

# Research on Social Work Practice

## Developing and modelling complex social interventions: introducing the Connecting People Intervention

Journal:	<i>Research on Social Work Practice</i>
Manuscript ID:	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Invited Articles
Keywords:	intervention research, social capital, social networks, intervention modelling, mental health social work

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

Review

1  
2  
3 **Developing and modelling complex social interventions: introducing the Connecting**  
4  
5 **People Intervention**  
6  
7  
8

9 Martin Webber <sup>a</sup>, Hannah Reidy <sup>b</sup>, David Ansari <sup>c</sup>, Martin Stevens <sup>d</sup>, David Morris <sup>e</sup>  
10  
11

12  
13  
14 <sup>a</sup> University of York  
15

16 <sup>b</sup> University College London  
17

18 <sup>c</sup> University of Chicago  
19

20 <sup>d</sup> King's College London  
21

22 <sup>e</sup> University of Central Lancashire  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 **Correspondence:**  
28

29 Dr Martin Webber, Reader in Social Work, Department of Social Policy and Social Work,  
30 University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD, UK, [martin.webber@york.ac.uk](mailto:martin.webber@york.ac.uk), tel.  
31  
32 +44(0)1904 321203  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **Acknowledgments:**  
39

40 This paper presents independent research funded by the NIHR School for Social Care  
41 Research. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and not necessarily those  
42 of the NIHR School for Social Care Research or the Department of Health, NIHR or NHS.  
43 The authors would like to gratefully acknowledge the time given by the participants in this  
44 study and would like to thank their agencies for providing us with access to their expertise.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 **Keywords:** intervention research; social capital; social networks; intervention modelling;  
55  
56 mental health social work  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 **Developing and modelling complex social interventions: introducing the Connecting**  
4  
5 **People Intervention**  
6  
7

8  
9 **Abstract**  
10

11 **Objectives:** Modelling the processes involved in complex social interventions is important in  
12 social work practice as it facilitates their implementation and translation into different  
13 contexts. This paper reports the process of developing and modelling the Connecting People  
14 Intervention (CPI), a model of practice which supports people with mental health problems to  
15 enhance their social networks.  
16  
17

18 **Method:** The CPI model was developed through an iterative process of focus group  
19 discussions with practitioners and service users, and a two-stage Delphi Consultation with  
20 relevant experts.  
21  
22

23 **Results:** We discuss the intervention model and the processes it articulates to provide an  
24 example of the benefits of intervention modelling.  
25  
26

27 **Conclusions:** Intervention modelling provides a visual representation of the process and  
28 outcomes of an intervention which can assist practice development and lead to improved  
29 outcomes for service users.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The development and evaluation of complex social interventions in social work can be a  
4 lengthy process, particularly if conducted with a view to generating high-quality evidence of  
5 their effectiveness. The process is largely sequential, moving from one step to the next,  
6  
7 though with feedback loops at each stage to permit iteration (Webber, 2014).  
8  
9

