



CRIMINAL JUSTICE SOCIAL WORK  
DEVELOPMENT CENTRE *for* SCOTLAND

*CJSW Briefing*

*Paper 11: April 2008*

## **Supported Accommodation Services for Offenders: A Research Literature Review**

Steve Kirkwood and Tim Richley  
Sacro\*

### **Introduction**

This paper examines the links between homelessness and offending and provides a description of supported accommodation services provided by Sacro for offenders in Scotland and a summary of some of the main findings from research on the impact of supported accommodation for offenders. Finally, the paper identifies a set of ‘critical issues’ for the consideration of practitioners that arise from the research and which may hinder the ability of the ex-offender to ‘move on’. These critical issues are: the financial insecurity of many offenders; the relevance of family breakdown; multiple deprivation; overdependence; the negative effects of hostel accommodation; and offender diversity. These issues highlight the need for more research to explore the short and long-term effectiveness of supported accommodation services in Scotland, taking into account different models of service provision, the individual circumstances of homeless ex-offenders and the social and economic contexts of their lives.

### **Context**

The notion that imprisoned offenders will or may require some form of support to reintegrate into society on their release from prison has been around for many years (Bain, 2004). Given that offenders often have needs that underlie their offending behaviour (see McNeill & Whyte, 2007; Social Exclusion Unit, 2002), it is our contention that offenders benefit from “support” in relation to the normal variety of skills required to live and function independently within the community. Sacro, and a number of other agencies, have been providing a range of models of supported accommodation for offenders for over thirty years. This paper explores some of the literature on the links between homelessness<sup>1</sup>, offending and imprisonment and some of the available research on the effectiveness of supported accommodation.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this paper “homelessness” relates to a lack of place of residence which is deemed suitable by those responsible for the management of the particular offender. More detailed definitions of “homelessness” can be found at <http://scotland.shelter.org.uk/advice/advice-2420.cfm>

A large variety of offenders are considered by Sacro to be suitable for supported accommodation. Offenders can be supported within a range of different types of accommodation. The Scottish Government (2007) has outlined the standards that supported accommodation services should meet, the different forms they can take and the principles by which they should operate. In relation to supported accommodation models, Sacro currently deliver the following:

- **Multi occupancy units** – currently are used widely in England and Wales but much less so in Scotland. This form of accommodation is attractive to funders and service users because the units often offer the facility to allow service users to be placed quickly, often on the same day as referral. There are however some operational issues regarding this model of supported accommodation for offenders which include: high cost (due to staffing requirements and up keeping of large residential premises), and difficulty for ex-offenders to avoid becoming re-immersed in deviant behaviour due to close proximity to others with an offending background.
- **Two bedded units** – accommodation tends to be provided in two-bedroom flats where offenders will live and have support workers available to assist them with their community reintegration. These support workers are non residential and can support a number of offenders and properties. Sacro's experience is that two bedded properties are well suited as a first stepping stone for offenders coming out of custody, often after long sentences, and prior to moving to an environment where they are able to live on their own.
- **Individual units** – where offenders can receive levels of support, and monitoring if required, based on their level of need and risk. Within this type of supported accommodation there are a number of different models which can be delivered and tailored to suit both the offender's profile and needs and funder requirements. This model offers the service user the opportunity to demonstrate their ability to work towards independent living whilst still having the support and monitoring intervention present. In some cases Sacro would be the tenant of the property with a view to transferring the tenancy to the offender once it is assessed as being appropriate to do so. In other models Sacro would act as a reference in relation to supporting an offender's application for a permanent tenancy of their own.
- **Floating Support** – This model provides a flexible support service wherever it is required and is particularly useful in terms of supporting offenders who have no stable accommodation of their own. In practice Floating Support can be delivered within homeless accommodation, or in environments where offenders are living with friends or family until a more stable environment can be found.
- **Intensive Support and Monitoring Services (ISMS)** – These are bespoke services for offenders who are deemed to be at very high risk of reoffending and/or causing harm. Service users for ISMS will almost all have committed serious sexual offences and be monitored within the community under the Multi-Agency Public Protection Arrangements (MAPPA). These services are individually designed around the needs of the offender and the requirements placed upon them under the MAPPA. Typically ISMS will provide these services 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, or as required. The services will be delivered in accommodation and areas where an environmental profile and assessment has been undertaken by the police and social workers. It is important to note that this is a service for adult offenders and should not be confused with the Intensive Monitoring and Support Service which accompanies a movement in restriction condition available as an option for young people referred to Children's Hearings and instituted by Section 135 of the Antisocial Behaviour (Scotland) Act 2004.

