

Who owns desistance? A triad of agency enabling social structures in the desistance process

ALBERTSON, Katherine <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7708-1775>>, PHILLIPS, Jake <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7606-6423>>, FOWLER, Andrew <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-0164-9915>> and COLLINSON, Beth

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

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/27320/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

ALBERTSON, Katherine, PHILLIPS, Jake, FOWLER, Andrew and COLLINSON, Beth (2020). Who owns desistance? A triad of agency enabling social structures in the desistance process. *Theoretical Criminology: an international journal*.

Copyright and re-use policy

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

Who owns desistance? A triad of agency enabling social structures in the desistance process

Author A, Author B, Author C, Author D

Abstract

Theories of desistance assert agency is a prerequisite to the process which can be enabled or curtailed by social structures. We present data from six community hub sites that hosted probation services in the UK in 2019. While our analysis identifies agency enabling institutional and relational structures across the different hub governance sub-types in our sample, these were clearest in hubs run in the community by the community. This article contributes a triad of core enabling social structures that operate at the intersection between agency and structure in the desistance process. The significance of our findings is that the ownership question is key to the expedition of enabling social structures.

Key words: ownership of desistance; desistance; agency and structure in the desistance process; agency-desistance link; community hubs; agency and desistance; enabling social structures.

Introduction

In 2006, Maruna posed the question: "Who owns re-integration?" using Christie's (1997) 'conflicts as property' perspective. Maruna (2006) argues that if viewed as 'property', the ownership of re-integration has been "given over" to the formal criminal justice sector rather than being "located with its rightful owners - victims, offenders and communities" (Maruna, 2006: 24). Based on the data analysis presented in this article, we ultimately apply the same ownership question to the desistance process. Responding to the call to the discipline to "expand its collective imagination" (Paternoster, 2017: 225) our analysis illuminates how the "process of desistance, and the people who support it, extend beyond penal practices and practitioners" (Weaver, 2013: 193; see also: McNeil et al., 2012; Farrall, 2005; Farrall et al., 2010).

Understanding the agency-desistance connection is described as the "missing link" in desistance research (Laub and Sampson, 2003: 141; see also Carlsson, 2016). This is

important as agency is considered by some as the most important predictor of successful desistance (Maruna, 2004; LeBel et al., 2008; Liem and Richardson, 2014). We conceptualise agency in the desistance process as being as much an institutional and relational structural concept as an individual phenomenon (see Burkitt, 2016; Weaver, 2012; Farrall, 2005).

In this article we examine the link between desistance and agency in the context of community hubs. Community hubs are spaces in which a range of agencies are co-located to provide support services (Dominey, 2018). Community hubs operate with different governance models. Six governance sub-types are categorised by the third party status of the organisation providing the premises and defined as: community hub; hybrid hub; specialist hub; pop-up hub; co-location; and reporting centre (Gardner, 2016: 1). The nature of these sub-type governance structures range from: an independent community hub, e.g. Community Voluntary Sector (CVS) run premises providing space for probation appointments as a small part of a much wider existing generic local community support offer; to a reporting centre, although technically not a hub, the main premises are still provided by a third party, usually a police station or prison visitor's centre (Gardner, 2016). The remaining four sub-types range by the extent to which probation-run premises are used to host external agencies or vice versa.

This article begins by defining social structures and agency and considers how these concepts are currently conceptualised as interacting in the desistance literature. Our inductive data analysis is presented and the resulting triad detailed. The key implications of linking enabling social structures to the ownership question are detailed in the concluding sections. This article's contribution is threefold: extending understandings of institutional and relational structures that are agency enabling; providing a triad of core constituents of enabling social structures; and advocating for the addition of the ownership question to the growing recommendation that desistance interventions are informal (McNeill et al., 2012; McNeill, 2012).

Considering agency and structure in desistance

Conceptually complex and historically contested, contemporary definitions of social structure generally acknowledge at least two distinct types of structures exist (Lopez and Scott, 2000). These are: Institutional structures, defined largely in organisational terms as

embodying cultural or normative expectations of behaviour and: Relational structures, defined as the nature and quality of relational arrangements as patterns of interconnection and interdependence among agents (Lopez and Scott, 2000: 3-4). Desistance scholars have routinely focused on the socio-structural impacts at the individual level of family, employment and disconnection from criminal networks; however more meso and macro-level policy changes have received attention more recently (Farrall et al., 2010). Individual agency is defined as the capacity of an individual to act independently, make choices and exert influence over one's life (Hitlin and Elder 2007).

Early desistance theoretical frameworks offered contrasting conceptualisations of agency vs structural desistance actualising mechanisms, prioritising either internal or external triggers (e.g. Giordano et al., 2002; Laub and Sampson 2003). Since then however the relationship between structure and agency in relation to desistance has been explored in more detail. Desistance scholars have drawn on a range of social theorists who have attempted to bridge the agency structure divide, largely however these frameworks have focussed on the individual. For example, Vaughan (2007) draws on Archer's (1995) realist social theory to highlight the individual's negotiation between subjective concerns and structural opportunities and desistance, which are said to be realised through an internal reassessment conversation (Vaughan, 2007: 390). While attempting to compensate for the constraints in accounting for change in both Giddens (1984) and Bourdieu's (1997, 1990) models, Farrall et al., (2010: 553) however highlight Mouzelis' (2008) useful distinction between "formal institutional arrangements" and more informal "figurational" (relational) structures. Nevertheless, with regards to the subsequent discussion's relevance to desistance, these analyses prioritise the individual desistors' interpretation and navigation of the structural opportunities and impediments they face. This involves the individual 'situating' themselves differently towards structures than they have done previously (Farrall et al., 2010: 552-3).