10  
11 The process starts by identifying the need for the intervention from social  
12 epidemiology and practice-based research. In the case of the intervention being discussed in  
13 this paper, studies have identified that people with mental health problems have access to less  
14 social capital than the general population (Dutt & Webber, 2010; Song, 2011; Webber &  
15 Huxley, 2007). Social capital is a disputed notion which encompasses concepts such as trust,  
16 reciprocity, social networks and social norms, and has both cognitive and structural  
17 dimensions (see Halpern, 2005 for an overview). However, it is correlated with mental health  
18 (De Silva, McKenzie, Harpham, & Huttly, 2005; Nyqvist, Forsman, Giuntoli, & Cattan,  
19 2013); lowers the risk of depression (Fujiwara & Kawachi, 2008); and is associated with  
20 changes in quality of life for people with depression (Webber, Huxley, & Harris, 2011) and  
21 fewer experiences of discrimination (Webber et al., 2014).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Enhancing informal support networks and engaging people with mental health  
37 problems with their communities is key to enhancing their access to social capital. This has  
38 been recognised in the UK as a key role of the mental health social worker (Allen 2014).  
39  
40 However, as there is insufficient evidence of the effectiveness of interventions which support  
41 the social participation of people with mental health problems (Newlin, Morris, Howarth, &  
42 Webber, in press), we set out to develop the Connecting People Intervention (CPI) .  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Modelling the processes involved in complex social interventions facilitates their  
50 implementation by helping to clarify what practitioners are expected to do; assisting them to  
51 clearly articulate their practice to others; identifying how an intervention can lead to  
52 improved outcomes; and providing a framework for the measurement of fidelity. This paper  
53 focuses on the modelling component of the intervention development by drawing upon the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 practice wisdom of practitioners and the lived experience of service users (we acknowledge  
4 that this term is not universally used to describe people who social workers work with –  
5 ‘consumers’, ‘clients’ or ‘customers’ are preferred in many contexts – but it is the one most  
6 commonly used in mental health services in England where this study originated from). The  
7 processes we used to develop the intervention model will be described under ‘methods’  
8 below, and the processes involved in the CPI itself will then be discussed under ‘results’.

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 After modelling the intervention comes the pilot phase where the aim is to evaluate if  
17 it produces positive outcomes for service users (Webber, 2014). We piloted the CPI in a large  
18 quasi-experimental study in 14 agencies in England to help us to answer the question: “Does  
19 it work?” The findings of this study are currently being prepared for publication. If pilot data  
20 suggests that the intervention does not improve outcomes as hypothesised, studies could  
21 either be replicated to see if the findings were context-dependent; the intervention itself could  
22 be amended in view of the pilot data; or the intervention could be abandoned at this point as  
23 not being effective. However, if findings are positive, it is possible to progress to an  
24 evaluation of the intervention in routine practice settings, often using a randomised controlled  
25 trial. If there is evidence of its effectiveness at this point, it is possible to recommend its  
26 implementation in routine practice, though in reality implementation often happens earlier  
27 should an intervention appear promising (Webber, 2014).

## 45 **Methods**

46  
47 We harvested practice wisdom about potentially effective ways of supporting the social  
48 participation of people recovering from a mental health problem using semi-structured  
49 interviews, unstructured interviews, non-participant observation, participant observation and  
50 informal discussions in six health and social care agencies. Data were analysed as an iterative  
51 process throughout data collection using the constant comparative method in grounded theory  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) and the findings of this study have been reported elsewhere  
4  
5 (Webber, Reidy, Ansari, Stevens, & Morris, 2015).  
6

7 To develop the intervention model we held focus groups of workers (n=18) and  
8 service users (n=16) to discuss the themes which emerged at the end of each phase of data  
9 collection in the study. Seven of the workers who participated in focus groups had been  
10 involved in the original study, though none of the service users had. The socio-demographic  
11 profile of the participants (table 1) is broadly similar to those who participated in the original  
12 study.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 *Table 1 about here*  
22

23 Two focus groups of workers and two focus groups of service users were held at the  
24 end of the first phase of data collection. These helped us to ensure our data coding was  
25 accurate; discuss emerging findings; iteratively develop the intervention model; and check  
26 when data saturation was achieved. A fifth group discussion was held after the second phase  
27 of data collection to check the assumptions we made in the analysis process and to confirm  
28 the intervention model which emerged from previous group discussions and further data  
29 collection. Group discussions followed a semi-structured topic guide which was amended  
30 iteratively throughout the process as the intervention model developed. The groups typically  
31 lasted between 45 and 90 minutes, and alternated between groups with service users and  
32 groups with workers. The focus groups also assisted us to develop the accompanying practice  
33 guidance.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 On completion of the focus group process (when no further major modifications to the  
48 intervention model were suggested), we used the Delphi consultation method (Linstone &  
49 Turoff, 1975) to refine the intervention model; ensure that it was feasible in practice; and that  
50 it reflected processes implicit in Lin's (2001) social capital theory. Twelve people including  
51 those with mental health problems, practitioners and international social care and social  
52 capital experts were sent a draft of the intervention model and a structured self-complete  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 questionnaire. This comprised standardised ratings on the fidelity of the intervention to social  
4 capital theory and the likely feasibility and acceptability of the intervention in practice. We  
5 additionally asked for brief qualitative responses to these items to inform the refinement of  
6 the intervention model. Mean ratings on the standardised measures were calculated and  
7 informed the revision of the intervention model, supported by the qualitative feedback where  
8 appropriate. A second round of consultation using the same method was conducted after the  
9 intervention model was amended. The iterative consultation provided an opportunity for  
10 members of the reference group to re-evaluate their opinions in the light of the average  
11 ratings of the group.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 Ethical approval for the study was provided by the NW London NHS Research Ethics  
24 Committee 2 (ref. 10/H0720/48).  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 29 **Results**

