy, thus undermining
6
7 desistance.
8
9

10 11 **Service user-practitioner relationships, compliance and desistance** 12 13

14
15 The relationship between service users and staff remains the central mechanism for the delivery
16
17 of community-based sanctions (Burnett and McNeill, 2005). Notwithstanding change and various
18
19 paradigms of reform (Scottish Office, 1998; Watson, 2003; McCulloch and McNeill, 2007), frontline staff
20
21 have long maintained that legitimacy, authenticity, mutual understanding and collaboration are integral
22
23 to effective relations and practice (Hubble et al, 1999; Burnett and McNeill, 2005; McNeill, 2006, 2009).
24
25 In a review of probation practice by Boswell et al (1993: 148), officers identified 'relationship making' as
26
27 a key skill, and the authors concluded that casework had 'come to be seen as a simple relationship-
28
29 making process, which incorporated respect for the individual, rather than the somewhat obscure and
30
31 esoteric practice of bygone years'. Similar conclusions were made by Knott (2004, cited in Burnett and
32
33 McNeill, 2005), who, shortly before her appointment as the first NOMS manager, emphasised the role of
34
35 supervisor, not only as referrer and enforcer, but also motivator. Other senior practitioners have
36
37 discussed the importance of case management in terms 'relating to the offender' so that they feel 'that
38
39 somebody cares about them' (Mann, 2004: 44), and a 'personal, relationship-based approach' (Grapes,
40
41 2004).
42
43
44
45
46

47
48 While commentators such as McGuire (2002) have noted the neglect of interpersonal and
49
50 relationship skills in research investigating the effectiveness of interventions with offenders, the upsurge
51
52 in desistance-focused research has begun to address this gap. Identified as existing at the interface
53
54 between personal maturity, the development of social bonds associated with significant life transitions
55
56 and changes in individual subjective narratives (McNeill, 2006), the desistance research emphasises the
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 relational aspects of the change process and so legitimises the supportive aspect of probation practice
4
5 (Robinson and McNeill, 2004; O'Malley, 2004; Hannah-Moffat, 2005). What is more, desistance
6
7 research into the effectiveness of interventions designed to reduce offending suggests that it is not so
8
9 much the content of programmes or appropriateness of service users chosen to engage, but the service
10
11 user-practitioner relationships surrounding these that are essential to reductions in re-offending.
12
13 Evidence suggests that service users' commitment to desistance can be generated by the personal and
14
15 professional commitment shown by their probation officers, with reasonableness, fairness and
16
17 encouragement engendering a sense of personal loyalty and accountability. Advice about behaviours
18
19 and underlying problems, interpreted by service users as evidence of concern for their wellbeing, can
20
21 also acts a key source of motivation to change (Rex, 1999). However, it is only when relationships model
22
23 virtues such as optimism, hopefulness, persistence, trustworthiness and loyalty, that the formal
24
25 authority of the probation officer is likely to be rendered legitimate in the mind of the offender (McNeill,
26
27 2006). The importance of perceptions of legitimacy can be explained by Bottoms' (2001) framework of
28
29 compliance. He argues that authentic relationships are more likely to elicit 'normative compliance',
30
31 based on a sense of moral obligation, a wish to maintain the alliance, and the perceived 'legitimacy' of
32
33 the conditions imposed.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The validity of this research is strengthened when looking at the impacts of enforcement-based
41
42 relationships on levels of compliance and desistance. Enforcement-based policy and practice is founded
43
44 on a model of offenders as rational actors, whose behaviour can be manipulated by incentives and
45
46 disincentives. It is assumed that by informing offenders that non-compliant behaviour will be met with
47
48 enforcement action, they will be more likely to desist (Robinson and Ugwu-dike, 2012). However,
49
50 research indicates that offenders are relatively immune to the deterrent effects of formal sanctions (see,
51
52 for example, Hearnden and Millie 2004; Hedderman and Hough 2000, 2004), with service users much
53
54 less likely to comply for purely instrumental reasons and deterrent strategies most effective with those
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 who have a stake in conformity (Bottoms 2001). Robinson and Ugwudike (2012) found that studies
4 exploring the links between 'tough' enforcement and desistance have produced mixed findings.
5
6 Although Home Office research tentatively indicates that taking appropriate enforcement action can
7
8 increase desistance (May and Wadwell, 2001), other evidence suggests that 'tough' enforcement can
9
10 produce higher rates of reconviction (Hearnden and Millie, 2003). Indeed, research indicates that
11
12 perceptions of rigidity and 'regulatory unreasonableness' can alienate service users and increase (rather
13
14 than reduce) the likelihood of future non-compliance (for example, Sherman 2003; Sherman, Strang and
15
16 Woods 2003; Digard 2010). When non-compliance is met with a response which is perceived as unjust
17
18 or unfair, secondary non-compliance may follow (Lemert, 1967). For this reason, some scholars have
19
20 warned that authorities seeking compliance should aim to protect their reputations as 'legitimate'
21
22 through fair and reasonable treatment (Murphy, 2005).
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 In exercising a note of caution, however, the extent to which service user-practitioner
30
31 relationships are the most important factor in promoting desistance is subject to debate. Various studies
32
33 into the offending patterns of young people suggest that their own resources and social networks, for
34
35 example, are often better at resolving their difficulties than professional staff (Hill, 1999). The potential
36
37 of wider social networks is highlighted by 'resilience' or 'strength-based' perspectives, which, in contrast
38
39 to approaches that focus on risk and needs, consider the 'protective factors and processes' involved in
40
41 positive adaptation in spite of adversity. Such perspectives emphasise recognition, exploitation and
42
43 development of offenders' competences, resources, skills and assets (Schoon and Bynner, 2003).
44
45
46