By way of contrast, but still grounded at an individual agency level, King (2013: 323) draws on the relational sociological perspective of Emirbayer and Mische (1998) to argue the transformative potential of agency and structure interaction depends on the configuration of both institutional and relational structures. These mechanisms are argued to be defined by the "quality of engagement between the actor and their structural context" (King, 2013:

323). The implication is however that, should an individual's social context limit opportunities for projective agency (imaging possibilities of future self) and practical-evaluative agency (realistic assessment of goal realisation), the outcome will result in a repetition of past actions (iterative agency), as "new or alternative forms of social action appear to be unobtainable" (King, 2013: 329). Drawing on Donati's (2011) relational morphogenetic society thesis, Weaver (2015: 2016) rejects the preoccupation with the structure and agency debate, asserting it is the social relation which is the key unit of analysis to understanding the changes required to facilitate desistance.

Notwithstanding these significant developments, albeit from a difference stance, affective, developmental and psychoanalytical frameworks have also been drawn on by desistance scholars which reinforce the pertinence of relational structures in agency actualisation. Mutual recognition in desistance is well-established (Maruna, 2012), however Gadd's (2006) work highlights this recognition can be realised in an individuals' every-day relational encounters, despite apparent power imbalances. Farrall's (2005) application of existentialism demonstrates one participant's agency interacting with relational social structures supporting her desistance efforts. Gadd and Farrall's (2004: 131) interpretive psychosocial approach further highlights individual change as depending on "attachments to, certain social configurations...and on the corroborating experiences of recognition and empowerment". While highlighting multiple forms of selfhood complicate explicit accounts of desistance, Laws (2020) also identifies feelings of acceptance as an interactive bridge overriding previously experienced structural barriers. These findings mirror the acknowledgement of the complex role of emotions in the desistance process with specific regard to "the feelings experienced by a wider social network of people" (Farrall and Calverley, 2006: 129; see also: Hunter and Farrall, 2018; Farrall, 2005). Collectively, this work raises relationships as being key to agency actualisation for those with often limited access to enabling institutional and relational structures, particularly for those "in situations of extreme disadvantage" (Hunter and Farrall, 2018: 293).

It is therefore well established that desistance from crime involves an interaction between agency and the socio-structural context (Farrall and Bowling, 1999; Farrall and Calverley, 2006; Farrall et al, 2011). As demonstrated throughout this section however, theoretically and methodologically, accounts have focussed largely on how individual agency is utilised to

reflect and act upon given socio-structural opportunities to aid desistance. Further, while the actual and practical configuration of agency and structural interaction remains uncertain (King, 2012; Weaver, 2015), with particular regard to our ownership question, it would seem it is individuals who remain theorised as largely responsible for negotiating between structure and agency in their own desistance process. Thus far, it would appear that the "structure-agency coupling...generally fails to illuminate how structures shape decisions" (Weaver, 2012: 397). Ultimately, this literature can be said to have largely overlooked explicating institutional and relational social structures that "may be enabling" (Farral et al. 2010: 547), inadvertently buttressing existing power relations (Nugent and Barnes, 2013; Barry, 2016) by unintentionally conceptualising structural constraints as personal shortcomings (Healey, 2013). Our data analysis speaks directly to these omissions.

Method, sample and data analysis

The data presented here are drawn from a research project designed to identify the potential role of community hubs to [*Project title*] support desistance in England and Wales. The research was commissioned by [*Funder name*] and undertaken by the authors in 2019. The research design was approached from a desistance perspective, utilising McNeill et al.'s (2012: 2) eight principles of desistance-focussed practice to establish the ways in which practice in community hubs could be described as supporting them.

The fieldwork was conducted in a sample of six community hubs representing each of Gardner's (2016) hub governance sub-types. Data were generated in two primary ways: interviews with hub workers, responsible officers, strategic managers and service users; and observational data collection concentrated on the environment and layout of the hub, with a focus on identifying the interactional possibilities facilitated by the spaces encountered. Semi-structured interview schedules (SSIs) were specifically developed around seven areas to identify: 1) background of hub attendance 2) the extent of hub resources 3) users/workers experience of the hub 4) diversity and environmental issues 5) facilitators, barriers and good practice 6) impacts on relationships with responsible officers 7) individual evaluations of the service (and de-brief material). The SSI was adapted slightly to be relevant for each interview sub-group experience. Across the six sites, the research team conducted interviews with: 33 probation, Community Rehabilitation Company (CRC) and

wider hub staff; 37 current or previous probation service users; and seven regional strategic lead staff. The service user sample consisted of 21 male and 16 female respondents, with ages ranging between 23 to 63 years old, with 67% (n=25) aged between 20 and 40 years old and 33% (n=12) between 40 and 70 years old at the time of the interview. The majority, 86% (32) self-identified as British or white British and the remaining 14% (n=5) identified as Welsh (n=3), Black British (n=1) and Black Caribbean (n=1). Sentencing profile wise, 40% (n=15) identified this as being their first community sentence, 49% (n=18) identified as this not being their first community sentence, while 11% (n=4) did not supply this information. From within this breakdown, 24% (n=9) identified as having been released into probation from a custodial sentence within the last 2 years. All interviews were recorded and transcribed.

Observational data collection was undertaken over each of the three day-long site visits. An observational template was designed to ensure consistency, based on generating data regarding how the hubs function on a day-to-day basis. Rather than interviews, which shed light on what people say they do; observations allow the researcher to observe activity first-hand. Thus, the observation template sought to collect data to address a set of research sub-questions: 1) How do people use the physical environment provided in the hub? 2) How does the environment enable or inhibit desistance-informed practice? 3) Does – and if so how does – the hub meet the needs of a full range of service users? The observational template contained five sections prompting the recording of observations on the: 1) physical location of the hub; 2) external hub building; 3) physical space inside and how it is utilised by whom; 4) open notes page for photographs/ scanned leaflets 5) social capital building data collection ladder. The social capital building ladder was adapted from a social capital building model (AuthorA and [additional author], 2019), prompting recording of data regarding the extent to which the space and activities facilitated social capital building opportunities, ranging from 1 to 6. This prompted recording opportunities to: 1) visit the hub outside of probation appointments; 2) participate in hub awareness-raising activities; 3) participate in hub-based social events and group tasks; 4) engage in reciprocal and generative activities; 5) participate in wider local community events; 6) participate in formal civic, governance or decision-influencing settings. These data were typed up, stored and analysed alongside the interview data.