### 30 *Connecting People Intervention model*

31  
32 The final model which emerged from the focus groups and refined in the Delphi consultation  
33 was dynamic and featured four intertwined domains – ‘agency’, ‘individual’, ‘practice’ and  
34 ‘worker’ (figure 1). The relationship of the worker and the service user is central to the  
35 model, though it is an evolving, mutual relationship which is not typical of traditional  
36 ‘clinician-patient’ roles. Conceived as spinning circles, the process requires a partnership  
37 where both circles revolve at a pace to suit both the worker and the service user. The circular  
38 motion also indicates that the intervention process is not a linear one where an outcome  
39 emerges predictably as a direct consequence of intervention. Instead, social networks are  
40 developed as a bi-product of this model, which is arguably sympathetic to Lin’s (2001)  
41 propositions. New relationships could form, mutuality be developed and the potential for  
42 reciprocity be created at any point in the intervention process. The circles are represented as  
43 Catherine wheels, with sparks flying off in all directions representing the unpredictability of  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 when, or if, social networks are enhanced. However, barriers to social network development  
4  
5 were prominent in the data collected and were represented on the model as two counter-  
6  
7 rotating circles which frustrate the motion of the two main circles.  
8

9  
10 *Figure 1 about here*

11  
12 The model is centred around the partnership of a worker and a service user within an  
13  
14 agency. It is based upon the principles of co-production. Rather than a worker ‘doing’ and an  
15  
16 service user ‘receiving’, workers and service users co-create the objectives and actions within  
17  
18 the model together. This means that the model represents a shared journey of discovery with  
19  
20 inputs being invested and outcomes being produced for both the worker and the service user.  
21  
22

### 23 24 25 *Social work agency*

26  
27 The agency in which the intervention occurs – whether this is a statutory service, a voluntary  
28  
29 or private sector organisation, a social enterprise, or something else – is really crucial. It is  
30  
31 depicted on the model as underpinning and running up through the middle of the intervention.  
32  
33 This demonstrates the responsibility of the agency to support the rest of the process; without  
34  
35 a supportive agency, it is much harder for the rest of the intervention to run smoothly.  
36  
37

38  
39 There are a number of features that are typical of an agency where the intervention  
40  
41 works well. These include a modelling of good practice; skill sharing; community  
42  
43 engagement and good local knowledge. This means that the agency will have a strong  
44  
45 knowledge of local assets and the social networks available in the community it serves,  
46  
47 outside of the health, social care and wellbeing services.  
48

49  
50 The agency can provide a physical environment which facilitates social connections  
51  
52 but, more importantly, can provide useful links with local geographical and interest  
53  
54 communities which workers may not have independently. The agency is depicted in this  
55  
56 model as running up through the centre of the intervention. This demonstrates how the shared  
57  
58 knowledge of the local community and the intervention model held by the agency can prevent  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 interventions failing when workers leave. Agencies can help to reduce reliance on individual  
4  
5 workers, who may be the only ones to hold connections within the local community, by  
6  
7 taking collective responsibility for these connections. The agency is key to holding the  
8  
9 structure of the intervention together.  
10