47
48 Building upon this body of literature, this paper considers the nature of legitimacy and service
49
50 user perspectives on their relationships with staff as they experience desistance programmes. This is
51
52 analysed in the context of a diverse range of programmes that (at least to some extent) reflect the more
53
54 complex sector developing in the wake of the TR project. Prior to presenting findings and analysis, the
55
56 next section of the article outlines the methodology used in the data collection process.
57
58
59
60

Methodology

The data presented in this article is derived from a series of semi-structured interviews with service users engaged in four different desistance programmes, delivered in one probation - now CRC – area in England. One of the programmes was a voluntary scheme, delivered by a multi-agency team drawn from a range of criminal justice agencies. The second was a court-mandated scheme, whereby community penalties were delivered by a third sector organisation contracted to the probation service. The third was also a community sentence delivered by the public sector, but by an individual employed (along with other skills and experience) on the basis that they had a personal history of crime and substance abuse. The fourth was a community sentence delivered by a private CRC, in conjunction with a network of local support agencies, which placed considerable emphasis on service users engaging in group work with their peers. All of the programmes were multi-agency in nature and three of the four were delivered by a combination of public, private and third sector groups. In total, interviews with 64 service users were carried out: 11 undertaking the first programme, 7 enrolled in the second, 23 in the third, and 23 in the fourth. Several service users were interviewed multiple times. The interviews were conducted in various locations and at different stages of service user engagement in the respective programmes. Naturally, the offending history of participants was varied, but the programmes were all targeted at those with relatively long-standing careers, comprised of low-gravity offending. The vast majority of those interviewed were male: only 15 (23%) were female; as such, the analysis offered below cannot address gendered differences. The interviews addressed a broad range of issues, including respondents' offending histories, previous engagements with the criminal justice system, perspectives on desistance and 'lifestyle normalisation' and attitudes toward staff delivering their current programme. Interviews took place in private spaces in the various premises where the services were

1
2
3 provided and typically lasted between 20 and 40 minutes. They were fully transcribed and thematically
4
5 analysed. The study was approved by the research team's university ethics committee.
6
7

8 9 **Research findings**

10
11
12 An important finding from the studies is that service user perceptions of their motivation to
13
14 desist from crime were often expressed in terms of their relationship with support workers. In
15
16 circumstances where service users reported positive relationships, these tended to be cited as a reason
17
18 for a strong commitment to desistance. It is shown below that there were three important components
19
20 to a positive relationship: authenticity, instrumentality and programme ethos. Each of these is analysed
21
22 below and the implications that each might have in terms of key elements of the TR agenda are
23
24 considered.
25
26
27

28
29 The perceived authenticity of staff was typically associated either with their professional
30
31 commitment to service users and/or their personal experience of offending and desistance. The latter
32
33 element related to the notion of offender biography and the concept of narration of a pro-social
34
35 identity, whereby desistance emerges from socio-psychological recalibration of the offenders perceived
36
37 relationship with their external environment, social relationships and future potential (Farrall, 2002). A
38
39 key feature of the TR agenda is to establish a more diverse set of service providers, with the greater
40
41 engagement of the voluntary sector in the delivery of desistance appearing particularly likely. Contrary
42
43 to much criticism of the likely impacts of TR, the data below suggests that a more mixed economy of
44
45 provision – including the greater involvement of peer mentors and volunteers – might actually be
46
47 beneficial.
48
49
50