This original dataset was analysed with the eight principles of desistance-focused practice deployed as sensitising concepts. In order to ensure inter-rater reliability, the research team exchanged transcript sub groups. The findings were written up into a report for [*Funder name*] (AuthorB et al., 2020a) and a separate article highlighting principles of good practice (AuthorB et al., 2020b). In the course of the analysis and writing process it became clear that as institutional and relational structures hubs were particularly well placed to affect structural impediments to desistance at the nexus of community, society and the individual.

A theoretical framework identifying enabling social structures

Across the literature, successful desistance trajectories are largely presented as being conditional on the capacity of individual agency to develop pre-existing or creating new resources (Giordano et al., 2002; Maruna, 2001; Paternoster and Bushway, 2009; Hunter and Farrall, 2015; Bottoms and Shapland, 2011; Farrall et al., 2010). Nonetheless, little is known about how people on probation "marshal their personal resources to help them embark on meaningful and productive lives" (Healey, 2013: 557). Many of whom begin this process with already disproportionately depleted choices which arise from and contribute to a lack of access to enabling social structures (Farrall et al., 2010; Paternoster et al., 2015). These issues emphasise "unreconciled discrepancies between core theoretical accounts of desistance" (Paternoster et al. 2015: 210) and particularly the social structures that could support the process. This curtails our understanding of the potential of institutional and relational structures to advance agency-desistance progression requirements. This is where we began formulating our alternative approach to identifying enabling social structures and establishing the conditions from which these can be said to interact positively with individual agency with regard to supporting desistance trajectories.

Our approach to analysing the existing data was therefore designed to address a different, but specific research question: What institutional and relational structures can be identified as impacting on probation service users' agency-actualisation? We applied an interpretative inductive approach to the raw data in order to derive relevant themes (Thomas, 2006). This was a recursive process (Neeley and Dumas, 2016) and after several shared readings we began to identify the key structural mechanisms both explicitly and implicitly referred to as facilitating the agency and engagement of probation service users (Braun and Clarke, 2006;

Elo et al., 2014). From our inductive analysis, three core components were identified as structural mechanisms supporting service user agency in the provision of: sustainable resources service users could elect to access; a friendly, welcoming space in which they were received as members of the community first and foremost, in which a range of activity choices were made available to them; and as a resource that was open to the whole community. We then revisited existing desistance theories to identify what the key mechanisms involved in the agency-desistance actualisation process are, for a deductive comparison against our inducted data analysis findings (Bradley et al., 2007). Across the desistance theoretical frameworks, we similarly deduced the process as largely: an extended process; involving some form of severance from previously stigmatised identities; and as requiring some form of engagement in alternative pro-social relational structures. The results section below is structured around these three components: temporal facilitation; spatial facilitation; and relational facilitation (see full triad in figure 1). Pseudonyms are used to ensure respondent anonymity.

Findings triad component 1: Temporally sustainable support services

Sustained agency-desistance activation opportunities

Agency actualisation is described as the first key step into desistance trajectories, be that as "up front work" (Paternoster and Bushway, 2009: 1152) or "agentic moves" (Giordano et al., 2002: 992). It would therefore appear that the well-established empirical observation of a "temporal zig zag nature" (Farrall et al., 2010: 560; see also AuthorB, 2017) of desistance trajectories does not fit with the ownership of the desistance process residing with institutional structures whose interventions are time limited (Farrall et al., 2010).

The majority of our respondents had experience of traditional probation office appointments previous to accessing the hub. They reflected on this experience as "faltering on a pendulum of ambivalence" (Burnett, 2013: 169). For example, the first three months of Gina's probation appointments occurred in this formal institutional environment, where surviving the waiting room experience was her main priority. Below Gina's agency can be seen to have been impeded by this experience. Not engaging agency was her survival strategy, which once adopted could not be left behind when she was taken from the waiting room into her 1:1 probation appointment:

"The staff were behind glass...always banging on it and shouting...it was an intimidating environment...**I would be just trying not to make eye-contact...that carried on even when I was in the appointments**" (Gina, Probation service user).

"you've got to speak to them like if you go to a bank... Then they've got to buzz each other in. **I'm like 'hmm, no'**" (Philippa, Probation service user).

Many of our respondents reported these formal institutional and relational structures resulting in weak or delayed agency actualisation (Healy and O'Donnell 2008). However, having being subjected to the enabling informal institutional and relational structures within the community hub context was reported as meaningfully affecting their sense of agency:

"but what it's led to [attending the hub]... it enables me to turn my life back around to better than it was before, so it's been a kind of an opportunity" (Gina, Probation service user).

"Everything about this [hub] is perfect. The staff are so welcoming...you wouldn't think it was probation" (Philippa, Probation service user).

Individual agency was also identified as being stimulated when presented with a range of "more externally faced" (Burnett, 2013: 169) opportunities from which they could select to attend at the hub outside of their probation appointments:

"there's loads offered here. It empowers people to perhaps realise that they can do things...that they can use other skills, they can find out what they're good at" (Georgina, Probation service user).

"The main thing for me is getting out and about, not sat at home doing nothing, keeping myself occupied and active. With this it gives me a purpose" (John, Hub volunteer, ex-probationer).

As with Goodwin's (2020) desistors, our service users reported benefitting from the extended period of time the community hub model offered to allow agency-desistance processes to manifest:

"if they know where everything is and where they can go for support, particularly if their order finishes then they've already forged links with different agencies in the community. It's meeting their needs and meeting them where they are" (Jane, Senior Responsible Officer CRC).

INT: And how are you feeling now your probation has come to an end?