#### 11 12 13 14 *Partnership of worker and individual*

15  
16 At the top of the model are some pre-requisites which need to be in place before the  
17  
18 intervention cycle can start moving forward. The worker needs to have empathy, a ‘can do’  
19  
20 attitude and be a skilled networker, while the person they are working with needs to have  
21  
22 some enthusiasm for engaging in this process and taking ownership over it. Together, the  
23  
24 worker and service user work in partnership which ideally needs to be as equal a relationship  
25  
26 as possible. Both need to see what they can gain from the other, and what they can give back  
27  
28 in order to ensure that the intervention process is a success. Qualities within this partnership  
29  
30 also include the shared attributes of confidence; flexibility; lived experience or a  
31  
32 comprehensive understanding of the client group in which they are working; openness; hope;  
33  
34 and trust.  
35  
36

37  
38 The importance of this partnership is clear throughout the model. The circle on the  
39  
40 left of figure 1, which represents the worker’s journey during the intervention, and the circle  
41  
42 on the right, which represents the journey of the service user, overlap to symbolise that they  
43  
44 are constantly intertwined and interdependent. We have used these two interlocking circles to  
45  
46 represent the fluidity of the process and the uncertainty about when, or if, social network  
47  
48 development will occur.  
49

50  
51 The goal of the intervention is to get these two circles moving in tandem, working  
52  
53 with each other to move the service user forward. It is down to a strong partnership to ensure  
54  
55 that the worker can maintain a good relationship with the service user, and support them to  
56  
57 continue moving forward into roles, relationships and networks beyond the service. The  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 partnership is evident in the shared processes that occur during the intervention. This is  
4 represented by the square in the middle which is the true heart of the model because it  
5 represents the co-produced activities. When the worker and service user meet for the first  
6 time in the context of this model, they explore the life goals of the service user and they  
7 develop a realistic strategy together to help him or her to achieve these.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 The activities which the worker and the service user agree to undertake together may  
15 be in the context of what the agency provides or it may be additional to that. Some  
16 underpinning elements of these activities may include network and asset assessment;  
17 objective development; and inspiration (where the worker talks about new ideas or helps the  
18 individual to develop their existing ones). When the plan for engaging in new activities and  
19 networks is made, the worker's role is to facilitate the service user's engagement with it. The  
20 worker needs to know, or find out, what resources or facilities are available to assist the  
21 service user to achieve their goal, so they can sign-post or support them to engage with them  
22 as appropriate. However, the intervention process relies on both the service user and the  
23 worker fulfilling their side of the partnership to keep the circles spinning. This might involve  
24 activities for the worker to engage in to develop their knowledge of the networks available  
25 for the service user. Finally, the shared processes of skill recognition and feedback provide  
26 individuals with the encouragement to build upon and share their strengths and assets.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

#### 45 *The service user's process*

46  
47 The circle on the right of figure 1 represents the process a service user undertakes which can  
48 lead to social network development. We expect every instance to be different, but in general  
49 the process involves catalysing ideas and experiences. This is where the person is exposed to  
50 new ideas and activities, or has their existing ones encouraged and developed. This process  
51 may introduce them to new people and activities, further develop their skills and interests and  
52 enhance their social confidence. An ultimate goal of this process is to develop networks with  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 new people and organisations which enhances that person's access to social capital. As the  
4  
5 service user gains ownership over this process, it could be referred to as them 'building  
6  
7 currency'. We have deliberately omitted any details about what the service user and worker  
8  
9 might do within this process as it is up to them to co-produce the activities. However, our  
10  
11 research findings (Webber et al., 2015) suggest that social network development may occur at  
12  
13 any point in this process.  
14  
15

16 A key point to note is that the service user is free to leave and re-enter the intervention  
17  
18 process as they want and need to. They may go away and come back at a different stage in  
19  
20 their process of recovery, or as they develop more confidence in their ability to form  
21  
22 relationships and links beyond services. They may even choose to re-engage with a different  
23  
24 organisation. The agency and worker need to be supportive of this in order to make sure that  
25  
26 when the person is moving through the intervention they want to be there.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 *The worker's process*

