

Makeright—Bags of Connection: Teaching Design Thinking and Making in Prison to Help Build Empathic and Resilient Communities

Abstract This paper argues that designers have a future role to play in redesigning prison systems. It describes the Makeright anti-theft bag action research project that first ran at HMP Thameside, London (UK) in 2015, and later at Sabarmati Central Jail, Ahmedabad (India) in 2016. It offers an account of the strengths and limitations of utilizing co-design methods to deliver transformational learning for prison inmates, and build resilience and entrepreneurship skills. Between 2015–17 we delivered seven iterations of the Makeright design course. A total of eighty-five UK inmates and twenty-five Indian inmates participated; we also performed twenty-six interviews with inmate participants, which we report on here. This article reflects on our practice, including our engagement with prison staff to iteratively improve our approach. We conclude that whilst inmates can strongly engage with design thinking and collaborative design practices – and benefit from the skills and competencies this fosters – for design education to be meaningful to their lives as returning citizens, opportunities for collaboration and learning through making need to continue beyond prison gates linked to resettlement programs. We suggest that prisons need to redesign their systems both inside prison walls and beyond to better connect inmates to reflexive relational networks that can facilitate social integration and, ultimately, abstinence from crime.

Keywords

Rehabilitation
Design education
Design thinking
Resilience
Effectuation
Empathy

Received March 6, 2017

Accepted February 13, 2018

Emails

Lorraine Gamman
(corresponding author)
l.gamman@csm.arts.ac.uk

Adam Thorpe
a.thorpe@csm.arts.ac.uk

Copyright © 2018, Tongji University and Tongji University Press.
Publishing services by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the
CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).
The peer review process is the responsibility of Tongji University and Tongji University Press.

<http://www.journals.elsevier.com/she-ji-the-journal-of-design-economics-and-innovation>
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sheji.2018.02.010>



1 Editorial note: while the body text conforms to U.S. English, all project titles and institution names adopt British English where appropriate.

2 Jeremy Bentham, *The Works of Jeremy Bentham*, published under the Superintendence of his Executor, John Bowring, vol. 10 (Edinburgh: William Tait, 1838–1843), accessed February 25, 2018, <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/2085>.

3 “About Maggie’s,” accessed February 25, 2018, <https://www.maggiescentres.org/about-maggies/>.

4 Yvonne Jewkes, “Designs on Punishment: The Architecture of Incarceration and the Architecture of Hope” (lecture, John Barry Memorial Lecture in Criminology, The University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia, Nov 24, 2016).

5 Yvonne Jewkes and Dominique Moran, “Should Prison Architecture be Brutal, Bland or Beautiful?,” *Scottish Justice Matters* 2, no. 1 (2014): 8.

6 David Canter, *Criminal Psychology: Topics in Applied Psychology* (London: Routledge, 2008), 229.

7 Lorraine Gamman and Adam Thorpe, “Could Design Help to Promote and Build Empathic Processes in Prison? Understanding the Role of Empathy and Design in Catalysing Social Change and Transformation,” in *Transformation Design: Perspectives on a New Design Attitude*, ed. Wolfgang Jonas, Sarah Zerwas, and Kristof von Anshelm (Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 2015), 83–100.

8 Ben Crewe, Jason Warr, Peter Bennett, and Alan Smith, “The Emotional Geography of Prison Life,” *Theoretical Criminology* 18, no. 1 (2014): 56–74, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480613497778>.

9 Fergus McNeill, “Inspiring Desistance: What Role for the Arts?,” *Iriss* (blog), last modified October 12, 2011, <http://blogs.iriss.org.uk/discoveringdesistance/2011/10/12/inspiring-desistance-what-role-for-the-arts/>.

10 Shaplan, Farrall, and Bottoms suggest, “in criminology, ‘desistance’ has become the shorthand term to describe the process by which someone who was committing crimes on a frequent basis ceases to offend. Accordingly, criminologists do not normally

Preamble: The Problems of Prison Design and Culture

Prison designs often appear inspired by medieval dungeons or Victorian workhouses.¹ The ethos of a prison is one of domination and attrition, as exemplified by Jeremy Bentham’s Panoptical mill aimed at “grinding rogues honest.”² The prison as a space – with a few Scandinavian and other exceptions – is rarely designed to promote rehabilitation, community values, or well being in the way that other rehabilitation centers are. Consider Maggie’s Centres,³ whose architects use spatial design that often integrates engagement with nature to aid the healing, self-understanding, and re-socialization of people living with or recovering from cancer. Yvonne Jewkes and Dominique Moran suggest that today’s prison design is linked to the architecture of despair rather than the architecture of hope.⁴ Contemporary, twenty-first century municipal “large bland warehouse style prisons,” as Jewkes and Moran point out, define a kind of “boundary between prisoners and communities ... offering a visual metaphor for the loss of public empathy for the excluded offender.”⁵