Research into the efficiency and effectiveness of supported accommodation across the UK is sparse (Scottish Government, 2007). When considering the limited literature, it is important to bear in mind the following two key issues:

1. Across Scotland there has been a tendency to develop supported accommodation provision in line with the availability of housing stock and local housing policy rather than having services which have been developed on a “needs led” basis. The lack of availability of suitable housing stock, funding restrictions and difficulty with community perceptions about the needs and risks of offenders, are all contributory factors.

2. In the recent past there has been a move away from the traditional focus of “support” in relation to the accommodation needs of offenders. Currently resources appear to be much more targeted at offenders who are at the higher end of the risk spectrum, in order to support the Community Protection Agenda. For instance there is now a National Accommodation Strategy for Sex Offenders, whilst there is no such equivalent for the general offender population. Whilst this move away from consideration of the accommodation needs of offenders generally is understandable, there are dangers in shifting the emphasis from “support” to “monitoring” in relation to accommodation. This drift towards focussing on the higher risk end of the offender spectrum has the potential for marginalising general offenders. The consequence is that there is a large proportion of offenders who still pose a risk of re-offending and whose needs, particularly relating to supported accommodation, are not being met.

### **Homelessness, Offending and Imprisonment**

The link between homelessness, offending and imprisonment is well-established. McIvor and Taylor (2000) found evidence that offending is disproportionately high among those who are homeless. Research in England and Wales found that a third of prisoners were not in stable accommodation before imprisonment and one in twenty were sleeping rough (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002). In Scotland, approximately 3,000 ex-prisoners submit homelessness applications each year (Pawson, Davidson & Netto, 2007). There is, therefore, a clear relationship between homelessness and offending. The causal relationships, if any, are, however, complex (Adamczuk, 2007; Hickey, 2002; Shelter Cymru, 2004).

Research on the links between homelessness and offending suggest that homelessness can result in people being more likely to be involved in some way with the criminal justice system, and that involvement in the criminal justice system can increase the risk of people becoming homeless. For instance, research by Shelter Cymru (2004) found that homelessness at a young age can be a predictor of future offending. This is supported by Hickey (2002) who found that homelessness at a young age could lead to offending behaviour - such as shoplifting and squatting - that was related to people’s “survival” on the streets. In this regard, there is evidence that some people use drugs as a method of coping with homelessness, and that this in turn can lead to an increase in offending behaviour - such as theft, robbery, drug dealing and prostitution - in order to fund drug habits (Arnull et al., 2007; Baldry, McDonnell, Maplestone & Peeters, 2003; Hickey, 2002; Shelter Cymru, 2004).

The homeless are at an increased risk of being drawn into the criminal justice system or, once in it, being treated more severely. For example, the homeless are more likely to experience increased policing (Baldry et al., 2003), they have an increased likelihood of being remanded in custody rather than being bailed in the community and they have a decreased likelihood of being considered for parole (Scottish Executive, 2001; McIvor & Taylor, 2000). The Audit Commission (2004) estimated that in England and Wales over 800 young offenders may be getting a custodial sentence each year because they are not in stable accommodation and sentencers are therefore discounting the possibility of a community sentence (cited in Arnull et al., 2007).

