



Evaluating Social Action for Rehabilitation

Khulisa Rehabilitation Social Action programmes

Executive Summary

July, 2015

Theo Gavrielides, Andriana Ntziadima & Ioanna Gouseti

Restorative Justice for All Publications

Kemp House, 152 City Road, London EC1V 2NX, United Kingdom

contact@rj4all.info

www.rj4all.info

Restorative Justice for All (RJ4All) is an international institute with an aim to create, increase and disseminate knowledge in the areas of restorative justice and alternative dispute resolution. The Institute challenges the restorative justice movement through ground breaking research and evaluation, and by bringing people together to network and exchange best practices.

Published in the UK by Restorative Justice for All Publications

© 2015 RJ4All

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

Database right RJ4All Publications (maker)

First published July 2015

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of IARS Publications, or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside of the scope of the above should be sent to IARS at the address above.

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

ISBN: 978-1-907641-32-9

Printed and designed in the UK by RJ4All

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The findings of this report are based on an independent evaluation that was carried out by qualified researchers using a mixture of quantitative and qualitative research. The quantitative research was carried out over a specified timeframe and with financial support from the Cabinet Office. The research was conducted between 1 November 2013 – 1 July 2015 (20 months).

During the research period, the Silence the Violence programme was delivered to **162 participants** in total. In particular:

- Seven cohorts attended the programme in HM Prison Forest Bank in Manchester, a Category B Male prison for adults and young offenders;
- Nine cohorts attended the programme in HMP & YOI Isis in London, a Category C prison, based for male offenders under the age of 25; from which two attended a 1-day intensive programme
- Five cohorts attended the programme in Wormwood Scrubs in London, a local category B prison for male offenders over the age of 21.

During the research period, Milestones was delivered to **61 offenders**, who were released from HMP & YOI Isis, HMP Winchester and HMP Forest Bank. An additional 45 offenders were mentored by partner organisations under contract to Khulisa¹. However, useable data was only secured for 40 Milestones participants giving us **a total final research sample of 194 participants**.

Programme	Population	Sample size
Silence the Violence	162	154
Milestones	106	40
Total	268	194

A triangulation of these findings was carried out through:

- Qualitative research that was carried out with financial support from Buckinghamshire New University and resources (in-kind and cash) from the Restorative Justice For All institute
- A review of the Ministry of Justice Data lab
- Control Groups that accessed with the support of the Prison National Offender Management Information System (p-NOMIS).

¹ Milestones were delivered to 45 offenders by Inside Out at HMP Wormwood Scrubs and by Footprints at HMP Winchester. Both organisations were contracted by Khulisa. Data from those interventions are not utilised in this study.

The initial hypotheses that we wanted to test were:

- ✓ H1. Offenders completing the Khulisa Social Action intervention programme (experimental group) exhibit **reduced rates of reconviction** compared to people who have not completed the Programme (control group)
- ✓ H2. Offenders who participated in the Khulisa Social Action intervention programme express **higher levels of self-confidence** after the completion of the programme, compared to the levels of self-confidence before their participation;
- ✓ H3. Offenders who participated in the Khulisa Social Action intervention programme express **higher levels of motivation for desistance** from crime after the completion of the programme, compared to the levels of motivation for desistance before their participation;
- ✓ H4. Offenders who participated in the Khulisa Social Action intervention programme **express higher levels of life satisfaction** after the completion of the programme, compared to the levels of life satisfaction their participation;

Our summary conclusions are broken into two groups reflecting the separate programmes making the Khulisa Social Action Rehabilitation intervention.