51
52 The (real or perceived) instrumental benefits that staff could provide in terms of negotiating
53
54 with other service providers, benefits agencies, housing providers and the like, was often central to
55
56 positive evaluations of engaging with desistance programmes. Often these benefits related secondarily
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to desistance and were couched in broader terms of assisting with 'lifestyle normalisation'. Support to
4
5 access and engage with a range of agencies is widely recognised as a vital precursor to desistance (LeBel
6
7 et al, 2008; McNeill, 2006, 2009). However, identifying the impact of such 'soft outcomes' and then
8
9 attributing payment for that result is challenging (Vennard and Hedderman, 2009). Further elaboration
10
11 of the implications of service user perspectives on desistance programmes for key features of the TR
12
13 agenda are outlined at various stages of this discussion below.
14
15

16
17 Finally, the ethos of programmes themselves and their relation to offender perspectives on
18
19 desistance appeared significant. Indeed, it is timely to consider how service users perceive the status of
20
21 organisations with which they engage in light of the diversified landscape of delivery organisations
22
23 under TR. The research findings presented below suggest that service users were relatively unconcerned
24
25 with the formal sectoral status of the delivery organisation(s). What emerged from the interview data,
26
27 however, was a strong value placed on the programme being distinctive from the usual experience of
28
29 offender management services. From where this distinctiveness was delivered was less important than
30
31 that the programmes were understood by those engaged in them as being out with the usual
32
33 parameters and ethos (real or perceived) of mainstream provision. This has two potential ramifications
34
35 in a post-TR environment characterised by multi-sectoral and multi-agency provisions. Positively, that
36
37 greater perceived legitimacy may result in increased engagement under TR. More concerning, however,
38
39 is that proposed electronic or remote monitoring without sustained relations with staff post-TR may be
40
41 detrimental to engagement and desistance.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Authenticity*

49
50
51

52 Service users frequently expressed that their strong commitment to desistance was derived
53
54 from the perceived authenticity of the staff with whom they were working. Each of the programmes was
55
56 designed such that service users would develop a close working relationship with an individual
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practitioner – whether this be a qualified practitioner or a peer mentor. Positive assessment of those
4
5 were predicated either on the basis that the staff member was ‘authentic’ in terms of their personal
6
7 biography or that they had a genuine and demonstrable commitment to supporting the service user. As
8
9 noted above, the third of the four programmes was largely facilitated by an individual employed to work
10
11 as a peer mentor with service users. The individual had an extended history of offending and substance
12
13 abuse. Not only was this individual respected by many of those interviewed on the basis of successfully
14
15 managing their personal desistance, credibility was also given since that person was continuing in their
16
17 ‘recovery journey’ through further support from other peer mentors. Three extracts from service user
18
19 interviews reflect these perceptions:
20
21
22

23
24
25 *‘He’s singing the right notes ... He’s been there and done it. He’s in a good place now...I’ve seen*
26
27 *where he was, he was in a bad place and now he’s in a good place...and that’s where I want to*
28
29 *be.’ (Project 3, respondent 1)*
30
31

32
33 *‘He’s been through it. You’ve got to have been through it. It’s hard to explain it. That’s why it’s*
34
35 *good that they have people like him working in these sorts of places. You feel better talking to*
36
37 *them.’ (Project 3, respondent 2)*
38
39

40
41 *‘It takes an addict to understand another addict...most everyday people will never, ever get*
42
43 *it...only an addict understands.’ (Project 3, respondent 3)*
44
45

46
47 The ‘understanding’ mentioned by respondent 3 did not mean, necessarily, that service users found this
48
49 engagement more palatable or in some way easier to negotiate. Indeed, the relationship could be
50
51 challenging, as noted in fieldwork observations when service users were questioned in terms of their
52
53 presentation of the inevitability of their drug use or their inability to sustain abstinence. Even so, service
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 users valued that the peer mentor had personal experience that made for a more honest – or more
4
5 authentic – relationship. One interviewee noted that:
6
7

8
9 *'It doesn't matter how much you relapse or what mistakes you have made, that support will*
10 *always be there, they won't judge you, you won't get in trouble from being honest with them.*
11
12 *There's no pressure...I can just focus on myself.'* (Project 3, respondent 4)
13
14
15