33  
34 The process the worker follows, represented by the circle on the left of the model, is equally  
35  
36 as important in the intervention process as the service user's. This assumes that the worker  
37  
38 will need to develop their own social network knowledge in order to support the service user  
39  
40 on their journey. Workers will need to build relationships with the person and often their  
41  
42 family, friends and local community, as well as with other local organisations. They will need  
43  
44 to foster trust through their reliability and interpersonal skills; identify opportunities; engage  
45  
46 with the individual's local community; develop their own networks and resources and  
47  
48 remember these for future use; adapt to new ideas; and utilise their contacts in the process of  
49  
50 supporting the person they are working with. It is important that the worker can think  
51  
52 creatively and use their resources effectively in order for them to keep their part of the  
53  
54 intervention process moving. At any point, they may need to provide extra support or reassess  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 their involvement, while the person they are working with may also need to seek advice from  
4  
5 them and develop their own self-awareness of their journey.  
6  
7

### 8 9 *Barriers*

10 A prominent finding from the study was that even if the worker does everything that they  
11  
12 could, and the service user completes their part of the process successfully, there could still  
13  
14 be things that frustrate social network development. The possible barriers are represented as  
15  
16 smaller circles that turn against the journeys of the individual and the worker. They are not  
17  
18 necessarily internal to the service user or the worker themselves, but all have the common  
19  
20 factor of working in the opposite direction to the intervention cycle, and so potentially posing  
21  
22 considerable challenges.  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 For the service user, these barriers may include self-stigma or discrimination from  
28  
29 their families or wider communities. Some minority groups may face barriers due to a lack of  
30  
31 culturally appropriate services or networks, or may find it difficult to engage with mainstream  
32  
33 services which may not be suitable for their needs. Some people may experience physical  
34  
35 health problems, complicated external lives or unhelpful attitudes within themselves or the  
36  
37 organisation providing the context for the intervention. Others may be connected to people  
38  
39 who are not conducive to their recovery, have insufficient information about services  
40  
41 available, or experience poor access to services, for example. These barriers will present the  
42  
43 worker with a number of challenges, and are likely to be the most time-consuming element of  
44  
45 their work. They need to be tackled and overcome in order for the intervention cycle to  
46  
47 progress.  
48  
49  
50

51 The worker may also face barriers. These may include a lack of local knowledge, and  
52  
53 insufficient time or resources to engage with existing networks or agencies, which prevents  
54  
55 them from making new connections. Inefficient or bureaucratic procedures can compromise  
56  
57 their ability to develop relationships with a service user and their wider communities.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 However, the attitudes of the agency, the worker and the local community can be one of the  
4 largest barriers faced. The 'can-do' mentality mentioned above is crucial in order for workers  
5 to be able to overcome this.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 *Outcomes*

12  
13 Our findings suggest that when these systems and processes occur, and the intervention  
14 process moves in the dynamic way that is seen in the model, the outcomes will include an  
15 enhancement in the individual's social network, thereby increasing their access to social  
16 capital. In addition, the service user may experience an increased social confidence and  
17 participate in more social activities, which may also improve their wellbeing. These activities  
18 are ideally activities based on shared interests within the local community rather than being  
19 confined to health or social care services. The person may also deepen their existing  
20 relationships, more closely align their activities to their talents, and increase their own  
21 contribution to the lives of others. Additionally, the worker may develop their community  
22 knowledge and improve the ways that they network and interact with others.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 The intervention model is not a prescriptive and linear process. The nature of social  
37 network development means that it can be quite spontaneous and occur at any time during the  
38 intervention. The CPI model brings together the factors which our findings suggest are  
39 necessary to help make it happen.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 **Discussion**

48  
49 The CPI model articulates the processes involved in working with someone to enhance their  
50 social networks. Although informed by social capital theory (Lin, 2001), the CPI model has  
51 synergies with other models and theories which social workers draw upon in their practice.  
52 For example, the asset-based approach of the CPI model is not dissimilar from Rapp's (1998)  
53 Strengths Model. It starts with what the service can do and builds upon that whilst focusing  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 on what they can bring to the process. Additionally, systems theory, whose social work  
4  
5 origins can be attributed to Forder (1976), reminds practitioners of the networked nature of  
6  
7 our lives and the importance of engaging with systems and networks to support an individual  
8  
9 or family.

