

An aerial photograph of a city, likely in the United States, showing a dense residential area with many houses and trees. In the center of the city, there is a large, complex of buildings, possibly a government or institutional facility, with several courtyards and parking lots. The sky is clear and blue.

PRISON SERVICE JOURNAL

November 2012 No 204

Co-producing change: resettlement as a mutual enterprise

Beth Weaver is a Lecturer at the School of Applied Social Sciences at the University of Strathclyde and **Dave Nicholson** is Director of Ex-Cell Solutions Ltd., an ex-offender-led worker co-operative providing co-operative and mutual development services for offenders, ex-offenders, Prisons and Probation Trusts.

Introduction

Prison numbers have continued to rise across the UK over the last decade despite a corresponding reduction in crime rates, suggesting a custodial-turn in sentencing practices. As a penal response, the well documented failure of prison to rehabilitate prisoners and support their civic reintegration¹ is a costly concern, with each prison place costing an average of £39,573 in England and Wales², £73,762 in Northern Ireland³ and £32,146 in Scotland⁴. In this context, the ongoing financial crisis has necessarily added considerable weight to arguments in favour of reconfiguring criminal justice to better facilitate reductions in the cost of re-offending, estimated in England and Wales to amount to between £7 billion and £10 billion per year⁵.

While it is well established that prisons are a financially costly and ineffective way of tackling offending, it is equally accepted that imprisonment further exerts unintended but no less deleterious effects, or opportunity costs, on the factors that can support desistance from crime such as relationships and employment^{6 7 8}. Proponents of the *Rehabilitation Revolution* are focussing their energy on making prisons 'places of hard work and industry'⁹ as a means

of promoting citizenship, but, crucially, are neglecting to attend to the role of employment in the *resettlement* of former prisoners. Audit Scotland (2011)¹⁰ have recently estimated that helping one former prisoner into employment and out of crime for five years after release would yield a net saving of £1M. There is also a substantial body of empirical research evidencing a significant, albeit complex, relationship between participation in employment and desistance^{11 12}. Moreover, a recent Ministry of Justice study¹³ revealed that most prisoners wanted to work and saw this as critical to supporting their efforts to 'go straight' on release.

In this article, we consider the potential of an old idea in a new context: that is the use of social co-operatives and mutual structures as a mechanism for supporting the resettlement of prisoners. We review what this means in a criminal justice context and share some exciting developments in how this idea is being put into — effective — practice. There has been little consideration of what role co-operatives and mutuals might play in the 'Rehabilitation Revolution', in supporting desistance and in penal reform more broadly. Admittedly, the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) has recently published a report on *Reducing Re-offending Through Social Enterprise*, delineating the involvement of social

1. Ministry of Justice (2010a) *Compendium of re-offending statistics and analysis*. Ministry of Justice Statistics Bulletin, November 2010. London, HMSO.
2. Table 1, Ministry of Justice (2011) *Costs per place and costs per prisoner by individual prison, National Offender Management Service Annual Report and Accounts 2010-11: Management Information Addendum*, London: Ministry of Justice.
3. Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland (2011) *An inspection of prisoner resettlement by the Northern Ireland Prison Service, Belfast*: Criminal Justice Inspection Northern Ireland.
4. Scottish Prison Service (2011) *Scottish Prison Service Annual Report and Accounts 2010-11*, Edinburgh: Scottish Prison Service.
5. Ministry of Justice (2010b) *Breaking the cycle: effective punishment, rehabilitation and sentencing of offenders*. London: Ministry of Justice.
6. Armstrong, S and Weaver, B (2010) *What do the punished think of punishment? The comparative experience of short prison sentences and community based punishment*. SCCJR Research Report 04/2010 available online at: <http://www.sccjr.ac.uk/pubs/User-Views-of-Punishment-The-comparative-experience-of-short-term-prison-sentences-and-communitybased-punishments/284>
7. Trebilcock, J (2011) *No Winners: The reality of short term prison sentences*. London: The Howard League for Penal Reform.
8. Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) (2002) *Reducing Re-offending by Ex-Prisoners: A Report by the Social Exclusion Unit*. London: ODPM/SEU.
9. Ministry of Justice (2010b:1) *Breaking the cycle: effective punishment, rehabilitation and sentencing of offenders*. London: Ministry of Justice.
10. Audit Scotland (2011) *An overview of Scotland's criminal justice system*. Available online at http://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/docs/central/2011/nr_110906_justice_overview.pdf
11. See for example Rhodes, J (2008) Ex-Offenders, Social Ties and the Routes into Employment. *Internet Journal of Criminology*.
12. See for example Farrall S (2002) *Rethinking what works with offenders: probation, social context and desistance from crime*. Willan Publishing: Cullupmton, Devon.
13. Ministry of Justice (2012) *Research Summary 3/12, Accommodation, homelessness and reoffending of prisoners*, London: Ministry of Justice.