16
17 As is noted in more detail further below, this authenticity was often positively contrasted with
18
19 respondent's previous experiences of offender management programmes. While the extract below is
20
21 from a service user engaged in the third project, similar points were made by interviewees involved in
22
23 the fourth project, which also involved an element of group work with peers. The interview extracts
24
25 below indicate the value placed on engagement with peers with credible personal experience, and that
26
27 this was assessed as more significant than working with those more formally qualified.
28
29
30

31
32 *'It's quite good to be involved with people in similar situations, I can sit and talk about my*
33 *problems to professionals and they just sit there and nod and they don't understand at all.*
34
35 *Where you can sit and talk to a complete stranger who's been through similar experiences and*
36
37 *even though they might not have these qualifications, these people who are lower down the*
38
39 *qualification level, understand a lot more. It's like a breath of fresh air.'* (Project 3, respondent 1)
40
41
42

43
44
45 *'I liked it really, I spoke to everybody, people listened to you and everybody had been through the*
46
47 *same type of stuff. I knew the man (the mentor), I'd know him from years before, I felt*
48
49 *comfortable with him. They were all spot on.'* (Project 4, respondent 1)
50
51

52
53 In terms of engaging a broader range of voluntary third sector organisations in a post-TR landscape, this
54
55 is significant. The broader literature around peer mentoring has noted the value that authenticity offers,
56
57 but that this can be in tension with the professional expertise of trained and qualified staff. Vennard and
58
59
60

1
2
3 Hedderman (2009) argued that the perceived value of voluntary sector input into desistance
4 programmes stemmed from the distinct tradition of working outside the framework of offender
5 management, but that this risked being undermined as third sector organisations become further
6 enmeshed into contractual relations with criminal justice agencies. TR has significantly accelerated this
7 development since third sector, social enterprise and community interest companies are contractual
8 partners in all of the 21 probation areas (Amiston et al, 2014). The quality underpinning the perceived
9 legitimacy of peer mentors is that their biographical experience gives them authenticity and this
10 contrasts favourably with the professional practice of staff in other criminal justice agencies.
11 Furthermore, as suggested by Tyler (1990), the voluntary nature of the mentoring relationship and the
12 way in which it emulates familial or friendship relationships – unlike typical professional worker-client
13 relationships – may add to legitimacy. Service users also typically perceive that peer mentors can offer
14 higher levels of contact time than professional support workers (Barry, 2000).

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 Another component of the authenticity of staff valued by interviewees was the perceived
32 strength of their commitment to assisting service users. As noted further below, this was often
33 expressed in instrumental terms – since greater benefits followed – and was noted in contrast to
34 previous engagement with offender management and probation services. Service users who reported
35 that they valued the personal commitment, rather than professional delivery, of staff tended to suggest
36 that this enhanced their disposition towards desistance. Just as motivation was strengthened through
37 working with an authentic peer mentor, so too was it bolstered since service users did not want to ‘let
38 down’ staff who had demonstrated a higher than expected degree of personal investment in their
39 desistance. Indeed, where the relationship is established on the basis of respect and support, evidence
40 suggests that service users will be keen to (re)gain the mentor’s approval and see the social and
41 personal values modelled by the mentor as important and worth striving for (Brown and Stuart, 2010).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Furthermore, in terms of transforming ex-offenders’ social identity, the positive experience of

1
2
3 demonstrable commitment from staff was understood as evidence that the service user had some value
4
5 not previously recognised. Content-wise, these desistance programmes were underpinned by
6
7 'strengths-based' approaches, which encouraged service users to develop social capital and imagine
8
9 themselves in terms not solely defined by anti-social, problematic and criminal behaviour (McNeill,
10
11 2006). The authenticity underpinning this perception was based on the congruence between content,
12
13 communication and demonstrated staff behaviour. This perspective was encapsulated in the comments
14
15 of Respondent 1 in Project 2. She reflected on an experience whereby staff from the project had
16
17 attended a ceremony to mark completion of the scheme:
18
19
20
21

22
23 *' . . . they are more hands on, on the other end of the phone . . . picking us up and things like that,*
24
25 *if I was short of bus fare. It's a close bond that you have with them They are all lovely ... all*
26
27 *really nice. The [project name] had like a passing-out thing. I didn't know that you could have*
28
29 *people there, all the other lads have carers and family there, I was the last to get up and talk and*
30
31 *when I sat down someone told me that [names staff] were there at the back. I thought 'e, my*
32
33 *God!', I was buzzing and that, they'd come to see us! I was chuffed to bits, that was really nice.'*
34
35