Once imprisoned, people are at an increased risk of losing any accommodation that they might have had. McIvor and Taylor (2000) note that many people lose their accommodation through imprisonment due to housing benefit restrictions and a lack of information about how to retain their tenancies. They also suggest that private landlords may discriminate against those with criminal convictions who are trying to access accommodation. There is also some evidence that periods of imprisonment can weaken family bonds, meaning that ex-prisoners are unable to return to and remain in their original family accommodation (Hickey, 2002). McIvor and Taylor’s review of research found that about half of the people going into prison were not able to return to their original accommodation on release and 16% to 38% were homeless on release. Applying this information to the Scottish prison statistics suggests that between 3,600 and 8,550 people may have been homeless upon liberation in 2006 (Scottish Executive, 2006). Research in Australia also found that:

*“As far as housing is concerned, the policy of imprisonment for short sentences for petty crime seriously destabilises at least half of those imprisoned and results in re-offending and re-incarceration” (Baldry et al., 2003, p. 29).*

It has been suggested that the loss of tenancies could be prevented in some cases (Social Exclusion Unit, 2002) and that prevention of the loss of accommodation would be more cost-effective compared with finding new accommodation, both in terms of the costs of re-housing a person and in terms of a reduced risk of re-offending (Carlisle, 1996).

Baldry et al explore this poverty trap in relation to social capital in more detail in their research:

*“It is as if each time a person is imprisoned, a little more of the social and other resources (like somewhere to live) that they may have held, even tenuously, are stripped away or lost. There appears to be a serial depletion each time persons already in disadvantaged circumstances are incarcerated and released. Their already meagre social and economic resources are leeched away if there is no intervention to stop it. [...] This study has provided results not brought together before by showing that moving often post-release is a predictive factor in a person’s return to prison. That does not mean that just ensuring an ex-prisoner has stable affordable housing will prevent him or her from returning to prison, but it does mean that he or she will be better off than if they were moving every week or so. And when stable housing is combined with helpful support that assists in addressing things like drug problems, family relations and employment the evidence from this study is that ex-prisoners are much less likely to return to prison” (2003, p. 28).*

### **Addressing Accommodation Needs to Reduce Re-offending**

One of the established principles of “what works?” in relation to working with offenders is that interventions should address “criminogenic needs” - that is, factors that contribute directly or indirectly to the chances of someone re-offending - including access to suitable accommodation (Vennard & Hedderman, 1998). Research in England and Wales found that, from 1,000 assessments of offenders, 31% of those on community sentences and 43% on custodial sentences had problems in terms of their accommodation. May (1999) found that for people subject to community sentences, reconviction rates were higher for those who had accommodation problems as opposed to those who had stable accommodation. The Social Exclusion Unit (2002), in turn, has noted that “Research suggests that stable accommodation can make a difference of over 20 per cent in terms of reduction in reconviction” (p. 94).

Interviews with prisoners and ex-prisoners in the West Midlands found that accessing suitable accommodation in an appropriate area was the first priority for almost all those who were interviewed (Allender et al., 2005). Furthermore, research on ex-prisoners by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Prisons (2001) found that those who re-offended were significantly less likely to have had accommodation on release from prison and, when surveyed, several linked their lack of stable accommodation with their re-offending.

The Scottish Executive (2001) has acknowledged that:

*“It is now widely recognised that, in general terms, the provision of settled accommodation can assist in reducing the risk of re-offending” (p. 19).*

This is supported by the Australian research already mentioned that found that ex-prisoners who received either informal or specialist support that they described as ‘being helpful’, and those who had accommodation that they described as being suitable, were less likely to be re-incarcerated. Extreme mobility (i.e., changing accommodation more than once during the months following liberation from custody) and/or unstable accommodation were the main predictors of returning to prison (Baldry et al., 2003).

The research cited above suggests that addressing accommodation may form a part of “what works?” in terms of working with offenders. Research on “what works?” has found that most offenders have multiple criminogenic needs, and that those with multiple criminogenic needs are at the highest risk of re-offending; therefore interventions that address several factors are likely to be more effective than those that focus on a single factor (Harper & Chitty, 2005). Importantly, Maguire and Raynor (2006) have drawn on recent theories on desistance to argue that interventions need to address the attitudes and motivations of offenders, as well as addressing practical needs such as stable accommodation, if they are to be effective.

Accommodation can be a formal requirement for accessing certain support services, and may also be an essential influence on attitudes and motivations in helping people to deal with other issues in their lives, such as accessing specialist services, dealing with drug or alcohol problems or securing employment, which may be directly related to their offending behaviour (Allender et al., 2005; Social Exclusion Unit, 2002; Arnull et al., 2007; Baldry et al., 2003). In support of a model of intervention that addresses accommodation needs, as well as other criminogenic needs, the literature review by McIvor and Taylor (2000) found that there is some evidence that offenders receiving accommodation and support are less likely to re-offend than those who are homeless.