enterprises within prisons and probation services, but the authors make no distinction between the work of mutual and co-operative social enterprises and the work of the wider social enterprise sector. Conflating the various forms of social enterprise as ‘independent businesses that trade for a social purpose’¹⁴, obfuscates the critical feature of mutual and co-operative forms of social enterprise — the ‘ownership question’ — which differentiates them from other models of social enterprise. Moreover, the social enterprise model of the NOMS report allows for a prisoner run enterprise to be considered indistinct from a global corporation (like Kalyx which bills itself as ‘a business with social purpose’¹⁵) and seems in other ways to be as focused on encouraging private sector investment and profit (as with A4E¹⁶) in criminal justice as on the resettlement of prisoners.

The ownership question is fundamental to differentiating between the cooperative and mutual sector and ‘social enterprise’. Cooperatives and Mutuals are businesses owned by their members — their customers in the case of consumer cooperatives; their employees in the case of worker cooperatives; and service users, service providers and the wider community in the case of public service multi-stakeholder social cooperatives or public service mutuals. It is these multi-stakeholder social cooperatives in particular that offer a unique potential to support desistance, providing a mechanism to pursue co-production and personalisation¹⁷. In general terms, then, ownership by staff, service users, and, where appropriate, the wider public is the defining characteristic of social cooperatives and mutual public services, just as ownership by consumers and workers is

These circumstances show the need to co-operate to ‘co-produce’ more innovative and sustainable means through which various stakeholders collaborate with service users, professionals and public services to respond to this collective need.

the defining characteristic of the different forms of co-operative enterprise¹⁸. While Boyle and Harris (2009¹⁹) specifically rule out mutuals and co-operatives for policing and justice, they assert that specialised public services for *preventing and dealing with crime* ‘rely on an underpinning operating system that consists of family, neighbourhood, community and civil society’. Indeed, informal social networks are the predominant means through which probationers and former prisoners access paid employment^{20,21,22}. However, while this perhaps illuminates the challenges that former prisoners and probationers experience in accessing employment opportunities, not all families have access to such resources and many institutions and services are often similarly unprepared to offer the kinds of assistance required²³. These circumstances show the need to co-operate to ‘co-produce’ more innovative and sustainable means through which various stakeholders collaborate with service users, professionals and public services to respond to this collective need. Realising this, however, not only means relinquishing monopolies of power and service defined expertise but the generation of reciprocal relationships underpinned by mutual responsibilities; this, we argue, can be realised through the co-ownership and co-control of mutual structures providing social and economic support to its members.

Origins of Mutuals and Co-operatives

The birth of modern cooperative and mutual enterprise coincided with the industrial revolution but the sense of solidarity and cooperative organisation

-
14. NOMS (2009) *Reducing re-offending through social enterprise: social enterprises working with prisons and probation services – a mapping exercise for National Offender Management Service*. London: Ministry of Justice.
 15. <http://www.kalyxservices.com>
 16. <http://www.mya4e.com/>
 17. Weaver, B (2011) Co-producing community justice: the transformative potential of personalisation for penal sanctions. *British Journal of Social Work*. Doi:10.1093/bjsw/bcr011
 18. Hunt, P (2006) *In the public interest: the role of mutuals in providing public services*. Mutuo Manchester.
 19. Boyle, D and Harris, M. (2009:6) *The challenge of co-production: how equal partnerships between professionals and the public are crucial to improving public services*. London: NESTA.
 20. Farrall (2002) see n.12.
 21. Rhodes (2008) see n.11.
 22. Niven, S and Stewart, D (2005) *Resettlement outcomes on release from prison in 2003*. Findings 248: London: Home Office.
 23. Farrall, S (2004) ‘Social capital and offender reintegration: making probation desistance focused’ in Maruna, S and Immarigeon R (eds) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Willan Publishing, Cullompton, Devon.