36
37 (Project 2, respondent 1)
38
39

40 *Instrumentality*

41
42
43

44 The discussion above demonstrates that the legitimacy of desistance programmes was partially
45
46 constructed in terms of the social identity of the service user and their perceptions of relationships with
47
48 staff. Accompanying this was the perception that service users benefitted from engagement in the
49
50 programme in instrumental ways. The nature of the instrumental returns ranged from mundane day-to-
51
52 day support, to more substantive benefits relating to lifestyle normalisation, for example. Participants in
53
54 Project 3 spoke positively in interviews about the ease and effectiveness of engaging with staff, with
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 responses including: *'everything has been spot on since I've met him', 'If you ever ask him to do*
4 *anything, he's straight there. The support you get from him is second to none', 'He's done more than he's*
5 *paid to do', 'He's always there, he's committed'*. Across all the programmes, respondents valued
6
7 assistance aimed at helping them to organise 'chaotic lifestyles'. Sometimes this was expressed in
8
9 respect of routine activities, such as calling to remind of forthcoming appointments and to provide
10
11 transport to attend, or simply to check on their wellbeing. Similarly valued was advice to service users in
12
13 relation to accessing a wider range of support services to provide help in terms of recovery, health and
14
15 fitness, housing and benefits (including avoiding potential benefit sanctions), meaningful activities and
16
17 education, training and employment. One respondent expressed the instrumental benefits, and the
18
19 importance of that to maintaining desistance, in the following terms:
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *'[Staff name] would come and see [me to] ask how I was doing; if I needed any help. He took me*
28 *to [agencies]... I got registered with Crisis. I did the Health and Hygiene course. Just introduced*
29 *me to some people that would help me with, like, my CV; getting into jobs and all that ... if [staff*
30 *name] never came to see me in prison or I never became involved here at the [programme], I'd*
31 *probably be either in prison or due to go into prison or sitting with a drug habit and reoffending.'*
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 (Project 1, respondent 1)
40
41

42 Similarly, a respondent in the fourth programme noted practical benefits in terms of facilitating wider
43
44 support networks and that this was combined with developing their personal capacity within these
45
46 environments:
47
48

49
50 *'I get support from [staff name] if I need it: like [agency name], [agency name], [agency name].*
51
52 *She's got me to understand that I don't have to accept what's offered, I can change what's on*
53
54 *offer. I find it hard to open up in a group, or to open up in a group. But in the future I could come*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *back and have a word with [staff name], I know she'd be there for that.'* (Project 4, respondent
4
5 3)
6
7

8
9 These extracts suggest that positive evaluations of programmes were partially predicated on resulting
10
11 instrumental benefits, but that these were often couched in relatively minor terms and only indirectly
12
13 associated with desistance. This is significant in terms of the wider intention of TR to introduce PBR
14
15 mechanisms, since service users assessed some relatively minor outcomes as being especially significant
16
17 as potential pre-requisites or indeed, integral to sustained desistance. The value attributed to these
18
19 minor outcomes indicates that the legitimacy of the programme was based, in part, on service users
20
21 engaging more firmly within networks of local support agencies. This in turn means that there might not
22
23 be an overall reduction in referrals to local multi-agency networks, and so evaluations using
24
25 methodologies such as Social Return on Investment models (SROI 2011) need to become sufficiently
26
27 sophisticated to identify costs that enhance long-term desistance. Another challenge is that for such
28
29 work to prove beneficial in the long-term, there is an inherent need for local networks to exist in the
30
31 first instance. Current pressures on public sector provisions will make this more challenging and perhaps
32
33 the fluidity and instability of these local networks will mean that supporting service users to negotiate a
34
35 shifting landscape of providers is increasingly important. If the metaphor of desistance as a journey is
36
37 extended, then the route map requires frequent updates from an expert navigator.
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 Service users often valued the capacity of staff to help them to identify a positive conception of their
45
46 future self and to begin to narrate a new social identity. Frequently this was articulated in terms of
47
48 improving relations with friends and family. The quote below from a service user illustrates the
49
50 instrumental impact that engagement with the programme was held to offer in these terms. It further
51
52 demonstrates that benefits which might accrue from the desistance programme can be understood in
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 narrow terms of crime reduction, but actually are considered more broadly by service users. Attributing
4
5 and measuring such outcomes for the purposes of PBR would be extraordinarily challenging.
6
7

