

# RESTORE

## THEORY OF CHANGE

Stages	Theory of Change Elements	Evidence/Evaluation process
Rationale for RESTORE project, based on evidence	Offenders often trapped in cycles of reoffending	<b>Source:</b> Maruna, S (2010); Rivera, B & Widom, CS (1990);
	Violent offenders often have violent personal histories	
	Anger, retaliation/revenge lust, and fear of loss of face, are common amongst prison populations, and present clear obstacles to change	<b>Source:</b> Straub (2013); Gill (f); Braithwaite (2006); Brown (2011)
	Relationships within prisons rarely offer a 'safe space' for vulnerable disclosure (e.g. to explore feelings), uncertainty, sharing of fears/doubts, calm reflection: all processes necessary for behaviour and attitude change	<b>Source:</b> Straub (2013); Gill (forthcoming); Adler & Mir (2012:25)
	RESTORE proven to address this unmet need	<b>Evidence - independent academic studies:</b> Brown (2011); Adler & Mir (2012); Edwards (2013); Straub (2013); Gill (f)
	RESTORE approach seen by prison staff as unique, invaluable, powerful. Closely related to Restorative Justice approach – academically appraised as particularly effective in desistence in violent offending	
TFP Inputs	Specialist expertise in Restorative Justice-related approach, using an exploration of 'forgiveness' and reparation	<b>Source – independent academic studies:</b> Brown (Op.cit); Adler & Mir (Op.cit); Edwards (Op.cit); Straub (Op.cit); Gill (Op.cit)
	Unique, non-judgemental appraisal of victim and perpetrator narratives	
	Expert group facilitation teams	
	Training for prison staff, & apprenticeship opportunity - further facilitation teams	Considered by the above commentators to be important priorities.
	Mentoring/facilitation by ex-offenders	
	Follow-up contact for research, and continuing follow-up support as required	
RESTORE Activities	3-5 day intensive, facilitated group workshop process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed account of each session maintained / fed back by facilitators;</li> <li>Feedback sought from participants, staff, observer-participants;</li> </ul>
	Introduction to victims of serious violent crime, and ex-offenders, who share their stories openly. Offender life-narratives explored in safe, compassionate space	
	Existing and habitual behaviour patterns and attitudes explored, and self-appraisal enabled in a non-judgemental space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cell workbooks</li> <li>Facilitator accounts</li> </ul>
	Guided individual cell-work (reflection) in workbooks	
	Group reflection to encourage peer support and trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participant feedback</li> <li>Apprenticeship appraisal</li> </ul>
	Follow-up 1-day consolidation and support workshops at 1 and 3 months	
	Trainee facilitator apprenticeships x approximately 6-8	