were present in many pre-modern societies including the early Christian Church, medieval monasticism and craft guilds. Five models of cooperation can be identified arising out of the industrial revolution and into the modern era. Firstly, the consumer cooperative originating in Fenwick in Scotland in 1769 and Rochdale in England in 1844; secondly, labour or worker cooperatives originating in a variety of contexts which gained ascendancy in France from 1831 onwards; thirdly, credit unions or mutual banks, again emerging in a variety of contexts but becoming a major force in Germany from 1849 onwards; fourthly, the joint farmers' cooperative were a particular feature of late nineteenth century Scandinavian society, but like credit unions has also been a feature of many different societies worldwide.

It is the fifth model that largely concerns us here. Various called the 'social cooperative', 'multi-stakeholder cooperative' or 'public service mutual', this model originated in Italy in the 1970s as a totally new version of extended mutual cooperation. It is characterised by a multi-stakeholder model of governance, a model in which the representatives of a number of different interest groups all have a say in decisions and a role in the governance structure. Thus the decision-making bodies comprise not only worker-members but also the beneficiaries of the cooperatives' services and representatives of the local community. This model has been widely replicated across Europe and serves as the European definition of 'social enterprise' in distinction to the much wider and vaguer UK definition referred to above²⁴.

In a criminal justice context these social cooperatives or public service mutuals provide employment and resettlement services for their members both in prison and in the community. They are essentially 'mutual reducing re-offending services'²⁵, where former and serving prisoners create their own

employment and provide resettlement support to each other through their membership of the social co-operative. The role of the professional in these structures is to facilitate the promotion, development, and success of each social co-operative rather than simply providing either expert assistance or 'offender management' to individual members²⁶. Social Cooperatives are thus both part of the formal criminal justice system but at the same time transcend it. Just as the process of desistance itself extends beyond the

criminal justice system, so approaches to supporting resettlement and desistance require collaborative responses that extend beyond the practices and proclivities of the justice sector²⁷. Social Cooperatives provide a structure through which to deliver these collaborative responses.

The Operative Function of Public Service Mutuals and Social Cooperatives.

Mutuals and social co-operatives are based on the values of self-help, self-responsibility, democracy, equality, equity and solidarity²⁸. In the setting of criminal justice, mutuals and social co-operatives' of former and serving prisoners and rehabilitation professionals are a legal structure through which co-produced ventures providing employment and other resettlement services to their

members in prison and on release can be developed. There are some examples where these services are provided solely by serving and former prisoners for serving and former prisoners. Most, however, are through-the-gate *multi-stakeholder* mutuals providing employment and resettlement services and comprise an equal partnership of serving and former prisoners, professional staff (including prison staff and other relevant service providers such as further education providers, local businesses and local authorities) and appropriate community members. In some ways they resemble the *Prisoner Aid Societies* which pre-dated the

Just as the process of desistance itself extends beyond the criminal justice system, so approaches to supporting resettlement and desistance require collaborative responses that extend beyond the practices and proclivities of the justice sector.

24. Zamagni, S and Zamagni, V. (2010). *Cooperative Enterprise: Facing the Challenge of Globalization*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

25. Nicholson, D (2011: 18) *Cooperating out of crime*. CentreForum.

26. Thomas, A (2004) The rise of social cooperatives in Italy. *International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organisations*, Vol 15, 2004

27. Weaver (2011) see n.17.

28. Majee, W and Hoyt, A (2010) Are worker-owned cooperatives the brewing pots for social capital? *Community Development*, 41 (4): 417-30.

formation of the Probation Service in the early twentieth century, but their key difference is that they are co-owned and controlled by their service users 'co-producing' their own services in the context of paid co-operative and mutual employment²⁹.