8
9 *'... society has changed now, people don't buy stolen goods now, they know it is a crime. A lot of*
10 *people who used to steal don't now, they've got jobs, the people I used to hang around with have*
11 *got themselves into college courses, they have got jobs and settled down with families. They've*
12 *managed to stick in their jobs, and that has changed people's perceptions about crime. My sons*
13 *know now not to commit crime, and that if they do they'll get into trouble for it. When I was*
14 *younger, when I was committing crime, I was applauded for it. It's different for my sons, they*
15 *won't be appreciated for it. They know not to go to the shops if they've got no money.'* (Project 2,
16 *respondent 2)*
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 *Sectoral status and programme ethos*

29
30
31

32 A central element of the TR reforms has been the development of a more diverse range of
33 providers of offender management. All 21 of the contracts that established the new CRCs were awarded
34 to consortia comprising public, private and third sector organisations. These included multinational
35 corporations, public agencies including NHS trusts, charities (both national and local), not-for-profit
36 social enterprise companies, and community interest companies (some of which were constituted by
37 former probation officers). While the development of multi-agency and cross-sectoral delivery is not
38 new within criminal justice, this aspect of TR has been a major step in a wider process of privatisation
39 (Amiston et al, 2014). As noted above, this has been subject to extensive critical analysis, which there is
40 not room to rehearse here. But notably, little of this has drawn upon the insights of service users and so
41 the analysis offered below adds further perspectives on these wider debates.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In various combinations, the four programmes from which research respondents were drawn
4
5 were delivered in a multi-agency environment. Project 1 was delivered under contract by a charity that
6
7 had little prior history in criminal justice. Service users reported that the charitable status of the project,
8
9 and its independence from the CJS, enhanced the trust and confidence that were significant factors in
10
11 their motivation to desist. The legitimacy of the programme was often expressed in terms of how it
12
13 positively differed from service users' previous engagement with probation services. The interview
14
15 extracts below illustrate the widely expressed perception that the programme was valued partly
16
17 because of the contrast with prior engagements:
18
19
20
21

22
23 *'When I had probation in the past, I just walked into a room, they asked a couple of questions*
24
25 *and that was it. That was basically it: you've showed your face, you can go now. Not 'How you*
26
27 *doing? Are you keeping out of trouble?'* nothing like that. *[This programme] is different . . . It's*
28
29 *much better. They seem to care for you, they ask how you're doing, whereas I have never had*
30
31 *none of that...'* (Project 1, service user 2)
32
33

34
35 *'Probation is more like a school isn't it, if you are late, they just breach you then, there is no*
36
37 *leeway, where here it's more easy going, everyone's ok really, it's alright ... They treat you like an*
38
39 *adult, not like a kid.'* (Project 1, service user 3)
40
41
42

43
44 Service users were clearly aware that the project was being delivered by a charity (not least since it was
45
46 run from their premises) and often articulated that there was an ethos distinct from previous
47
48 engagements, and this enhanced perceived legitimacy of the programme. While this suggests that the
49
50 sectoral status of the delivering organisation underpins service users' perceptions of legitimacy and
51
52 motivation towards desistance, the picture becomes more complex when considering the interviews
53
54 with service users engaged in projects delivered by other configurations of agencies. Those engaged in
55
56 Project 2 also expressed their positive perceptions by contrasting their experience with less positive
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 prior offender management. Project 2 was entirely delivered by public service organisations (a
4 combination of probation service staff and police). The extract below shows how service users
5 contrasted the experience of that project with mainstream probation:
6
7
8
9

10
11 *'It's not, like, 'how have you been doing ... Blah-di-blah', like five minutes and you're out of here.*
12
13 *But they, like, have the time to talk to you and stuff like that, do you know what I mean? Like,*
14 *ask how you've been doing and things like that. It's just better, rather than coming in and just,*
15 *do you know what I mean, doing nothing?'* (Project 2, service user 3)
16
17
18
19

20
21 The peer-mentoring component of the third project and the strengths-based approach to delivering the
22 fourth project were similarly recognised by service users as distinguishing characteristics that contrasted
23 positively with previous offender management. From whatever sector, or combination of sectors, the
24 project was being delivered, service users perceived legitimacy in terms of relations with staff and that
25 this was contrasted with the perceived normal pattern of probation work. In sectoral terms, legitimacy
26 was 'liquid' in the sense that it seeped around boundaries between public, private and third sectors.
27 While legitimacy might be articulated in terms of the ethos of a charitable organisation, the service user
28 interviews suggested that this perception could be morphed and expressed in similar terms to
29 programmes delivered by public and private sector agencies. In terms of the ambition of TR to diversify
30 service provisions by including private and not-for-profit organisations, this suggests that such
31 developments might enhance legitimacy among service users, but only in circumstances where an ethos
32 is embedded that prioritises authentic relationships of the type outlined in the earlier section of this
33 article. Conversely, it follows, legitimacy will be harder to sustain where such relationships are absent;
34 discussion of the possibility of introducing electronic monitoring of low-risk offenders or of delivering
35 supervision remotely via kiosks at which service users check-in effectively exclude the possibility of
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 authentic relationships and so seem likely to have deleterious effects in terms of legitimacy and
4
5 desistance.
6
7