Prison design and the punishment culture that prevails in these institutions often exemplify closed systems. Housed in austere physical contexts, many accounts of prison life describe a culture where mutual mistrust, fear, aggression, and violence are constant, and where “prisoners typically are given no alternative culture to which to ascribe or in which to participate.”⁶ Unsurprisingly, many inmates repress their feelings and their compassion for themselves and empathy for others behind what is known as the prison mask.⁷ In many of the prison’s geographical spaces, inmates find themselves not in control and recognize that it is unwise to show vulnerability.⁸ They suppress their emotions or hide their feelings in order to avoid upset or conflict, often by putting up a front and playing the role they perceive to be ascribed to them – that of a criminal and prisoner. This masking of emotion and negative role play appears to block empathy and self-development. Fergus McNeill observes that prison appears to stunt inmates’ abilities to build prosocial capacities by “limiting agency and responsibility, delaying maturation, damaging social ties (and sometimes building anti-social ones) and cementing criminalized identities.”⁹ This conditioning militates against the reintegration of offenders within the wider community as returning citizens after their release. In our view, such experiential conditioning also works to prevent empathic concern for others and instead appears to promote the sort of self-absorption that is a barrier to desistance.¹⁰

New inmates arriving in prison often want to keep out of trouble. They appear to do their best to shut down their senses and desire to connect with others in order to survive difficult and sometimes violent situations. The prison experience itself seems to create serious interpersonal difficulties for inmates, and brings what Richard Wortley defines as situational precipitators into play that adversely impact on the inmate’s life in prison.¹¹ Instead of offering rehabilitation, the narrowly defined and overly determined gender codes associated with hyper masculinity in male prisons, and the way staff and inmates treat each other, may operate to compromise inmate learning about how to relate to and care for others in socially constructive ways.¹² This lack of preparation for emotional life in the outside world, as well as a lack of gainful employment, may be why so many inmates go on to reoffend. Globally, prison has a poor record for reducing recidivism; in the UK, forty-four percent of adults are reconvicted within one year of release. For those serving sentences of less than twelve months this increases to fifty-nine percent. Worse, over two thirds of under-eighteens (sixty-nine percent) are reconvicted within a year of release.¹³

Makeright: A Community of Makers and a De-risked Space For Change

Some experimental work from criminology has suggested that building social relations in prison can usefully deliver mutual cooperation¹⁴ and empathic understandings that can impact on reoffending.¹⁵ However, such relational approaches remain on the fringe. This may be because the UK National Offender Management Service's (NOMS) "Seven Pathways to Reduce Re-Offending"¹⁶ (see Table 1) locate primarily *situational* factors as those that can influence behavior change and desistance from crime. Although pathways two, six, and seven understand the need to build personal agency and positive relationships in order to transform reoffending, these pathways do not highlight ideas about the importance of human connection with people (and place) beyond trying to better manage family relationships.

Table 1. The seven pathways to reduce re-offending (NOMS).

1. Accommodation and support	"A third of prisoners do not have settled accommodation prior to custody and it is estimated that stable accommodation can reduce the likelihood of re-offending by more than a fifth. It also provides the vital building blocks for a range of other support services and gaining employment."
2. Education, training and employment	"Having a job can reduce the risk of re-offending by between a third and a half. There is a strong correlation between offending, poor literacy, language and numeracy skills and low achievement. Many offenders have a poor experience of education and no experience of stable employment."
3. Health	"Offenders are disproportionately more likely to suffer from mental and physical health problems than the general population and also have high rates of alcohol misuse." Not surprisingly, 31% of adult prisoners were found to have emotional well-being issues linked to their offending behavior.
4. Drugs and alcohol	"Around two thirds of prisoners use illegal drugs in the year before imprisonment and intoxication by alcohol is linked to 30% of sexual offences, 33% of burglaries, 50% of street crime and about half of all violent crimes."
5. Finance, benefits and debt	"Ensuring that ex-offenders have sufficient lawfully obtained money to live on is vital to their rehabilitation. Around 48% of prisoners report a history of debt, which gets worse for about a third of them during custody and about 81% of offenders claim benefit on release."
6. Children and families	"Maintaining strong relationships with families and children can play a major role in helping prisoners to make and sustain changes that help them to avoid re-offending." This is difficult because custody places added "strains on family relationships."
7. Attitudes, thinking & behavior	"Prisoners are more likely to have negative social attitudes and poor self-control. Successfully addressing their attitudes, thinking and behavior during custody may reduce re-offending" by up to 14%.