RESP: "It's a bit strange...a bit sad, but the door [to the hub] is always open if I need anything. I like the social feel. It's just kind of coming and being here was what I enjoy the most" (Gina, Probation service user).

Our findings thus add to an increasing body of evidence that the agency-desistance process is neither simple nor linear, suggesting that standard institutional and relational structures of criminal justice interventions lack temporal dimensionality. This further implies traditional provision may be misaligned for those who do not realise agency during criminal justice's "bundles of temporal and spatialised activities" (May and Thift, 2001, cited in Hunter and Farrall, 2015: 950). This places constraints on what can be achieved and highlights a direct tension with more desistance informed temporal concerns (Farrall et al., 2010; Maguire and Raynor, 2006). In short, 'enabling social structures' can provide temporal routines that are more amenable to the zig-zag trajectories of desistance theory frameworks. Enabling institutional and relational structures can therefore disrupt the criminal justice systems desistance-incongruent disciplines of time and concomitant ownership of the means of the agency-desistance process. The data presented here contributes to our understandings of temporal restraints on agency-desistance processes and provides some insight into how to address them.

Findings triad component 2: Spatially sensitive environments

Stigma avoiding spaces signalling different behavioural expectations and relational experiences

Across theories of desistance, spatial, situational and environmental issues are identified as highlighting the potential of experiencing different 'places' as safe spaces where service users can be enabled to: see their past behaviours as incongruent (Giordano, et al., 2002; Rocque, 2015); experience a crystallisation of discontent and recalculate a new world view (Maruna, 2001; Paternoster and Bushway, 2009); form relationships with pro-social others

and distance themselves from distractors (Paternoster and Bushway, 2009); access different routines and networks (Bottoms, 2014; Farrall et al., 2011; Farrall et al., 2014); and recognise 'place' rather as 'space', that is, as a location where opportunities to realise a different, but achievable future selves can be formulated (King, 2013a, 2103b). Distinguishing between the types of spaces in and through which meanings are generated overtly situates agency-desistance processes through service users deriving "a sense of belonging (or exclusion)" (Hunter and Farrall, 2015: 948).

In our data, these factors were primarily typified by descriptions of the different behavioural and relational expectations set up by the institutional and relational structures of a formal probation office being described as 'places', in direct contrast to experiences of community hub sites being described as 'spaces' (see Hunter and Farrall, 2015). Service users accessing the hub felt respected, valued and confident: "I have never seen anybody kicking off...I've never felt intimidated by anybody in here" (Adrian, Probation service user). The benefits of this space management ethos are explicitly identified by staff:

"If you invite someone in to a space and they are respected and valued and welcomed, the psychology would suggest that they will behave differently and they will be responsive to that" (Joan, Hub Manager Third Sector).

"I do think that's because they feel safe here. The whole ethos...is about breaking down the barriers...so that it's not us and them...and projecting that...everyone that comes here is a visitor, not a service user or client" (Sarah, Welcome Team Lead).

This impacted on probationers' relational expectations of more open, informal and equal relationships which enhanced retention and engagement behaviour:

"I think if they weren't...I probably wouldn't be so trusting...I'd probably be a bit more, 'oh, I don't want to talk to you about my business'" (Angela, Probation service user).

"It's not an atmosphere that you could come in and think, 'Oh God, I'm back here again, I don't want to do this'" (Dave, Volunteer, ex-probationer).

This spatially sensitive approach therefore set up different expectations of behaviour for service users, accommodating a more distinctly restorative interaction which could be

described as a threshold into liminal rites of transition (Van Gennep, [1908] 1960; Turner, 1969).

"you've been stood at the glass screen trying to get someone to hear...already wound up like a blooming spring...then to a room where it looks like you are an axe wielding maniac...It's almost a self-fulfilled prophecy. [Whereas in the hub] there's a very different approach that changes the whole dynamics" (Norman, Regional Strategic Responsibility CRC).

"We don't have a security team; we have a welcome team" (Thandie, Hub Women's Project Lead).

The stigma associated with an offending identity is described as invisible punishment (Travis, 2002), while opportunities for people on probation to access different institutional and relational structured spaces where stigma is avoided are limited (Jamieson, 1999; Skeggs, 2004). Our findings indicate that social structures directly addressing stigma enhance motivation to attend formal appointments: "It's not a big sign outside saying 'probation' basically" (Rory, Probation service user), thereby social structures operate to disassociate from an offending identity:

"[Usually] when you come in to probation it's so embarrassing, because of what you've done. You're walking around with your head down" (Philippa, Probation service user).

"I don't feel such a stigma coming here as I did going to the probation [office]" (Steve, Probation service user).

The data presented here is from the three of the six hubs in our sample that offered mixed provision, the other three delivered to probation service users only. This data demonstrates the potential of enabling social structures to provide meaningful places where stigma is minimised and behavioural expectations are strengths-based (AuthorA, 2015; AuthorA et al., 2015). This illustrates the benefits of spaces avoiding identifying probationers with the "behaviours we would rather they left behind" (McNeill and Maruna, 2007: 235). The data presented here contributes to our understandings of the spatial impact on the agency-desistance actualisation process and provides some insight into how to reflect these issues in delivery setting planning.

Findings triad component 3: A community-based relational milieu

Pro-social relational community membership, roles and identity opportunities

Decisions (for example, to desist) must be contextualised by the availability of the institutional and relational structural resources required to realise these decisions, as the circumstances in which people make decisions "may not enable them to live up to these decisions" (Farrall and Bowling, 1999: 260). Social reinforcement of and recognition of attempts to desist are identified as "critical features" often missing in probationers lives (Giordano, 2016: 22). Desistance can be a painfully socially isolating experience (Nugent and Schinkel, 2016; Farrall et al., 2010) as access to building social capital (Putnam, 2000) opportunities are often limited. Yet, the actual social structural mechanisms by which these issues can be addressed remain unclear in terms of any realistic proposals to link service users into wider relational contexts.