10  
11 Beyond social work, asset-based community development (Kretzmann & McKnight,  
12  
13 1993), which involves a community identifying and mobilising its own assets to solve  
14  
15 problems without the intervention of external agencies, uses some similar techniques. Also,  
16  
17 the RSA Connected Communities programme (Rowson, Broome, & Jones, 2010) uses  
18  
19 network mapping techniques to map a community's connections which can be mobilised for  
20  
21 specific purposes.  
22  
23

24  
25 The CPI model can also work in peer support services. People could move from the  
26  
27 circle on the right to the one on the left (see figure 1) as they become peer support workers,  
28  
29 for example. Sometimes the two circles could be inter-changeable, as in the case of a user-run  
30  
31 social enterprise which was supported to develop by one of the agencies participating in this  
32  
33 study. This small social enterprise provides peer support and mobilises community assets to  
34  
35 provide opportunities for people to develop their skills, knowledge and access to social  
36  
37 capital via new and emerging social networks. Additionally, it is conceivable that the service  
38  
39 user's circle on the right could spin off the page to join other circles beyond the model. This  
40  
41 represents someone moving on from the service and developing their own networks which  
42  
43 support them so that they no longer require social work involvement.  
44  
45

46  
47 The model is complex, which can lead some practitioners to misunderstand how it  
48  
49 works. Although the accompanying practice guidance illustrates the components of the  
50  
51 models using case studies, its complexity can deter some from using it. Also, it is not  
52  
53 prescriptive about what the practitioner should do at each stage of the process as it relies upon  
54  
55 their professional judgement. Many standardised interventions clearly state what has to be  
56  
57 undertaken on a session by session basis whereas the CPI starts and builds upon a service  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 user's strengths to help to enhance their social connections. The co-production and shared  
4  
5 decision-making in this model may be difficult for some practitioners to work with. However,  
6  
7 the training accompanying the CPI model enables practitioners to understand their existing  
8  
9 practice within the context of the model, therefore acting as a professional development tool.  
10

11  
12 The modelling and articulation of the processes involved in connecting people permits  
13  
14 replication and measuring fidelity to the intervention. Additionally, the CPI features generic  
15  
16 processes which can apply in social work with other isolated people, although further  
17  
18 research is required to evaluate this. Should pilot findings show positive results, further  
19  
20 experimental evaluation may help the model to provide an evidence-based framework for  
21  
22 mental health social work, which occasionally struggles to define its unique contribution to  
23  
24 mental health services in England (Nathan & Webber, 2010). Finally, making the processes  
25  
26 involved in connecting people explicit may help the CPI model to be sensitively translated  
27  
28 into different socio-economic and cultural contexts.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 **References**

35  
36  
37  
38 De Silva, M. J., McKenzie, K., Harpham, T., & Huttly, S. R. A. (2005). Social capital and  
39  
40 mental illness: a systematic review. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 59*,  
41  
42 619-627.

43  
44  
45 Dutt, K., & Webber, M. (2010). Access to social capital and social support amongst South  
46  
47 East Asian women with severe mental health problems: a cross-sectional survey.  
48  
49 *International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 56* 593-605.

50  
51  
52 Forder, A. (1976). Social Work and System Theory. *British Journal of Social Work, 6*, 23-42.