### **The Effectiveness of Supported Accommodation**

A consistent finding of research into the accommodation and support needs of homeless offenders and ex-prisoners is that most people in this group are in need of mainstream accommodation; a minority are in need of some form of supported accommodation; while very few are in need of intensive support as well as accommodation (Baldry et al., 2003; Carlisle, 1996; McIvor & Taylor, 1994; Scottish Executive, 2001). However, very little research exists that actually explores the impact of supported accommodation services for ex-offenders (Scottish Government, 2007). This section outlines the Scottish research that the authors of this paper have found on the effectiveness of supported accommodation services for ex-offenders and the following section presents the findings from research specifically on Sacro’s Supported Accommodation Services.

Research was conducted on supported accommodation services for ex-offenders in the Grampian region of Scotland, including Sacro’s Supported Accommodation Service based in Aberdeen (McIvor & Taylor, 1994). The research found that most of the people who accessed these services believed they had made personal progress since coming to the projects, with several stating they had stopped offending and/or reduced their drug and/or alcohol misuse. Generally social workers who referred people to the services were also satisfied with the quality of the services.

Although the ex-offenders generally expected to stay on in supported accommodation projects until they were ready for independent living, only a small minority moved from the projects into their own accommodation in a planned way. Many of the service users were asked to leave due to breaching their contract with the service or due to rent arrears; some others were remanded in custody or simply disappeared. This research suggests that the support aspects of the service were meeting the needs of the service users to some extent according to their own assessments of the services, and the accommodation may have been very beneficial, at least in the short term. However, the lack of move-on to permanent accommodation does raise questions about the long-term impact of the services.

An evaluation of a supported housing project in Drumchapel for young homeless people provides some useful information on how to deliver effective services (Communities Scotland, 2007). An unknown number of those young people targeted by the service had offended but the project specifically focused on young people who were homeless, threatened with homelessness, or were looked after and accommodated by the local authority. All of these characteristics are associated with offending behaviour among young people and therefore some of the lessons from the research may be transferable to supported accommodation services for offenders.

The evaluation concluded that the project succeeded in delivering holistic and flexible support that assisted independent living (Communities Scotland, 2007). The evaluation highlighted that the support was rated

highly by the service users; that a trusting relationship between the key workers and the service users was important in helping to develop skills and confidence amongst the service users; and that the project helped other agencies - such as health agencies - to access young people who were otherwise hard to reach.

The evaluation also found that support beyond the transition from a short term to a permanent tenancy, combined with the joint decision between the service and the service user about when to end the support, helped the service users to sustain tenancies in some instances. In the assessment of the researchers, the project helped the service users to achieve personal development through treating them as individuals; accepting that their path to independence would not be linear and so continuing their support through crises; and recognising their strengths and so helping them to develop their aspirations for the future. According to interviews with the service users, the project helped increase self-esteem, self-confidence, communication skills, social skills, independent living skills and relationships with family; this was verified by information from external agencies that suggested the service users became more stable and had longer-term goals including education and employment.

### **The Effectiveness of Sacro's Supported Accommodation Services**

Some unpublished research has been conducted by students on Sacro's Glasgow Supported Accommodation Service. This section presents the key findings from this research.

Heather Bolton (2005) conducted a small piece of research analysing Sacro's Glasgow Supported Accommodation Service statistics from 1999 to 2001 when 152 people used the service. She sought to identify the factors that were associated with planned or unplanned departure from the service. Of the study participants, 88% were male, over 98% were white and the average age was 31 years. Participants had an average of 14 convictions; they had been imprisoned an average of five times, with 24% having been imprisoned more than five times; one third had received psychiatric care for clinical depression; 21% had disclosed some form of childhood abuse; 42% had experienced parental departure before the age of 16; 14% had been in local authority care; 32% had never been employed.