The benefits of addressing social isolation and access to informal pro-social capital building contexts are key findings of this study. Probation service users were linked into pro-social capital building opportunities via their interaction with the wider community:

INT: These activities, are they for people on probation or people not on probation?

RESP: A mix

INT: How did that feel?

RESP: It didn't make me feel any different to themselves really. I mean they don't pre-judge you or nothing like that. [I] made really good friends. From here I've been able to –it's broadened my support network...I can reach out to people and talk to them if I have a problem (Andrew, Probation service user).

These links were identified as occurring to a greater degree in hubs where membership is not restricted to probation service users only. Of the hub governance sub-types (Gardner, 2016) this mixed delivery ethos existed in half of the hubs, but was more explicitly championed by the independent CVS run and hybrid hubs. A reciprocally beneficial relationship was reported both for the probation and non-probation community hub members; members of both groups can often suffer from social isolation. For our probation service user participants, this provided motivation, hope and reassurance:

"[We have] some women who have never been anywhere near the criminal justice system, but they're quite isolated...what's lovely about that is that some of the younger, particularly more chaotic women [on probation orders], they absolutely love having those women in the group because it's like an older, female...mum type" (Thandie, Women's Hub Project Lead).

"I feel so low but then when I come here I'm thinking I'm not on my own...you see other normal [non-offending] people and you hear them talking and you're thinking well, it's not just me" (Philippa, Probation service user).

Being able to choose between two or more realistic possibilities is a key feature of agency. The multi-agency institutional structure of the hubs enables a large range of activities in which people on probation can choose to get involved or otherwise. This includes drama groups; craft workshops; creative writing clubs; walking groups; and allotment gardening groups. Such activities also provide opportunities to build social capital alongside reducing social isolation:

"you're going to like make friends and bond with people, like to have the support network of friends and stuff" (Sarah, Probation service user).

"there is always different things going on in here every day. They have trips where they go and do stuff out and about" (James, Probation service user).

Because the hubs institutional and relational structures operate to connect those with few existing resources into these activities, probation service users felt they were being provided with the opportunity to garner realistic every-day relational encounters within their community (see, Gadd, 2006):

"you've got people buying in to it and a sense of belonging - you can't buy those things can you? You can't buy a relationship. You can't buy trust. You can't buy all the things that you get from being visible in the community and just dropping in and becoming familiar with people. Relationships are key to it all" (Jane, Senior Probation Officer).

The impact of these opportunities for people on probation includes opportunities to engage in civic and generative roles via leading volunteer and service user groups in roles defined by representing their hub community:

"We have a service user led group...it's led by an ex service user that used to come here"
(Alison, Hub Manager, Third sector).

"I do voluntary work...we're building beds and growing vegetables and anyone can access...It's to keep myself busy...gives me something to do and something to get up for"
(Robert, Probation service user).

"I did the Away-Day so I went and talked to lots of people...about my experience" (Gina, Probation service user).

The data presented here contributes to our understandings of the interaction between structure and agency with regard to enabling institutional and relational structures and how they impact on agency-desistance progression. We demonstrate the potential of structures that are enabling to provide probation service users with realistic choices that are of value to them.

Overall, these three empirical component findings extend our current understandings of the links between agency and structurally facilitated dimensions of: temporality; meaningful utilisation of space; and realistic links into local community membership. Thus we highlight that theoretical frameworks focussing on individual agency activation lack consideration of the institutional and relational structures that can support the process. In other words, they cannot adequately account for the interdependency of the processes which have been presented here, resulting from the observed interplay of agentic and structural factors experienced by our respondents.

A triad of core components of agency-desistance-enabling social structures

Our triad evolved out of an analysis of qualitative data as an inductively generated framework of agency actualisation "consistent with the theory of crime and desistance" (Paternoster et al., 2015: 353). This led to the induction of key social structural features which lend themselves to the integration of agency and both institutional and relational

social structures. Our triad illustrates enabling social structures which provide access to sustained, anti-stigmatising spaces and contact with pro-social relational resources, as illustrated below:

Figure1: Triad of core components of enabling social structures

Desistance process link	Enabling social structures provide:	Identifying enabling social structures:
An extended zig-zag process that requires maintenance	Sustained opportunities and support Triad component 1 "Temporally sustainable services"	Do they provide temporally appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ongoing social and relational enabling contexts and activities; • sustainable routines that accommodate the reality of the zig-zag nature of agency-desistance processes?
Involving some form of severance from stigmatised identities, previous social networks and locations	Stigma avoiding spaces signalling different behavioural expectations and different relational experiences Triad component 2 "Spatially sensitive environment"	Do they offer spaces that provide: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • temporally stable, meaningful stigma avoiding environments; • a sense of communal belonging; • a safe space to view past behaviours as incongruent; • facilitation of the envisioning of alternative selves; • projective future orientation and intention pathways amenable to agency-desistance processes?
Requiring some form of access to resources/ environment to improve prospects for legitimate social and relationally agentic identities, blue-print roles and generation of intent choice opportunities	Pro-social relational community membership, roles and identity opportunities Triad component 3 "A community-based relational milieu"	Do they facilitate relational support of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • realistic and achievable pro-social identities and goal setting; • adopting community roles, civic and generative activities; • choices in which reflective and evaluative agentic decisions can occur; • activities to distance service users from distractors and address social isolation; • alternative community belonging amenable to agency-desistance processes?

Significantly, while our triad of components were evident throughout the community hub governance sub-types in the sample, they were most clearly identified in those sites located towards the independent community hub category (Gardner, 2016). This implication of this question of ownership is discussed further in the next section.