Conclusions for Silence the Violence (STV)

- ✓ It is established that participants' well-being improves on average, by approximately 0.6 points. The findings evidence that STV continued to be effective increasing significantly participants well-being. Participation in the programme improves participants well-being by 11.6%. There is correlation between the offence and the level of well-being post intervention. Serving time for property crime decreased the expected level of participants' well-being by .853 points in comparison to doing time for a violent crime. The effect is significant at $p < .05$. Consequently, we can infer that STV is more effective in increasing participants' well-being when the offence type is property related.
- ✓ Participants' aggression tendencies appear to decrease by 0.15 points after their participation in the programme. The effect is significant at $p < 0.01$. Participation in the programme reduces participants' aggression tendencies by 3%.
- ✓ STV is successful in addressing the key issues and needs of the participants as they have been identified by themselves.
- ✓ The majority of the STV participants feel that the programme has a positive impact on their well-being and their aggression tendencies both of which are related with reduction of the possibilities for future criminal behaviour and reconviction.
- ✓ STV is a highly innovative programme as it manages to engage participants through a variety of activities that are fun, interesting and appealing to them while at the same time offers them the opportunity to understand complex concepts around violence and their very own personal attitudes and behaviours. It combines educational,

inspirational and motivational elements with long term effects on participants' attitudes and behaviours.

- ✓ The programme is effective in creating the appropriate psychological space for opening up, sharing and connecting with others at the individual level as well as in creating the need to the participants "to break open" in order to help them to come to terms with their criminal act and move away from the so called criminal "self-labelling".
- ✓ Participants reported that the programme encouraged them to think about making amends as a process which involves certain stages and enables them to understand their specific concerns in relation to each stage and further improves their willingness and ability to apologise.
- ✓ Findings from the observations as well as quantitative findings allow us to infer that that the STV is effective in improving participants' self-confidence, self-belief and self –appreciation as well as their overall well-being.

Conclusions for Milestones

- ✓ The results ($t(7) = 4.28, p < .05$) indicate that participation in the Milestones programme has a positive impact on participants well-being, in that mid-intervention mean scores ($M = 4.32, SD = 0.33$) are significantly higher than pre-intervention scores ($M = 3.59, SD = 0.51$). In particular, well-being improves on average, by approximately 0.72 points.
- ✓ Participants' well-being continues improving until the completion of the programme. The results ($t(4) = 3.50, p < .05$) indicate that participation in the programme has a positive impact on participants well-being, in that post-intervention mean scores ($M = 4.65, SD = 0.16$) are significantly higher than mid-intervention scores ($M = 4.45, SD = 0.06$). In particular, well-being improves on average, by approximately 0.20 points accounting for a total improvement of approximately 17%.
- ✓ Participants' scores in all 10 areas of lives are improved on average by 2.1 points. The average increase is statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).
- ✓ The results ($t(4) = 9, p < .001$) indicate that participation in the programme has a positive impact on participants' ability to manage their lives outside prison, in that post-intervention mean scores ($M = 9.64, SD = 0.13$) are significantly higher than pre-intervention scores ($M = 7.46, SD = 0.8$). In particular, their ability in relation to life management improves on average, by approximately 3.6 points.
- ✓ Identification of accommodation, access to employment and access to future training are the three key priorities that participants would need high level of support as defined by them.
- ✓ Participants' scores in relation their employment status indicate a positive impact (e.g. access employment opportunities). The results are $t(4) = 4.49, p < .05$; in that

post-intervention mean scores (M=4.2) are significantly higher than pre-intervention scores (M=2.00).

- ✓ Participants' ability in relation to life management also improves by approximately 2.2 points (p. <0.01) compared to pre-intervention.

Overall conclusions and recidivism rates

It is our conclusion that the Khulisa Social Action intervention programme achieved its intended aims as these were aligned with the [Rehabilitation Social Action Fund](#) (RSAF) and priority no 4 i.e. creating stronger and safer communities. Bearing in mind the sampling caveats as well as the short timeframe within which our evaluation was carried out, a reduction of re-offending is indicated as well as an increase in well-being and attitudes. In particular, the results show that the proportion of Khulisa programme participants (7.6%) that were reconvicted following their release was **23.8% percentage points below that observed in the control group (31.4%)**. In comparison to the programmes studied by the Ministry of Justice Data Lab (the list can be accessed through the published Ministry of Justice reports), both Silence the Violence and Milestones (as a combined innovative approach) **score significantly high providing a 23.8% recidivism reduction**.

These findings highlight the effectiveness of both elements of the Khulisa programme as

- a comprehensive social action model that enables most of its participants to receive a holistic intervention looking at past experiences and needs
- a forward looking, Good Lives model that provides the tools and appropriate support that nurtures their individual talents and help them to re-integrate back to society.