Around half (53%) of the 152 service users left the service on a planned basis. Bolton's analyses suggested that a person was more likely to leave the service on a planned basis if they engaged in employment or training; if they had dependant children; if they were not using illegal drugs; or if they disclosed childhood abuse to their key worker. The researcher suggested that the first three factors indicated service users who had a stake in conformity, or social bonds that discouraged illegal behaviour; that is, they had a level of stability and reasons for leading a crime-free life. The final factor (childhood abuse) was interpreted as suggesting that disclosure of traumatic events showed a level of trust in professionals, and that this may have helped to maintain stability. An alternative interpretation was that people who disclose previous abuse may be treated as priorities for receiving support and accessing services, therefore possibly increasing their likelihood to succeed.

This research highlights the challenging backgrounds of such service users and suggests that there are dynamic factors that are linked to achieving stability and maintaining tenancies.

Another small scale study by George Nelson (2007) used qualitative methods to explore the role that Sacro's Glasgow Supported Accommodation Service played in terms of desistance from crime. In-depth interviews with 7 of the 58 service users who were engaged with the service in Spring 2007 found that advice and advocacy in engaging housing associations and benefits agencies was seen by the service users as very beneficial. The research highlighted the impact of imprisonment and "institutionalisation" on the service users that reduced their ability and confidence to live independent and crime-free lives, and the extent to which the service helped provide service users with skills for independent living. Six of the interviewees suggested that Sacro helped them to become more independent through "having structure and routine, positive encouragement, role-modelling, good advice, helping to overcome negative thought patterns, a reduction in feelings of being overwhelmed or a growth in self-confidence and self-belief" (p. 10). Five of the seven respondents reported that, due to the service, they now had a greater degree of security, sense of purpose and direction.

Most of the interviewees admitted that they were distrustful of organisations, institutions or even society as a whole; however, six of the interviewees stated that they shared more with their Sacro worker than with anyone else in their lives, and a level of trust and respect was highlighted as key to establishing a meaningful relationship with the worker, discussing emotional issues and taking the worker's suggestions seriously.

Some of the interviewees, however, admitted that they would not disclose everything to their Sacro worker, especially regarding drug use and re-offending. The research also highlighted that homeless offenders can be particularly vulnerable to becoming isolated, anxious and lonely, and it was suggested that this could also increase the chances of re-offending if nothing was done to address it. The interviewees explained how their Sacro workers helped change their attitudes and behaviours in relation to offending, drug use, and increased their empathy for victims of crime; they suggested that this was mostly achieved through positive role modelling and through discussion. All of those interviewed suggested that their lives would have been worse if they had not accessed the service; some suggested that they would have re-offended, that they would have increased drug misuse, that they would be back in prison and that their lives would be adrift or that they would be dead.

Some of the interviewees showed dissatisfaction with the move-on accommodation they secured, and felt that they were not in a position to criticise the work done by Sacro and other agencies to access the accommodation, as they would be seen as ungrateful. The research also suggested that the move-on from the Sacro tenancy into a new flat brought on a great deal of stress and responsibility, which some of the interviewees found overwhelming, and it was suggested that it might be beneficial to extend the level of support provided at this stage.

Although the seven interviewees were a small and possibly unrepresentative sample of the service users, these results suggest that the Supported Accommodation Service can play a key role in helping homeless offenders to gain some stability, improve their quality of life and help them desist from offending.

## **Critical Issues for Consideration by Practitioners**

### *Financial insecurity for offenders*

Although the available evidence suggests that supported accommodation may help people to desist from offending, research has highlighted some of the potential barriers in terms of effectiveness. For instance, McIvor and Taylor (1994) found that service users were left with little money after paying their rent, which limited what they could do in their spare time, leading to increased boredom, which may increase the likelihood of re-offending. Furthermore, accommodation for offenders is almost always paid through housing benefits, and the high prices of supported accommodation, and other suitable accommodation, make it difficult for some people, particularly young people, to enter into employment, training or education and cover the costs of rent, due to the cuts in their benefits that would result (Arnull et al., 2007; Carlisle, 1996; Communities Scotland, 2007). As entering employment or education is linked with lower levels of offending (Boyle, 2007), this may be acting as a barrier to people living sustainable, crime-free lives in the long term.