53  
54  
55 Fujiwara, T., & Kawachi, I. (2008). A prospective study of individual-level social capital and  
56  
57 major depression in the United States. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 62*,  
58  
59 627-633.  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for*  
4 *qualitative research*. New York: Aldine.  
5  
6  
7 Halpern, D. (2005). *Social Capital*. Cambridge: Polity Press.  
8  
9  
10 Kretzmann, J., & McKnight, J. (1993). *Building communities from the inside out: A path*  
11 *toward finding and mobilizing a community's assets*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.  
12  
13  
14 Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital. A theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge:  
15 Cambridge University Press.  
16  
17  
18 Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (1975). *The Delphi method: techniques and applications*.  
19 Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.  
20  
21  
22 Nathan, J., & Webber, M. (2010). Mental health social work and the bureau-medicalisation of  
23 mental health care: Identity in a changing world. *Journal of Social Work Practice*, 24, 15-28.  
24  
25  
26 Newlin, M., Morris, D., Howarth, S., & Webber, M. (in press). Social participation  
27 interventions for adults with mental health problems: A review and narrative synthesis. *Social*  
28 *Work Research*.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 Nyqvist, F., Forsman, A. K., Giuntoli, G., & Cattan, M. (2013). Social capital as a resource  
35 for mental well-being in older people: A systematic review. *Aging & Mental Health*, 17, 394-  
36 410.  
37  
38  
39  
40 Rapp, C. (1998). *The Strengths Model: Case Management with People Suffering from Severe*  
41 *and Persistent Mental Illness*. New York: Oxford University Press.  
42  
43  
44  
45 Rowson, J., Broome, S., & Jones, A. (2010). *Connected communities. How social networks*  
46 *power and sustain the Big Society*. London: RSA.  
47  
48  
49  
50 Song, L. (2011). Social capital and psychological distress. *Journal of Health and Social*  
51 *Behavior*, 52, 478-492.  
52  
53  
54 Webber, M. (2014). From ethnography to randomised controlled trial: An innovative  
55 approach to developing complex social interventions. *Journal of Evidence-Based Social*  
56 *Work*, 11, 173-182.  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 Webber, M., Corker, E., Hamilton, S., Weeks, C., Pinfold, V., Rose, D., . . . Henderson, C.  
4  
5 (2014). Discrimination against people with severe mental illness and their access to social  
6  
7 capital: findings from the Viewpoint survey. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, *23*,  
8  
9 155-165.

10  
11 Webber, M., & Huxley, P. (2007). Measuring access to social capital: The validity and  
12  
13 reliability of the Resource Generator-UK and its association with common mental disorder.  
14  
15 *Social Science and Medicine*, *65* 481-492.

16  
17  
18 Webber, M., Huxley, P., & Harris, T. (2011). Social capital and the course of depression: six-  
19  
20 month prospective cohort study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *129* 149-157.

21  
22  
23 Webber, M., Reidy, H., Ansari, D., Stevens, M., & Morris, D. (2015). Enhancing social  
24  
25 networks: a qualitative study of health and social care practice in UK mental health services.  
26  
27 *Health and Social Care in the Community*, *23*, 180-189.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60


Table 1 Socio-demographic characteristics of focus group participants

	<b>Workers</b> n=18 (%)	<b>Service users</b> n=16 (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	6 (33.3)	9 (56.3)
Female	12 (66.6)	7 (43.8)
<b>Age (in years)</b>		
<29	6 (33.3)	8 (50.0)
30-49	6 (33.3)	6 (37.5)
>50	5 (27.8)	1 (6.3)
Not given	1 (5.6)	1 (6.3)
<b>Ethnic group</b>		
White British	9 (50.0)	10 (62.5)
Other white ethnicity	5 (27.8)	2 (12.5)
Asian / Asian British	0 (0)	1 (6.3)
Black / Black British	2 (11.1)	0 (0)
Other ethnicity	1 (5.6)	1 (6.3)
Not given	1 (5.6)	2 (12.5)
<b>Worker role</b>		
Manager / team leader	2 (11.1)	
Support worker	4 (22.2)	

Social worker	1 (5.6)
Social work student	1 (5.6)
Occupational therapist	3 (16.7)
Clinical Psychologist	3 (16.7)
Consultant Psychiatrist	1 (5.6)
Other workers (e.g. health and wellbeing worker)	3 (16.7)

For Peer Review

Figure 1 Connecting People Intervention Model



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