There are opportunities for this model to go beyond current Italian practice to develop prison-based and through-the-gate co-operative and mutual structures of employment as a means of enabling prisoners to make financial reparations to victims as well as to support their own families and provide financially for themselves on release through the imbursement of real pay for real work operating under fair trade principles^{30 31 32}. To a certain extent this has already been piloted in the UK in the Howard League's 'Barbed'³³ enterprise in HMP Coldingley. Launched in 2005, The Howard League's 'Barbed' project was the first social enterprise to be run from an English prison. This enterprise provided an innovative, meaningful approach to prison work to eleven prisoners through a professional graphic design service³⁴. Incarcerated members contributed 30 per cent of their wages into a separate fund that made charitable donations. The remainder of the income generated by serving prisoners was used to make financial contributions to their families or saved to support resettlement on release.

Where *Barbed* differed from the Italian model, however, was that it was a social enterprise in the UK sense rather than the European sense. Prisoners were not equal members of the enterprise with other stakeholders and, moreover, *Barbed* did not guarantee continued employment in the enterprise post-release. Crucially, it is this provision of *continued* access to training and through-the-gate employment opportunities that can contribute to the longer-term social resettlement of former prisoners. Equally, the open membership of mutual and social co-operatives

structures of employment can circumnavigate some of the structural obstacles (relating to criminal records, employers attitudes and discrimination³⁵) that former prisoners routinely encounter which directly impact upon their potential to access employment. As part of a mutually co-operative self-help structure, former and serving prisoners, professionals and the wider community can thus 'co-produce' the kinds of social supports and associated goods that can assist former prisoners' social reintegration.

A further and perhaps more radical opportunity to go beyond current Italian practice is presented by the Royal Society of Arts proposals contained in 'RSA *Transitions: A Social Enterprise Approach to Prison and Rehabilitation*'³⁶. This essentially proposes that prisons should themselves be run as Public Service Mutuals or Social Cooperatives, with prisons and prison services '...co-designed and delivered by service users, local employers, local people and civic institutions; all would have a voice in how it is designed and run', which Alison Liebling³⁷ described as 'wholly consistent with existing practice, but [which] attempts to offer a co-productive form of public service management that is explicitly and uncompromisingly rehabilitationist'.

Crucially, it is this provision of *continued* access to training and through-the-gate employment opportunities that can contribute to the longer-term social resettlement of former prisoners.

Examples of Public Service Mutuals and Social Co-operatives

Public Service Mutuals or Social Co-operatives providing through-the-gate employment and resettlement services are a rapidly developing feature of the Italian Criminal Justice System and are increasingly found throughout the EU and further afield. Some are entirely prisoner and ex-prisoner owned and managed while others include criminal justice and social work staff in their membership to provide additional rehabilitation and resettlement support services. Some work exclusively with prisoners

29. Nicholson, D (2011) *Co-operating out of crime*. CentreForum.

30. <http://www.fairtradeprinciples.org/>

31. See Howard League (2008), *Prison work and social enterprise: the story of Barbed*. London: The Howard League for Penal Reform.

32. See Howard League (2011) *Business Behind Bars: Making Real Work in Prison Work*. The Howard League for Penal Reform.

33. Howard League (2008) see n.31.

34. Howard League (2008) see n. 31; Howard League (2011) see n. 32.

35. McEvoy, K (2008) *Enhancing employability in prison and beyond: a literature review*. Belfast: Queens University.

36. O'Brien, R (2011:14) *RSA Transitions: A social enterprise approach to prison and rehabilitation*. London: The Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures and Commerce.

37. Liebling, A (2011:3) in O'Brien R (2011) see n.36.

with drug and alcohol problems while others work with all prisoners regardless of offence-category. Some operate both in prisons and in the community offering 'through-the-prison-gate' employment and mutual support, while others provide day release employment and a guarantee of continued employment on release.

An Italian prisoner-led co-operative, for example, runs a micro brewery in Saluzzo Prison, producing high quality craft beers which are exported across Europe and the United States. The same co-operative also operates in Turin Prison, processing, roasting and packaging coffee and cocoa for the Pausa Café ('Coffee Break') chain of co-operative Cafés³⁸. Prisoners join the co-operative by paying a small fee. Membership then guarantees them paid employment during their time in prison as well as after their release, together with resettlement support and, as members of the cooperative, they also share in the profits and decision-making of the business as a whole.