Source: London Councils, "Reducing Reoffending in London: Why Investing in Local Solutions Will Deliver" (London Councils, 2013), 12–13, accessed February 25, 2018, <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/6470>.

Inmate feedback from the interviews we undertook for the Makeright¹⁷ project reminds us that humanistic and psychological factors are incredibly important to rehabilitation and resettlement, in addition to the situational factors outlined by the NOMS pathways. Also, we see that that the prison mask that is part of a

speaking of people 'desisting' after a single offence." Joanna Shaplan, Stephan Farrall, and Anthony Bottoms, eds., *Global Perspectives on Desistance: Reviewing What We Know and Looking to the Future* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 1.

11 Richard Wortley, "A Classification of Techniques for Controlling Situational Precipitators of Crime," *Security Journal* 14, no. 4 (2001): 63–82, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.sj.8340098>.

12 David R. Karp, "Unlocking Men, Unmasking Masculinities: Doing Men's Work in Prison," *Journal of Men's Studies* 18, no. 1 (2010): 63–83, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3149/jms.1801.63>.

13 Prison Reform Trust, "Prison: The Facts, Bromley Briefings" (Prison Reform Trust, Summer 2017), accessed February 25, 2018, <http://www.prisonreformtrust.org.uk/Portals/0/Documents/Bromley%20Briefings/Summer%202017%20factfile.pdf>.

14 Beth Weaver and Dave Nicholson, "Co-producing Change: Resettlement as a Mutual Enterprise," *Prison Service Journal*, no. 204 (2012): 9–16.

15 Deborah W. Kilgore, "A Group Learning Intervention into How Women Learn Empathy in Prison," *Adult Education Quarterly* 51, no. 2 (2001): 146–64, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/07417130122087197>.

16 London Councils, *Reducing Reoffending in London: Why Investing in Local Solutions Will Deliver*, October 2013, 12–13, accessed February 25, 2018, <https://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk/node/6470>.

17 We got permission from HMP Thameside for Erika Renedo (who was employed there as an Operational Support Officer in Textiles) to undertake interviews with Makeright inmates about their experiences of the course. The University of the Arts London (UAL) ethics committee approved the consent forms and thirty interviews took place, although only twenty-six were usable and have been transcribed and can be accessed here: <https://makerightorg.wordpress.com/interviews/list-of-interviews/>.



Figure 1 Geese Theatre Company explore key issues and challenges faced by inmates. Copyright © 2010 Gina Print Photography.

18 “Use of Masks,” *Geese Theatre Company*, last modified March 03, 2017, <http://www.geese.co.uk/about/use-of-masks-in-our-work>.

19 “Interview no. 16,” *Makeright*, accessed March 29, 2018, <https://makerightorg.wordpress.com/interviews/>.

20 Jenny Hughes, *Doing the Arts Justice: A Review of Research Literature, Practice and Theory*, ed. Andrew Miles and Angus McLewin (London: Anne Peaker Centre, 2005), available at <https://www.issuelab.org/resource/doing-the-arts-justice-a-review-of-research-literature-practice-and-theory.html>.

21 Charlotte Bilby, Laura Caulfield, and Louise Ridley, “Re-imagining Futures: Exploring Arts Interventions and the Process of Desistance” (report, National Criminal Justice Arts Alliance,

continuous performance that helps inmates survive in prison may, over the longer term, impact negatively upon progress in relation to all seven of the pathways described previously. It is for this reason that theater groups like the *Geese Theatre Company* use actual masks (Figure 1) as dramatic devices to help inmates to role play, build emotional intelligence and reflect on and question their own thoughts and feelings that inform the negative attitudes that adversely affect their behavior and social relations.¹⁸ Some prisoners cannot manage to hold the prison mask in place while incarcerated; others find they cannot remove it upon release. This damaging development is why we feel there is a need for empathic design experiences in prison, in addition to those created by arts practitioners. We believe designing and making within the confines of prison can improve inmates’ social engagement and ease their re-entry into society once they are released.