8 9 **Conclusion**

10
11
12 The primary intention of this article has been to consider the importance of relationship-based
13
14 practice in current probation interventions aimed at reducing reoffending and to use these findings to
15
16 provide insight into the impacts that various elements of TR might have on service user perspectives of
17
18 the legitimacy of programmes delivered in a more diverse sectoral environment. The data adds
19
20 perspectives from service users that have tended to be marginalised in wider debates about changes to
21
22 probation and offender management in England and Wales. Three key themes emerge. First, positive
23
24 perceptions of the legitimacy of staff and programmes had no relation to their formal status in sectoral
25
26 terms. Instead, services users valued the authenticity of staff in terms of their personal commitment to
27
28 assist them; sometimes this was related to their personal biographical experience of crime and
29
30 substance abuse. If TR succeeds in establishing an environment for offender management in which a
31
32 wide range of third, private and public sector agencies contribute to desistance programmes, it might be
33
34 that this proves an effective way of enhancing legitimacy in the eyes of service users. However, the
35
36 value that personal credentials offer in terms of staff and programme authenticity maybe in tension
37
38 with a counter-veiling tendency towards the development of evidence-based practice within probation.
39
40 The interviews reported above suggest that service users value authenticity and sometimes express this
41
42 via a negative comparison with remote 'professional' experts with whom they lack rapport. While it
43
44 might be possible to reconcile professional expertise and personal authenticity, this paper suggests that
45
46 this will be a continuing challenge. Related to this is the risk that as third sector organisations become
47
48 further enmeshed in contractual relations with private and public criminal justice providers, the
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 distinctive tradition of voluntarism is eroded. TR risks undermining the values that service users identify
4
5 as central to the legitimacy of those working outside of public sector mainstream offender management.
6
7

8 A second theme emerging from the discussion above relates to the difficulty of ensuring
9
10 effective mechanisms for PBR. These challenges have been noted elsewhere (Fox and Albertson, 2011),
11
12 but service user interview data reported here suggests that the instrumental outcomes that service
13
14 users valued, were often only indirectly related to desistance and often appeared to be relatively minor
15
16 in themselves. They were the 'soft outcomes' identified previously by Vennard and Hedderman (2009).
17
18 These benefits might have contributed in various ways to 'lifestyle normalisation', but only at a distance
19
20 were they linked to reduced offending and so might be removed from the formal outcomes that trigger
21
22 payments. Equally problematic for PBR is that the outcomes that do relate to desistance are subject to a
23
24 delay since they are secondary to more immediate steps such as referral to welfare or health services.
25
26 The temporal lag means that the secondary outcome (desistance) is not understood by PBR mechanisms
27
28 as a result that stemmed from the primary outcome (agency referral, or similar).
29
30
31
32

33 A third theme arising from the data is that the sectoral status of desistance programmes did not
34
35 seem to determine the legitimacy perceived by service users. What was highly significant was that the
36
37 ethos, values and culture of programmes were outside of the normal experience of probation and
38
39 offender management. Staff and programmes that prioritised the building of meaningful relationships
40
41 with service users were valued highly, and this was often expressed as a positive contrast with other
42
43 experiences with shallow or cursory interaction with staff. In terms of the TR agenda, this might suggest
44
45 that innovative programmes delivered by different combinations of service providers have the potential
46
47 to achieve greater levels of legitimacy. Counter to this are components of TR that prioritise greater
48
49 efficiencies in terms of community supervision of low risk offenders. If desistance programme providers,
50
51 whether public, private or voluntary, continue to develop – as has been widely mooted – systems that
52
53 remotely monitor service users, either through electronic monitoring or through check-in kiosks, then
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the personal relationships valued highly by service users will be impossible and the legitimacy that is
4
5 central to desistance will be greatly eroded.
6
7

8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

Annison, J, Burke, L and Senior, P (2014) Transforming Rehabilitation: Another example of English
'exceptionalism' or a blueprint for the rest of Europe? *European Journal of Probation* 6 (1): 6–23.