<b>RESTORE Processes</b> (Change mechanisms, and theoretical basis for RESTORE processes, evidenced by established scholarship)	<b>Creating a safe space</b> for reflection, and conducive conditions for questioning and changing attitudes (e.g. how criminality works, how society works, how humanity works, how forgiveness works, how revenge works, and how I work)	<b>Existing theoretical analysis:</b> Gill; Brown; Straub, all (Op.cit.)
	<b>Story-telling</b> , at the heart of RESTORE: considered a powerful tool, (for which the human race is hard-wired), in building intimacy between teller and listeners, developing empathy, creating community, constructing/reconstructing identity: all of these processes are pillars of the RESTORE process.	<i>'Storying'</i> , <i>'Story as therapy'</i> , <i>'Narrative pedagogy'</i> J Hsu, Scherto Gill, KN Dwivedi, Maruna & Ramsden (2004)
	<b>Empathy-building</b> , a key focus of all aspects of RESTORE. Developed through shared dramatic experience of traumatic, authentic stories; an atmosphere of non-judgmental sharing and humanity; positive psychology; values modelled by facilitators; Restorative Justice-based approach – seen as 'coaxing the offender's compassionate self to the fore'*. Generating true empathy is key to 'change'.	Huether on empathy and the brain; <i>'Unconditional Positive Regard'</i> , Carl Rogers; <i>'Restorative Justice theory'</i> , Braithwaite (2006: 434)*; and Turner's <i>'Communitas'</i> .
	<b>Transformative change</b> , 'perspective transformation'; appreciating, seeking & attaining 'forgiveness', considered a 'humanising process', requiring <b>'transgression'</b> : from detached, to mindful, to critically reflective, to 'victim', to actively reassessing self as 'offender' and the 'ripple-effect' of own behaviour. <b>Modelling</b> , whereby behaviours, attitudes and identity-building factors are led by example: adoption of patterns laid / modelled by influential individuals. Here the influence is increased through <b>Social (or therapeutic) alliance</b> : the believability/ authenticity of facilitators' experiences, and pivotal role of ex-offenders.	<i>'Transformation Theory'</i> , Jack Mezirow; <i>'Restorying'</i> , Scherto Gill; <i>'Social Learning Theory'</i> Albert Bandura (1971)
	<b>Different choices/intentions catalysed</b> through RESTORE focussing on the positive potential of offenders' future life-paths. (eg participants encouraged in deciding -and believing they are capable - to follow inspirational examples, to reconcile and restore damaged relationships, not to perpetuate cycles of violence and damage.)	<i>'Strengths-based'</i> approaches Ros Burnett & Shadd Maruna <i>'Desistence theory'</i> Shadd Maruna
<b>RESTORE Outputs</b> (response to activity)	Quality of engagement and response proven to be extremely high – often unprecedented in individual offenders' prison record Attendance and repeat attendance very strong Staff response widely enthusiastic and positive Offender evaluations of programme extremely positive	<b>Existing evidence:</b> <i>Brown (2011); Straub (2013); Edwards (2013)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participant &amp; staff feedback,</li> <li>Observation/accounts (PO)             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attendance records</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b>Concrete outputs</b> (products)	RESTORE 'Essential Good Practice' guide, underpinned by academically rigorous action research/evaluation Road-tested training programme for expert facilitators Expanded RESTORE delivery capacity	<b>NOMS project evaluation process:</b> Response from (prospective) users
<b>Intermediate Outcomes:</b> Knowledge & skills	<b>A] Participants demonstrate that they feel differently</b> – eg shocked, moved, focussed, open, vulnerable, empathetic, supportive, supported, heard ( <i>feel &amp; communicate differently about self, own stories, victims, what's possible</i> ) <b>B] Participants demonstrate that they think differently</b> – eg less judgemental, more emotionally open, broader perspective, negative thoughts challenged, new doors opening ( <i>new perspectives on other people, reasons for life events, own contribution to life path, victims, effect of own actions, future choices/options</i> ).	<b>Existing evidence:</b> <i>Brown (2011); Gill (forthcoming); Adler &amp; Mir (2012); Straub (2013); - Edwards (2013) -</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Data from cell workbooks</li> <li>Interviews: participants, wing staff, education teams</li> </ul>

<p><b>Intermediate Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Attitudes &amp; values</p>	<p><b>C] Participants begin to engage in and express attitude change</b> – eg how criminality works, how society works, how humanity works, how forgiveness works (<i>changed views on inevitability of reoffending, on value of anger and revenge, on value of forgiveness, on justice, on motivation and positive thinking</i>)</p> <p><b>D] Participants express new motivation to change their life paths</b> – eg new self-esteem and motivation to make new effort, to believe in self, to give back and restore, to contribute, to participate in further training, to mentor others.</p> <p><b>E] Different choices/intentions catalysed and voiced</b> – eg participants deciding to follow inspirational examples, to reconcile and restore damaged relationships, not to perpetuate cycles of violence and damage.</p>	<p><b>Existing evidence:</b> <i>Brown (2011); Gill (forthcoming); Adler &amp; Mir (2012); Straub (2013); Edwards (2013)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data from cell workbooks</li> <li>• Interviews with participants</li> </ul> <p>Interviews with wing staff and education teams</p>
<p><b>Intermediate Outcomes:</b></p> <p>Behaviours</p>	<p><b>F] Participants engage in different behaviours</b> – eg employing new levels of empathy, trying to foster forgiveness of others and of self, challenging own anger, not succumbing to revenge desires, resisting/refusing to resort to violence, finding/building positive relationships, avoiding negative/regressive peer relationships, and demonstrating new 'positive self-identity'.</p> <p><b>G] Participants act with greater awareness of negativity of victimhood</b> – eg no longer seeking revenge, or viewing other people as the answer - since now taking new control of own story; now recognising 'ripple effect' of criminal behaviour.</p>	<p><b>Existing evidence:</b> <i>Gill (f); Adler &amp; Mir (2012); Straub (2013), Edwards (2013)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data from cell workbooks</li> <li>• Interviews with participants</li> </ul> <p>Interviews with wing staff and education teams</p>
<p><b>Impact</b></p>	<p><b>Reduced offending behaviour, both in prison and beyond release</b> – eg choosing different solutions that no longer involve criminality</p> <p><b>Results in fewer victims and fewer offenders</b> - eg amongst participants, their families, their communities, generally</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interviews: wing staff, education teams,</li> <li>• Prison behaviour records</li> <li>• Longer term contact post-release: interviews, probation records</li> </ul>