### *Family breakdown*

Research has shown that homelessness is often preceded by relationship breakdown and conflict with family members or partners in the household, which may relate to offending behaviour or drug use on the part of the person who becomes homeless and/or to an abusive environment within the home (Arnull et al., 2007; Baldry et al., 2003; McIvor & Taylor, 1994; Pawson, Davidson & Netto, 2007). Furthermore, positive relationships with family and/or partners can be crucial in terms of someone retaining their tenancy throughout a prison sentence (Carlisle, 1996), while there is some evidence that a stressful home environment may actually increase offending among some young people (Arnull et al., 2007). This research suggests that the people who access supported accommodation services are likely to have strained relationships with family members, which the services may want to take into account.

### *Multiple deprivation*

Baldry et al. (2003) highlight that ex-prisoners tend to be settled in disadvantaged areas, increasing the concentration of ex-offenders in certain places, depleting the social and economic resources in that community, and making it harder for people to move on from their past offending. The researchers argue that work needs to be done to strengthen these communities and attempts should be made to settle ex-prisoners away from highly disadvantaged areas.

### *Over dependence*

McIvor and Taylor (1994) found evidence that ex-offenders were more likely to access supported accommodation than mainstream accommodation, regardless of their apparent need for the support element. Also, due to the lack of suitable move-on accommodation, some service users may be remaining in supported accommodation when they are actually ready for independent living and no longer need as much support. Both of these issues could be limiting access to supported accommodation for those who need it and highlight areas where provision may be inefficient due to difficulties for ex-offenders in accessing mainstream housing.

### *Negative effects of hostel accommodation*

Some research has suggested that some hostel accommodation for offenders may actually increase offending and drug misuse, as well as potential victimisation, due to groups of offenders and/or drug users being housed together, also creating environments that normalise bravado, threatening behaviour and violence, and for that reason some ex-offenders are reluctant to use hostel accommodation (Arnull et al., 2007; Carlisle, 1996; HMIP, 2001; McIvor & Taylor, 2000). This finding draws attention to the need for future research to pay attention to different models of supported accommodation and how different forms of service provision help or hinder the desistance process.

### *Offender diversity*

Research has highlighted that offenders are not a homogenous group, and specifically that support and accommodation needs differ with gender, ethnicity and mental health (Carlisle, 1996). For instance, women offenders who are attempting to relocate to escape from abusive relationships may have difficulty accessing mainstream social housing because they are unable to demonstrate a local connection (Scottish Executive, 2001). Furthermore, women with children can get caught in a 'catch-22' situation, as they may be treated as a priority and receive easier access to accommodation if they have dependant children; however, if their children are in local authority care, they might not be able to gain custody of their children until they have found suitable accommodation (McIvor & Taylor, 2000). Also, previous research has shown that people from ethnic minorities are underrepresented in hostel populations and that hostels could do more to meet the needs of this group (McIvor and Taylor, 2000).

These critical issues highlight the need to explore the short and long-term effectiveness of supported accommodation services in Scotland in a way that takes account of the different models of service provision, the personal circumstances of homeless ex-offenders and the social and economic contexts in which they live. With regard to evaluation, McIvor and Taylor (2000) have stated that:

*“The more recent emphasis upon the role of hostels in offering supervision and public protection suggests that their effectiveness might appropriately be assessed with regard to their impact upon reconviction among residents or the prevention of public harm, though such an analysis is likely to be hampered by the absence of a suitable comparison group of similar offenders who are not accommodated in hostel provision” (p. 22).*

Recent developments within research and theory on desistance from crime suggest that attention needs to be paid to the impact that such services have in terms of developing human and social capital, the way in

which the service users understand these developments, and the opportunities in the community for them to live productive and crime-free lives (Farrall, 2003; Maruna & Roy, 2007; McNeill, 2002, 2006; McNeill & Whyte, 2007).