Discussion and conclusion

The wider literature advocates that desistance-informed interventions be directed at the communal, social and personal contexts in which people on probation are located (Farrall 2002; McCulloch, 2005; King, 2013a, 2013b). Yet there have been few examples proffered regarding alternative ways in which formal to informal social structures can effectively be realised, let alone how we can ensure ownership of the desistance process remains "with its rightful owners - victims, offenders and communities" (Maruna, 2006: 24). Our desistance-enabling social structure triad is grounded in desistance theory frameworks and developed around our key premise; that the provision of enabling institutional and relational structures in the communities within which people on probation reside will increase the prospect of agency being realised. Our findings demonstrate the potential for the structural facilitation of different institutional and relational experiences that are more consistent with spatial, situational and stigma avoidance theoretical frameworks. This contrasts with the maintenance of a system prioritising formal institutional demands over the agency-desistance needs of its service users. Our findings highlight how traditionally structured criminal justice reporting and reception behaviour expectations operate, in effect if not in intent, to reinforce and extend stigma, constituting a direct challenge to integration of agency and structure in the desistance process. These results are induced from primary data and motivate theoretical frameworks of desistance specifically incorporating structures that are enabling of desistance alongside issues of appropriate ownership. The findings of our study are in line with the increasing acknowledgement that "the process of change exists before, behind and beyond the intervention" (McNeill et al., 2012: 13).

The potential for enabling social structures providing spaces that dissociate people on probation with their offending past is illustrated by our findings. The data underline the meaning implicit in certain places to those engaged in the criminal justice system; these inherent meanings can underpin (or undermine) efforts to desist (Hunter and Farrall, 2015). Hubs, for example, do not quarantine probationers into places and activities clearly identified as being delivered to a stigmatised group. Our findings also highlight the potential of facilitating connections into agency-desistance supporting opportunities in the wider informal institutional and relational structural context, by illustrating the benefits of enabling opportunities for the formation of an identity through participating in a new

practice or community (Wenger, 1998). Our study illustrates a community delivery model example of enabling social structures that draws on and supports naturally occurring community processes (Farrall, 2004). This point is aligned with the argument that the process is not – indeed, cannot be – owned by professionals, but that informal enabling social structures have a role in facilitating spaces where "citizens, not professionals" are "the primary agents" (Maruna et al., 2006: 28). Ultimately, the contribution of this paper is that it informs innovative informal and parsimonious intervention designs, underpinned by the acknowledgment that:

"instead of agency resting on the reflexive monitoring of action or the reflexive deliberation on structurally defined choices, agency emerges from our emotional relatedness to others as social relations unfold across time and space" (Burkitt, 2016: 322).

Our triad identifies enabling institutional and relational structures which are consistent with desistance theoretical frameworks. Along the ownership/management range of community hub sub-types, from those being run by the CVS to those operated by criminal justice agencies (Gardner, 2016), the relevance of the ownership question was realised as a salient feature in our study. Enabling institutional and relational structures are identified as increasing the further away one moves from the criminal justice ownership sub-types. This observation can be explained by the application of the 'conflicts as property' perspective (Christie, 1997), which leads us back to this article's opening question: Who owns desistance? The conflicts as property perspective, seminal to the restorative justice movement, informs a critique of formal criminal justice owned procedures as institutional and relational structures that are distant to ordinary people's informal lives; resulting in victims, offenders and communities being "denied rights to full participation" (Christie, 1977: 3). Christie (1997) asserts that, where ownership is located within official justice institutional and architectural spaces two types of formal segmentation occur: 'spatial and caste' (Christie, 1977: 5). These categories describe a separation between formal and informal spaces and also people groups: Space-wise, segmentation is said to occur in terms of physical location and the architectural design in a formal setting; People-group-wise, segmentation is said to occur between formal experts and informal supporters, networks and communities, who are excluded from these institutional and relational structures. Our

study highlights that hubs delivered in the community by the community are temporally more appropriate as sustainable informal spaces and informal relations are important to probationers, whereas formal spaces and relations have "limited relevance" (Christie, 1977: 5; McNeill et al., 2012; McNeill, 2012). Further, if viewed from this 'conflicts as property' perspective, our triad highlights how informal enabling social structures can be realised appropriately within the communities in which probationers reside. In this way, our triad echoes Maruna's list of the principles of restorative re-entry (Maruna, 2006: 28- 31).

The acknowledgement of the 'conflicts as property' (Christie, 1997) perspective means less intrusive models of criminal justice intervention may be realised (e.g. see McNeill, 2018) as parsimony in the design and delivery of probation services are considered. This would involve sharing some of the control formal criminal justice structures hold over the timing, location and range of services it supports (AuthorB et al. 2020b; Weaver, 2012). From our findings we suggest that commissioning criminal justice services adopt a meso-broker role for probation services into agency-desistance opportunities (Dowden and Andrews, 2004; Nugent and Schinkel, 2016) as a strategy towards supporting informal institutional and relational structures that are meaningful to them. Our study has identified communally owned institutional and relational structures that are enabling in that they assist in making the agency-desistance process less like "an endurance test" (Nugent and Schinkel, 2016: 580) and more like a realistically grounded supported intervention for those on probation.

Funding statement

The author(s) disclose receipt of the following financial support for the original [funder] research project, entitled: [Title], which was undertaken by the authors in 2019. No additional financial support was received for the writing of this article.

References

Archer M (1995) *Realist social theory: The morphogenetic approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barry M (2016) On the cusp of recognition: Using critical theory to promote desistance among young offenders. *Theoretical Criminology* 20(1): 91-106.

Bazemore G and Stinchcomb J (2004) Involving Community through Service and Restorative Justice: Theory and Practice for a Civic Engagement Model of Re-entry, *Federal Probation* 68(2): 14–24.

Bottoms A (2014) Desistance from crime. In: Ashmore Z and Shuker R (eds) *Forensic practice in the community*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 271-293.

Bottoms A and Shapland J (2011) Steps towards desistance among male young adult recidivists. In: Farrall S, Sparks R Maruna S and Hough M (eds) *Escape routes: Contemporary perspectives on life after punishment*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 43-80.