The *Exodus Social Co-operative* in Capriano del Colle³⁹ in Italy manufactures semi-finished window and door frames and has serving prisoners on day release as members, together with ex-prisoners, skilled trades-people from the local community and a social worker, psychologist, psychiatrist and criminologist who provide additional resettlement and rehabilitation services in the context of membership and employment in the co-operative. It also offers legal services to its members and pays 50 per cent of any legal costs incurred by them and a job brokerage service to help members move on into the mainstream labour market. This helps maintain a regular throughput of new members and provides an ongoing employment, resettlement and rehabilitation service.

In a similar way the *Inside Art Co-operative*⁴⁰ in Canada is a marketing and mutual support co-operative of self employed prisoners, ex-prisoners and community artists producing and selling both fine art pieces and production items: stained glass, fused and slumped glass, blown glass, carved wood items and handcrafted furniture. The income generated helps prisoners make reparations to victims and support their own families and there is a ready-made mutual support structure and

means of financial self sufficiency for members once they are released.

Prisoner Social Co-operatives like these share some features with what in the UK are called Social Firms or Work Integration Social Enterprises (WISE). But they have something else as well: democratic member control. Social Co-operatives are democratic organisations controlled by their members with equal voting rights. Prisoners co-own and co-control the co-operative together with the other stakeholder members — ex-prisoners, community members and criminal justice and social work professionals.

There are some scattered examples of both mutual and co-operative solutions to offending in the UK. One of us is directly involved in the operation and development of Public Service Mutuals and Social Cooperatives in the Criminal Justice System in the UK. Ex-Cell Solutions (www.ex-cell.org.uk) is itself an 'ex-offender' led cooperative providing employment and resettlement services to ex-prisoners returning to Greater Manchester. Together with Cooperative and Mutual Solutions (www.cms.coop), Ex-Cell have a contract with the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) to promote and develop Public Service Mutuals and Social Cooperatives with Prisons, Probation and the

Cooperative and Mutual Sector in the UK. This involves identifying through-the-gate Social Cooperative opportunities with individual prisons and working with them to implement them as well as assisting in developing full Public Service Mutual proposals and working with groups of ex-offenders to develop their own cooperative and mutual solutions to reducing reoffending. An example of the latter is Recycle IT!, a co-operative of former prisoners in Manchester who provide employment and mutual support to each other through their co-ownership of their own IT recycling business (www.recycle-it.uk.com). Work is ongoing with prisons across England and Wales to develop through-the-gate social cooperatives on the Italian model, particularly (but not exclusively) in the horticulture, green technology, catering, cleaning and construction sectors. However, despite this selective overview, mutual and social co-operative structures in

Social Co-operatives are democratic organisations controlled by their members with equal voting rights. Prisoners co-own and co-control the co-operative together with the other stakeholder members

38. http://www.pausacafe.org/chi_siamo_progetto.html

39. For Further information see: <http://www.scie-socialcareonline.org.uk/repository/fulltext/0017680.pdf>

40. For further information see: <http://bccacoop/member/inside-art-cooperative>

the criminal justice system remain rare and unevenly distributed; rarer still are systematic and comparable evaluations of their effectiveness.

Evidence of Benefits and Outcomes:

The research on mutuals and social co-operatives outside the Criminal Justice System show them to be effective at linking individuals and groups together in productive activities. This has the effect of developing social capital. Such achievements show how this model could lay the foundation upon which serving and former prisoners can build a life of desistance. Research is not yet available on the benefits and outcomes of mutuals and social co-operatives in the criminal justice sector specifically but this will come as structures develop and spread. At this point, then, we consider the role of mutuals and social co-operatives in the development of social capital, in supporting desistance and developing a sense of community.

Evidence from the literature on social co-operatives, beyond those operating in the criminal justice system, suggests that 'they are an organizing vehicle that creates both bonding and bridging social capital'⁴¹, which can be construed more generally as an 'intrinsic benefit'⁴² of membership. Social capital is generally portrayed as an important asset for the well-being or flourishing⁴³ of those involved in its creation and maintenance. In this sense, it is a social relation which encourages or discourages certain actions of individuals through their mutual orientation towards the maintenance of the relational goods it produces, from which other ends, information or resources can be derived as secondary emergent effects⁴⁴. Social capital is not, then, an asset

possessed by the individual, nor a collective property of a social structure, but a configuration of those social networks which are shared by people who will not be able to produce such goods outside their reciprocal relations⁴⁵. Put simply, social capital can be understood 'as networks, norms, and trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives'⁴⁶. The core emergent effects of social capital are the relational goods of social or civic trust, solidarity and social connectedness or civic engagement, all of which rest 'implicitly on some background of shared expectations of reciprocity'⁴⁷