### **Summary of Main Findings and Conclusions**

- The relationship between homelessness, offending and imprisonment is complex, with homelessness potentially increasing the chances of offending and/or being imprisoned, and imprisonment increasing the likelihood of becoming homeless.
- Preventing the loss of accommodation upon imprisonment could be more cost-effective than re-housing upon release.
- The provision of suitable, stable accommodation may reduce the chances of further offending among homeless ex-offenders.
- Services that address multiple needs, and focus on attitudes and motivation as well as practical issues, are likely to be more effective than those that focus on a single issue.
- Homeless ex-offenders are likely to have a variety of complex needs and may be distrustful of institutions and organisations ostensibly seeking to provide help and support.
- There is some evidence that supported accommodation services can assist ex-offenders to address some of the issues in their lives that are related to offending, to gain stability in their lives and to desist from further offending.
- More research is needed to establish the short and long-term role that supported accommodation services play in terms of assisting homeless ex-offenders to desist from crime.

### **Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank Heather Bolton and George Nelson for their excellent work and for choosing to conduct their research with Sacro. We would also thank Joe Curran from the Criminal Justice Social Work Development Centre for Scotland for his helpful comments on an earlier draft of this report.

### **Endnote**

\* Sacro - Safeguarding Communities - Reducing Offending. Sacro provides services in conflict resolution, criminal justice and youth justice based on the values of mutual respect, recognising and valuing diversity, personal responsibility, society's responsibility to all its members, capacity for change and to work together to reduce conflict and repair harm. Sacro also provides consultancy and training services.

<http://www.sacro.org.uk/>

## References

- Adamczuk, H. (2007). *Meeting the housing needs of prisoners and ex-offenders in the UK: Opportunities and limitations*. Downloaded from [http://www.enhr2007rotterdam.nl/documents/W06\\_paper\\_Adamczuk.pdf](http://www.enhr2007rotterdam.nl/documents/W06_paper_Adamczuk.pdf) on 14 August 2007.
- Allender, P., Brown, G., Bailey, N., Colombo, T., Poole, H. & Saldana, A., (2005). *Report on the prisoner resettlement and housing provision research project*. Downloaded from [http://www.housingcorp.gov.uk/upload/pdf/Report\\_on\\_the\\_Research\\_Project.pdf](http://www.housingcorp.gov.uk/upload/pdf/Report_on_the_Research_Project.pdf) on 22 August 2007.
- Arnull, E., Eagle, S., Gammampila, A., Patel, S. L., Sadler, J., Thomas, S. & Bateman, T. (2007). *Housing needs and experiences*. Downloaded from <http://www.yjb.gov.uk/Publications/Resources/Downloads/Accommodation%20Needs%20and%20Experiences%20-%20Full%20Report.pdf> on 21 August 2007.
- Bain, A. (2004). From redemption to rehabilitation to resettlement. *Criminal Justice Matters*, No. 56.
- Baldry, E., McDonnell, D., Maplestone, P. & Peeters, M. (2003). *Ex-prisoners and accommodation: What bearing do different forms of housing have on social reintegration?* Downloaded from <http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/projects/p70068> on 17 August 2007.
- Bolton, H. (2005). *Rehabilitation of homeless offenders: Examining success and failure within a programme of community reintegration*. Unpublished Masters Thesis, Glasgow Caledonian University.
- Boyle, M. (2007). *Unemployment and re-offending: An international literature review*. Edinburgh: Apex Scotland.
- Carlisle, J. (1996). *The housing needs of ex-prisoners*. York: Centre for housing policy.
- Communities Scotland (2007). *A longitudinal evaluation of the Drumchapel supported youth housing project*. Downloaded from [http://www.ro.communitiesscotland.gov.uk/stellent/groups/public/documents/webpages/pubcs\\_019735.pdf](http://www.ro.communitiesscotland.gov.uk/stellent/groups/public/documents/webpages/pubcs_019735.pdf) on 22 August 2007.
- Farrall, S. (2003). J' Accuse: Probation Evaluation-Research Epistemologies: Part One: The Critique. *Criminal Justice*, 3, 161-179.
- Harper, G. & Chitty, C. (Eds.) (2005). *The impact of corrections on re-offending: A review of 'what works'*. London: Home Office.
- Hickey, C. (2002). *Crime & homelessness*. Downloaded from [http://www.focusireland.ie/docs/research\\_policy/CH%20Insides.pdf](http://www.focusireland.ie/docs/research_policy/CH%20Insides.pdf) on 18 December 2007.
- HMIP [Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons] (2001). *Through the prison gate: A joint thematic review by HM inspectorates of prisons and probation*. Downloaded from <http://inspectorates.homeoffice.gov.uk/hmiprison/thematic-reports1/prison-gate?view=Binary> on 27 August 2007.
- Maguire, M. & Raynor, P. (2006). How the resettlement of prisoners promotes desistance from crime: Or does it? *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6, 19-38.
- Maruna, S. & Roy, K. (2007). Amputation of reconstruction? Notes on the concept of "knifing off" and desistance from crime. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 23, 104-124.
- May, C. (1999). *Explaining a reconviction following a community sentence: The role of social factors*.