It has to be noted that some of the original intentions of Khulisa were not achieved. Although its young offenders' model was indeed tested with adult offenders, this was achieved only in London and Bolton (as opposed to London, Hampshire and Bolton). The design was indeed tested with offenders on community as well as custodial sentences. However, the original intention of using RSAF to work with 180-270 offenders over 18 months (November 2013 – March 2015) was over-ambitious. Although this needs to be put within the context of a shifting institutional (e.g. two participating prisons were on reduced-staff "emergency" regimes), policy (the launch of the government's *Transforming Rehabilitation* strategy) and political climate (a general election) as well as a difficult financial environment, it is recommended that in future expectations are more modest.

It also has to be noted that the engagement of peer mentors who had already been through the programme bears evidence to the programme's social action contribution as well as its achievements in motivating civil society.

Our research was also able to cover some important gaps in the normative framework that we applied and in particular the Good Lives Model. The Khulisa programmes assume that we are all goal-influenced and seek certain 'goods' in our lives. Tapping into this need, the Khulisa programmes aim to nurture talents and through this achieve an increase in

psychological well-being. Our findings suggest that if offending behaviour is seen as an inappropriate or unskilled means of achieving primary 'human goods', then we can focus on creating the right internal or external conditions to work towards a positive or good life plan.

We can safely argue that Khulisa's two programmes helped the 195 offenders to achieve this, suggesting that the GLM operates in both a holistic and constructive manner in considering how offenders might identify and work towards a way of living that is likely to involve the goods we seek in life, as well as a positive way of living that does not involve or need crime.

The Khulisa programme as this is structured within the Good Lives Model works towards a positive, growth-oriented change in life where offenders work on the development of the values, skills and resources towards life based on human goods that is a necessary counter-balance of managing risk alone. Risk is managed as well as seeking to develop positive life alternatives, while using volunteers and civil society to achieve these objectives. It is recommended that the Khulisa Good Lives Model is replicated elsewhere both for adult and young offenders.

ABOUT THE RESTORATIVE JUSTICE FOR ALL INSTITUTE

Restorative Justice for all (RJ4All) is a UK-based international institute providing non-profit educational, research and training opportunities to victims, practitioners, users of the criminal justice system, policy makers, the media and the general public on restorative justice. RJ4All aims to increase awareness around restorative justice by providing free resources such as the e-library, the Internet Journal of Restorative Justice, projects and videos. It was founded by Professor Theo Gavrielides and it is jointly run with Professor Vasso Artinopoulou.

The aims of the Institute are to:

- **increase public awareness** of restorative justice and address misconceptions about its potential and pitfalls
- **carry out evaluations and research** on restorative justice and help build a stronger evidence base for further development
- **carry out information campaigns** in the interest of communities, victims and users of the justice system
- **challenge the restorative justice movement** and help build bridges between practitioners, policy makers and researchers
- **increase academic knowledge** and push the boundaries of restorative justice especially in the areas of domestic violence, sexual abuse and hate crimes
- **bring people together to network** and share best practice
- **make restorative justice more accessible** to junior researchers, students, practitioners, policy makers, the public and the media
- **disseminate** key events and news that are of international, regional and local interest
- **influence** international, regional and local policy, legislation and practice
- **provide** expert and independent advice on restorative justice.

RJ4All is a joint international initiative, which works with a number of associates from around the world to deliver its mission. **RJ4all is based on the non-profit principle of providing justice and education to all.** The key features of the RJ4All website are:

- the **Internet Journal of Restorative Justice (IJRJ)**, the free peer-reviewed e-journal publishing scientific papers on restorative justice
- the **free online library** with downloadable material on restorative justice including training manuals, conference presentations, research papers and book reviews
- **case studies** on restorative justice
- free **videos and audio** on restorative justice
- the EU funded "**Restorative Justice in Europe**" (RJE) project
- the **RJWiki** a free encyclopedia on restorative justice
- its ground breaking research and awareness raising **restorative justice projects**.