Two basic dimensions of social capital are bonding and bridging⁴⁸. Bonding social capital denotes ties between similarly situated people such as immediate family, friends and neighbours. Bridging social capital involves establishing new social relations; these ties facilitate the reciprocal exchange of resources from one network to a member of another network and in this sense are linked to the development of broader identities and social mobility⁴⁹. Confidence building among co-operative members through

Social capital is generally portrayed as an important asset for the well-being or flourishing of those involved in its creation and maintenance.

mutual ownership, democratic decision-making processes, teamwork and open communication, play a central role in improving their participation and network building capabilities⁵⁰. It is through these relational processes that mutuals and social co-operatives generate not only bonding but also the more elusive bridging social capital. The open membership status of co-operatives supports participation in activities that extend beyond familial and close social networks. They need 'critical mass' to be successful, requiring the development of ties to, and connections with, numerous other networks and

41. Majee, W and Hoyt, A (2011:59) Cooperatives and community development: a perspective on the use of cooperatives in development. *Journal of Community Practice* 19(1):48-61.
42. Carr, S (2004) *Has service user participation made a difference to social care services?* Social Care Institute for Excellence. Available online: <http://www.scie.org.uk/publications/positionpapers/pp03.pdf>
43. Flourishing is a broader concept than well-being in that it 'includes the development of character and potential, and participation in community' (Liebling (2012:1) (see: http://www.insidetime.org/resources/Publications/Can-Humans-Flourish-in-Prison_PPT_Liebling_Lecture-29May12.pdf). 'That human persons are flourishing means that their lives are good, or worthwhile in the broadest sense' (Pogge 1999:333) in Liebling (2012).
44. Donati, P(2006) Understanding the human person from the standpoint of the relational sociology. *Memorandum* 11: 35-42 available online at: <http://www.fafich.ufmg.br/memorandum/a11/donati01.pdf>
45. Donati, P (2007) L'approccio relazionale al capitale sociale. *Sociologia e politiche sociali* 10 (1): 9-39.
46. Putnam, R (1995:664-665) Tuning in, tuning out: The strange disappearance of social capital in America. *Political Science and Politics* 28:664-683.
47. Putnam, R (2000:136) *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
48. Woolcock, M and Narayan D (2000) Social Capital: Implications for development theory, research and policy. *World Bank Research Observer* 15 (2):225-249.
49. Woolcock and Narayan (2000) see n. 48.
50. Majee and Hoyt (2010) see n.28.

structures. The bonding of small networks into a coherent multi-stakeholder co-operative structure 'creates an opportunity for members to gain access to bridging social capital that is not available to them as individuals or as small isolated networks'⁵¹. Thus, the distinct strength or contribution of mutuals and cooperatives resides in their capacity to create businesses, and thus employment structures, based on a mutual need, that can negotiate for resources and build connections to external groups⁵².

Desistance research has consistently emphasised the significance of not only the acquisition of capacities to govern and control the direction of one's life but opportunities to exercise those capacities. Involvement in 'generative activities' (that contribute to the well-being of others), such as mentoring, volunteering, or employment can support the development or internalisation of an alternative identity or shifts in one's sense of self.^{53 54 55} Engagement in generative activities has also been shown to ameliorate the effects of a stigmatised identity, re-establish a sense of self worth and, importantly, a sense of citizenship⁵⁶. This suggests that the process of desistance from crime is not solely a within-individual phenomenon but is also dependent on interactions between the individual and their relationships, their immediate environment, community and the social structure. As such, supporting the development of social capital⁵⁷, fostering connections between people and restoring relationships are key components in supporting desistance.

These are the very processes, practices and outcomes that mutual and social co-operative structures can support, and the very factors that are either suppressed by the repetitive routine and minimally stimulating environment of prison or knifed off as an effect of imprisonment⁵⁸. Mutual and social co-operatives thus represent a potential means through which individuals, networks and agencies can collaborate to support desistance and ameliorate some of the pains of imprisonment⁵⁹. The emphasis

on the centrality of reciprocal relationships and mutuality in supporting resettlement is the distinct contribution that co-operatives and mutuals have to offer to current approaches to supporting desistance and contributing to penal and public sector reform.