Bottoms A and Shapland J (2016) Learning to desist in early adulthood. In: Shapland J, Farrall S and Bottoms, A (eds) *Global perspectives on desistance*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 99-125.

Bourdieu P (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Bradley EH, Curry LA and Devers KJ (2007) Qualitative data analysis for health services research: Developing taxonomy, themes, and theory, *Health services research* 42 (4): 1758-1772.

Braithwaite J (1999) Restorative justice: Assessing optimistic and pessimistic accounts. *Crime and justice* 25: 1-127.

Brandsen T and Honingh M (2016) Distinguishing different types of coproduction: A conceptual analysis based on the classical definitions. *Public Administration Review* 76(3): 427-435.

Braun V and Clarke V (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology* 3(2): 77-101.

Burkitt I (2016) Relational agency: Relational sociology, agency and interaction. *European Journal of Social Theory* 19(3): 322-339.

Burnett R (2013) To reoffend or not to reoffend? The ambivalence of convicted property offenders. In: Maruna S and Immarigeon R (eds) *After crime and punishment*. Cullumpton: Willan, pp.170-198.

Carlsson C (2016) Human agency, criminal careers and desistance. In: Shapland J, Farrall S and Bottoms, A (eds) *Global perspectives on desistance*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 44-65.

- Christie N (1977) Conflicts as property. *British journal of criminology* 17(1): 1–15.
- Dominey J (2018) *The Use of Community Hubs to Deliver Probation Supervision*. Available at: <https://www.cgsj.crim.cam.ac.uk/pdf/community-hubs> (accessed: 4 February 2020).
- Donati P (2011) Modernization and relational reflexivity. *International review of sociology* 21(1): 21-39.
- Dowden C and Andrews DA (2004) The importance of staff practice in delivering effective correctional treatment: A meta-analytic review of core correctional practice. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and comparative criminology* 48(2): 203-214.
- Elo S, Kääriäinen M, Kanste O, Pölkki T, Utriainen K and Kyngäs H (2014) Qualitative content analysis. *Sage Open* 4(1): 1-10.
- Emirbayer M and Mische A (1998) What is agency? *American journal of sociology* 103(4): 962-1023.
- Farrall S (2004) Social capital and offender reintegration: making probation desistance focused. In: Maruna, S and Immarigeion, S (eds) *After Crime and Punishment: pathways to offender reintegration*. Cullompton: Willan, pp.
- Farrall S (2002) *Rethinking What Works with Offenders: Probation. Social Context and Desistance from Crime*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Farrall S, Hunter B and Sharpe G (2014) *Criminal careers in transition: The social context of desistance from crime*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farrall S, Sharpe G Hunter B and Calverley A (2011) Theorizing structural and individual-level processes in desistance and persistence: Outlining an integrated perspective. *Australian and New Zealand journal of criminology* 44(2): 218-234.
- Farrall, S, Bottoms A and Shapland J (2010) Social structures and desistance from crime. *European journal of criminology* 7(6): 546-570.
- Farrall, S Godfrey B and Cox D (2009) The role of historically-embedded structures in processes of criminal reform: A structural criminology of desistance. *Theoretical criminology* 13(1): 79-104.
- Farrall S and Bowling B (1999) Structuration, human development and desistance from crime. *British journal of criminology* 39(2): 253-268.
- Fox KJ (2015) Theorizing community integration as desistance-promotion. *Criminal justice and behavior* 42(1): 82-94.
- Gadd D (2006) The role of recognition in the desistance process: A case analysis of a former far-right activist. *Theoretical criminology* 10(2): 179-202.
- Gardner T (2016) *Community Hub Strategy*. Working Links [unpublished policy document].
- Garland D (1996) The limits of the sovereign state: Strategies of Crime Control in Contemporary Society. *The British journal of criminology* 36(4): 445-471.

Giddens A (1979) Central problems in social theory: Action, structure, and contradiction in social analysis. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.

Giordano PC (2016) Mechanisms underlying the desistance process: reflections on a theory of cognitive transformation. In: Shapland J, Farrall S and Bottoms, A (eds) *Global perspectives on desistance*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 27-43.

Giordano PC, Cernkovich SA and Rudolph JL (2002) Gender, crime and desistance: Toward a theory of cognitive transformation. *American journal of sociology* 107(4): 990-1064.

Goodwin S (in press) 'Keeping busy' as agency in early desistance. *Criminology and criminal justice*.

Healy D (2013) Changing fate? Agency and the desistance process. *Theoretical Criminology* 17(4): 557-574.

Healy D and O'Donnell I (2008) Calling time on crime: Motivation, generativity and agency in Irish probationers. *Probation Journal* 55(1): 25-38.

Hitlin S and Elder Jr GH (2007) Time, self and the curiously abstract concept of agency. *Sociological theory* 25(2): 170-191.

Hunter B and Farrall S (2015) Space, place and desistance from drug use. *Oñati Socio-Legal Series*, 5(3): 945-968.

Jamieson J, McIvor G and Murray C (1999) *Understanding offending among young people*. Edinburgh: Stationery Office.

King S (2013a) *Desistance transitions and the impact of probation*. Abingdon: Routledge.

King S (2013b) Early desistance narratives: A qualitative analysis of probationers' transitions towards desistance. *Punishment and Society* 15(2): 147-165.

King S (2013c) Assisted desistance and experiences of probation supervision. *Probation journal* 60(2): 136-151.

King S (2013d) Transformative agency and desistance from crime. *Criminology and criminal justice* 13(3): 317-335.

Laws B (2020) Reimagining the self in criminology: Transcendence, unconscious states and the limits of narrative criminology. *Theoretical criminology*: 1362480620919102.

LeBel TP, Burnett R, Maruna S and Bushway S (2008) The 'chicken and egg' of subjective and social factors in desistance from crime. *European journal of criminology* 5(2): 131-159.

Laub JH and Sampson RJ (1993) Turning points in the life course: Why change matters to the study of crime. *Criminology* 31(3): 301-325.