Downloaded from <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs/hors192.pdf> on 10 August 2007.

McIvor, G. & Taylor, M. (1994). *Making it out: Supported accommodation for ex-offenders in Scotland - Identifying effective practice*. Stirling: Department of Applied Social Science, University of Stirling.

McIvor, G. & Taylor, M (2000). *Accommodation for offenders and ex-offenders: A review of the literature*. Unpublished Report, Department of Applied Social Science, University of Stirling.

McNeill, F. (2002). *Beyond 'what works': How and why do people stop offending?* Edinburgh: Criminal Justice Social Work Development Centre for Scotland. Downloaded from [http://www.cjsw.ac.uk/cjsw/files/Briefing%20Paper%205\\_final.pdf](http://www.cjsw.ac.uk/cjsw/files/Briefing%20Paper%205_final.pdf) on 13 September 2007.

McNeill, F. (2006). A desistance paradigm for offender management. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6, 39-62.

McNeill, F. & Whyte, B. (2007). *Reducing reoffending: Social work and community justice in Scotland*. Devon: Willan Publishing.

Nelson, G. (2007). *Sacro's Glasgow supported accommodation service: Service user perspectives*. Unpublished dissertation.

Pawson, H., Davidson, E. & Netto, G. (2007). *Evaluation of homelessness prevention activities in Scotland*. Downloaded from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/172550/0048196.pdf> on 22 August.

Shelter Cymru (2004). *Homelessness: It's a crime*. Downloaded from <http://www.sheltercymru.org.uk/shelter/uploads/pdf/CrimebriefingEng3.pdf> on 17 August 2007.

Scottish Executive (2001). *Criminal justice accommodation services: A review and consultation paper*. Downloaded from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/156375/0041956.pdf> on 10 August 2007.

Scottish Executive (2006). *Prison statistics Scotland, 2005/06*. Downloaded from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/923/0038126.pdf> on 10 November 2006.

Scottish Government (2007). *National care standards: Services for people in criminal justice supported accommodation*. Downloaded from <http://www.socialworkscotland.org.uk/resources/pub/CriminalJusticesupportedaccommodation.pdf> on 02 April 2008.

Social Exclusion Unit (2002). *Reducing re-offending by ex-prisoners*. London: Social Exclusion Unit.

Vennard, J. & Hedderman, C. (1998). 'Effective interventions with offenders' in P. Goldbatt & C. Lewis (Eds.), *Reducing offending: An assessment of research evidence of ways of dealing with offending behaviour*. London: Home Office.

### **Find out more at <http://www.cjsw.ac.uk>**

The Centre provides an effective network for information exchange, dialogue and dissemination of good practice in Scotland. A 'virtual centre' to link practitioners and managers throughout Scotland and beyond is now available. Please see the website for further details.

### **Contact CJSW**

We want to hear from you! Tell us what you think of the briefing paper and our website. If you have original data and/or would like to write a briefing paper or to share good ideas or any 'wee gems' about your practice, let us know. You can contact us at [cjsw@ed.ac.uk](mailto:cjsw@ed.ac.uk)

1FR, 31 Buccleuch Place,  
University of Edinburgh  
Edinburgh  
EH8 9JT

Tel: 0131 651 1464

Fax: 0131 650 4046

**ISSN: 1740-1623 (print)**

**ISSN: 1740-1631 (online)**

**The University of Edinburgh is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, with registration number SC005336.**