Concluding Observations

Mutual and social co-operatives not only provide training and employment opportunities within a supportive framework, but operate under a principled and legislative infrastructure through which serving and former prisoners can collaborate with other people, out-with the criminal justice arena, who can contribute the kinds of social

and economic resources which can support their desistance from crime^{60 61}. Mutual or social co-operatives can thus offer vital social support to individuals, contribute to the development of a more pro-social identity, increase levels of self-esteem, self-efficacy and provide a sense of purpose. Through the negotiation of mutual rights and responsibilities, mutual and social co-operatives can also promote

Mutual and social co-operatives thus represent a potential means through which individuals, networks and agencies can collaborate to support desistance and ameliorate some of the pains of imprisonment.

51. Majee and Hoyt (2011:57) see n. 41.

52. Ibid.

53. Uggen, C., Manza J., and Behrens, A. (2004) 'Less than the average citizen: Stigma, role transition and the civic reintegration of convicted felons' in Maruna S and Immarigeon R (eds) *After Crime and Punishment: Pathways to Offender Reintegration*. Willan Publishing: Cullompton, Devon.

54. Maruna S (2001) *Making Good: How Ex-Convicts Reform and Rebuild their Lives*. American Psychological Association Books, Washington, D.C.

55. Weaver, B (2012) The Relational Context of Desistance: Some Implications and Opportunities for Social Policy. *Social Policy and Administration* 46 (4).

56. Maruna, S and LeBel T. P. (2009) Strengths-based approaches to reentry: Extra mileage toward reintegration and destigmatization. *Japanese Journal of Sociological Criminology* 34: 58-80.

57. Farrall (2004) see n.23.

58. Armstrong and Weaver (forthcoming) Persistent punishment: Users views of short prison sentences. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*.

59. Sykes. G. M (1958) *The Society of Captives: A study of maximum security prison*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

60. Nicholson (2011) see n. 29.

61. Weaver (2011) see n. 17.

active citizenship⁶² and support the development of social capital.

While desistance may be one of the *ends* (or objectives) of the criminal justice system, for the would-be-desister desistance often seems to emerge rather as the *means* to actualising individuals' relational concerns, goals or aspirations with which continued offending is more or less incompatible⁶³. Increasing investment in these social relations and what these represent to an individual can trigger a reflexive evaluation of their current lifestyle against their shifting sense of self and what matters to them, reflecting this reorientation of their relational concerns⁶⁴. Critically desistance is, therefore, about more than reducing re-offending and promoting public protection; it is also about individual and collective flourishing. Nor is

supporting desistance the province of criminal justice processes and practices; the key message emerging from the research is that the process of desistance extends beyond professionally led practice, to what individuals and wider networks contribute in sustaining and supporting change. All of this implies the need to look beyond the practices and proclivities of the justice sector to find new ways to support people, communities and organisations to develop co-productive relationships and responses to the issues and challenges they face. In turn, this means re-configuring and renegotiating relationships between relevant stakeholders, premised on principles of reciprocity and mutuality, and in so doing harnessing each one's unique contributions and strengths⁶⁵. Social cooperatives and mutual structures offer one means of realising this.



Prison Service Library & Information Services

PSC Newbold Revel

Delivers a quality Library and Information Service to staff working in HM Prisons. Provides access to Prison Service related information to other organisations in the criminal justice system.

For further information:

Tel: 01788 804119

Fax: 01788 804114

Email: catherine.fell@hmps.gsi.gov.uk

62. There is no universally agreed definition of Active Citizenship. Crick (2002:2) argues that it represents a focus on 'the rights to be exercised as well as agreed responsibilities'. Activity in this sense is often associated with engagement in public services, volunteering and democratic participation. For further see Crick, B (2000) Education for Citizenship: The Citizenship Order. *Parliamentary Affairs* 55:488-504; Lister, R (2003) *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives* (2nd Ed) Basingstoke. Palgrave Macmillan.

63. Weaver (2012) see n. 55.

64. See also Vaughan B (2007) The Internal Narrative of Desistance. *British Journal of Criminology*. 47: 390-404.

65. Weaver (2011) see n. 17.