Laub JH, Nagin DS and Sampson RJ (1998) Trajectories of change in criminal offending: Good marriages and the desistance process. *American sociological review*, pp. 225-238.

- Levenson J and Farrant F (2002) Unlocking potential: active citizenship and volunteering by prisoners. *Probation journal* 49(3): 195-204.
- Liem M and Richardson N (2014) The role of transformation narratives in desistance among released lifers. *Criminal justice and behavior* 41(6): 692–712.
- Lopez J and Scott J (2000) *Social Structure*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Mouzelis N (2008) *Modern and postmodern social theorising*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCulloch T (2005) Probation, social context and desistance: Retracing the relationship. *Probation journal* 52(1): 8-22.
- McNeill F (2018) *Pervasive Punishment; Masking sense of mass supervision*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing.
- McNeill F (2016) Desistance and criminal justice in Scotland. In: Croall H, Mooney G and Munro R (eds) *Crime, justice and society in Scotland*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 200-216.
- McNeill, F (2014) Three aspects of desistance. Discovering desistance: An ESRC Knowledge Exchange Project. Available at: <https://discoveringdesistance.home.blog/2014/05/23/three-aspects-of-desistance/> (accessed 20 August 2011).
- McNeill F (2006) A desistance paradigm for offender management. *Criminology and criminal justice*, 6(1): 39-62.
- McNeill F, Farrall S Lightowler C and Maruna S (2012) *How and why people stop offending: discovering desistance*. Insights evidence summary to support social services in Scotland.
- McNeill F and Maruna S (2007) Giving up and giving back: Desistance, generativity and social work with offenders. *Developments in social work with offenders* 48: 224-339.
- Maguire M and Raynor P (2006) How the resettlement of prisoners promotes desistance from crime: Or does it?. *Criminology and criminal Justice* 6(1): 19-38.
- Maruna S (2012) Elements of successful desistance signaling. *Criminology and public policy* 11: 73-85.
- Maruna S (2004) Desistance from crime and explanatory style: A new direction in the psychology of reform. *Journal of contemporary criminal justice*: 20(2), 184-200.
- Maruna S (2001) *Making good*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Maruna S and Mann R (2019) *Reconciling 'Desistance' and 'What Works'*. Manchester: HMI Probation.
- Maruna S (2006) Who owns resettlement? Towards restorative re-integration. *British journal of community justice* 4(2): 23-33.

Maruna S and LeBel TP (2012) The desistance paradigm in correctional practice: from programmes to lives. In: *Offender Supervision*. Devon: Willan, pp.91-114.

Maruna, S and Roy K (2007) Amputation or reconstruction? Notes on the concept of "knifing off" and desistance from crime. *Journal of contemporary criminal justice*, 23(1): 104-124.

Maruna S, Wilson L and Curran K (2006) Why God is often found behind bars: Prison conversions and the crisis of self-narrative. *Research in human development* 3(2-3): 161-184.

Mauer M (2003) *Invisible punishment: The collateral consequences of mass imprisonment*. New York: New Press.

May J and Thrift N (2001) Introduction. In: May J and Thrift N (eds) *Timespace*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 1-46.

Meijer S (2017) Rehabilitation as a positive obligation. *European journal of crime, criminal law and criminal justice* 25: 145-162.

Neeley TB and Dumas TL (2016) Unearned status gain: evidence from a global language mandate. *Academy of management journal* 59(1): 14-43.

Nugent B and Schinkel M (2016) The pains of desistance. *Criminology and criminal justice*, 16(5): 568-584.

Nugent B and Barnes P (2013) Desistance and young people: Includem's work with children and young people and the limitations of desistance theory. *Scottish justice matters* 1(2): 21-23.

Paternoster R (2017) Happenings, acts and actions: articulating the meaning and implications of human agency for criminology. *Journal of developmental and life-course criminology*, 3(4): 350-372.

Paternoster R, Bachman R, Bushway S, Kerrison E and O'Connell D (2015) Human agency and explanations of criminal desistance: Arguments for a rational choice theory. *Journal of developmental and life-course criminology* 1(3): 209-235.

Paternoster R and Bushway S (2009) Desistance and the "feared self": Toward an identity theory of criminal desistance. *The journal of criminal law and criminology*: 1103-1156.

Putnam, RD (2000) Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. In: *Culture and politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 223-234.

Rocque M (2015) The lost concept: The (re) emerging link between maturation and desistance from crime. *Criminology and criminal justice* 15(3): 340-360.

Rocque M (2017) *Desistance from crime: New advances in theory and research*. Berlin: Springer.

Sampson RJ and Laub JH (1993) Structural variations in juvenile court processing: Inequality, the underclass and social control. *Law and society review*: 285-311.

Skeggs B (2004) *Class, Self, Culture*. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Thomas DR (2006) A general inductive approach for analysing qualitative evaluation data. *American journal of evaluation* 27(2): 237-246.
- Travis J (2002) Invisible punishment: An instrument of social exclusion. In: Chesney-Lind M, Uggen C Manza J and Behrens A (eds) *Less than the average citizen: Stigma, Role Transition and the Civic Reintegration of Convicted Felons*.
- Turner V (1969) *Liminality and Communitas in The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. Chicago: Al line Publishing.
- van Gennep A ([1908] 1960) (translated by MB Vizedom and GL Caffee) *The Rites of Passage*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Vaughan B (2007) The internal narrative of desistance. *The British journal of criminology* 47(3): 390-404.
- Weaver B (2016) *Offending and desistance: The importance of social relations*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Weaver B (2012) The relational context of desistance: Some implications and opportunities for social policy. *Social policy and administration* 46(4): 395-412.
- Weaver B (2013) Desistance, reflexivity and relationality: a case study. *European journal of probation* 5(3): 71-88.
- Weaver B (2013) Co-producing desistance. *Understanding penal practice* 13: 193- 236.
- Wenger E (1998) *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.