Barry, M (2000) The mentor/monitor debate in criminal justice: What works for young offenders. *British
Journal of Social Work* 30, 575–595.

Bottoms, A (2001) Compliance and community penalties, in Bottoms, A, Gelsthorpe, L and Rex, S (eds)
Community Penalties: Changes and Challenges. Cullompton: Willan pp. 87–116.

Boylan, RT and Mocan, N (2014) Intended and unintended consequences of prison reform. *Journal of
Law, Economics and Organization* 30 (3): 558–586.

Brown, M and Stuart, R (2010) 'Mentoring, social capital and desistance: a study of women released
from prison. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 43 (1), pp. 31–50.

Dunleavy, P and Hood, C (1994) From old public administration to new public management. *Public
Money and Management* 14 (3), 9–16.

Farrall, S (2002) *Rethinking What Works with Offenders: Probation, Social Context and Desistance from
Crime*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

1
2
3 Fox, C and Albertson, K (2011) Payment by results and social impact bonds in the criminal justice sector:
4 new challenges for the concept of evidence-based policy? *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 11(5) 395–
5
6 413.
7
8

9
10
11 Garland, D (2005) *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Oxford:
12
13 Oxford University Press.
14

15
16
17 Howlett, M (2012) The lessons of failure: learning and blame avoidance in public policy-making.
18
19 *International Political Science Review* 33: 539–555.
20
21

22
23 Hughes, G (2007) *The Politics of Crime and Community*. London: Palgrave.
24

25
26
27 LeBel, TP, Burnett R, Maruna, S and Bushway, S (2008) The 'chicken and egg' of subjective and social
28
29 factors in desistance from crime. *European Journal of Criminology* 5 (2): 131–159.
30
31

32
33 Mair, G and Burke, L (2011) *Redemption, Rehabilitation and Risk Management: a History of Probation*.
34
35 New York: Routledge.
36

37
38
39 McNeill, F (2006) A desistance paradigm for offender management. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 6
40
41 (1): 39–62.
42

43
44
45 McNeill, F (2009) What works and what's just?. *European Journal of Probation* 1 (1): 21–40.
46

47
48
49 McNeil, F (2013) Transforming rehabilitation: evidence, values and ideology. *British Journal of*
50
51 *Community Justice* 11 (2/3): 83–85.
52

53
54
55 McNeill, F and Robinson, G (2013) Liquid legitimacy and community sanctions. In Crawford, A and
56
57 Hucklesby, A (eds) *Legitimacy and compliance in criminal justice*. Cullompton: Willan, pp. 16–137.
58
59
60

1
2
3 Ministry of Justice (2013) *Transforming Justice: a Revolution in the Way We Manage Offenders*. London:
4
5 Stationary Office.

6
7
8
9 Newburn, T (2005) *Crime and Criminal Justice Policy*. London: Longman.

10
11
12 Paterson, C (2007) Commercial crime control and the electronic monitoring of offenders in England and
13
14 Wales. *Social Justice* 34 (3/4): pp. 98–110.

15
16
17
18 Robinson A (2013) Transforming rehabilitation: transforming the occupational identity of probation
19
20 workers? *British Journal of Community Justice* 11: 91–101.

21
22
23
24 Ruggiero, V (2010) Unintended consequences: changes in organised drug supply in the UK. *Trends in*
25
26 *Organized Crime* 13(1): 46–59.

27
28
29
30 SROI Network UK (2011) *What is Social Return on Investment?* London: SROI Network.

31
32
33
34 Travis, A (2016) Satellite-tracking schemes for offenders to be trialled this autumn. *The Guardian*, 8 July.
35
36 www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jul/08/satellite-tracking-schemes-for-offenders-to-be-trialled-
37
38 [this-autumn?CMP=share_btn_link](http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2016/jul/08/satellite-tracking-schemes-for-offenders-to-be-trialled-)

39
40
41
42 Vaughan, B (2007) The internal narrative of desistance. *British Journal of Criminology* 47: 390–404.

43
44
45 Vennard, J and Hedderman, C (2009) Helping offenders into employment: how far is voluntary sector
46
47 expertise valued in a contracting-out environment? *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 9: 225–245.

48
49
50
51 Wallis, E (1997) A new choreography: breaking away from the elaborate corporate dance. In Burnett, R
52
53 (ed) *The Probation Service: Responding to Change*, Oxford: Probation Studies Unit, Oxford University, pp.
54
55 91–104.

Weaver B (2014) Control or change? developing dialogues between desistance research and public protection practices. *Probation Journal*, 61(1): 826.

Safer Communities

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60