There are few so-called “de-risked” spaces within prisons where emotional learning can happen. Those that do exist appear to be associated with educational classes or therapeutic or restorative activities. As one inmate who participated in Makeright observed, “People show one another more respect. The atmosphere [in the Makeright studio] is completely different to any other part of the prison.”¹⁹ Arts ed-

ucation projects in the UK criminal justice system make a difference because they impact on the reduction of reoffending,²⁰ and create safe and playful spaces for inmates to rethink who they are and renegotiate their criminal identities. The extent to which inmate involvement in arts projects impacts recidivism is hotly debated – even if such work has been supported by groups such as the Koestler Trust and the National Criminal Justice Arts Alliance (NCJAA). The Koestler Trust has been awarding arts prizes and mentoring inmates for over fifty years. The National Criminal Justice Arts Alliance represents over eight hundred small arts businesses that work in prison to deliver creative experiences that help to transform inmates’ lives. The NCJAA champions the value of arts education in helping inmates re-imagine their futures²¹ and has produced over eighty evaluations mapping the ways the arts enable inmates to connect with understandings/feelings about themselves and others via creative processes that aid psychological change.²² Their evaluations have been written up by criminologists²³ and drawn upon by arts and humanities scholars such as Geoffrey Crossick and Patrycja Kaszynska,²⁴ also Peter Bazelgette²⁵ whose publications make a strong case for the power of empathy and arts education in catalyzing change, as did the 2016 Coates Review.²⁶

While forms of creative education may not always be a necessary or sufficient condition for supporting desistance, creativity can play a vital role in enabling some prisoners to embark on new self-perceptions and journeys that lead them away from crime.²⁷ In prison, as in the outside world, inmates confront identity questions in their own ways, and arrive at their own understandings of who they are based on an unfinished, unresolved self-dialogue. Perceptual shifts are crucial for actual change to happen and, as Shadd Maruna points out, it is here where notions about rehabilitative storytelling²⁸ and rebiographing²⁹ in association with education can inform redemption narratives and become significant – “I was lost but am figuring out how to find myself.” Redemption narratives are crucial to change, not just for

inmates, but also for those recovering from addictions including alcoholism.³⁰

In 2014, our team sought to create an action research project³¹ that drew upon our socially responsive design methodology³² to introduce design education to prison industries. “Makeright,” the project we created, was unique, as it intended to build inmate confidence by developing accessible teaching methods to promote transferable skills and engagement with design methods while asking inmates to design against crime in collaboration with volunteers, many of whom were design graduates or students. We envisaged that design methods could provide benefits to learners by developing their ability to empathize, communicate, cooperate, and collaborate. Specifically, we thought that the development of user personas and storyboards, and engagement with design against crime role play techniques³³ would support empathic understanding. We also envisaged that engagement with a formal design process would develop the problem solving skills of inmate learners.

Engagement with a collaborative design process also exposes the inmate learners to principles of entrepreneurial effectuation,³⁴ which they experience by proxy during the Makeright design process (see Table 2).

Table 2. Principles of entrepreneurial effectuation delivered by proxy within design processes.

Elements of Effectuation	Proxy within Makeright
Bird in hand: Expert entrepreneurs start with their means and imagine possibilities that originate from their means; who I am, what I know, whom I know – what I can do with that!	The Makeright design process promotes asset oriented approaches. Learners have to respond to constraints of available materials and machinery. Learners are encouraged to draw upon their criminal knowledge and behavioral understandings to inform their design proposals. Learners are encouraged to design for people or scenarios they are familiar with.
Affordable loss: Expert entrepreneurs “focus on the downside risk” to limit losses to affordable levels in case of negative outcomes or failure. This ensures they can proceed towards their goals even if they have to change their plan on how to do so.	The Makeright design process encourages iteration and “paper prototyping.” It provides opportunities for learners to mock up ideas quickly and cheaply in terms of materials and time, creating the space to learn from their experiences of what works and what doesn’t to improve their design.
Lemonade: Expert entrepreneurs “leverage surprises,” reframing unexpected challenges as opportunities for new possibilities.	The Makeright design process utilizes collage, paper prototyping, and other activities that create opportunities for ‘happy accidents’ from which learners can draw design inspiration.
Crazy (patchwork) quilt: Expert entrepreneurs collaborate, building partnerships with self-selecting stakeholders who have compatible aims. This provides opportunities to co-create new markets.	The Makeright design process requires inmates to work collaboratively with each other, and specifically with student and graduate designers who mentor and help them co-create design proposals. At the same time, the designers gain experience in design facilitation.
Pilot in the plane: Expert entrepreneurs focus on activities that are within their control. They take a worldview that the future is neither found nor predicted but, rather, made.	Makeright design process offers a structured approach to problem definition and problem solving. It provides learners with agency over the outcome of their engagement with the design process.

In addition to the exposure to entrepreneurial principles, learners are specifically introduced to the social enterprise model applied within Makeright – some of the bags designed are manufactured and sold with profits going to Sue Ryder, a charity that provides care to seriously and terminally ill people. When finalizing designs for manufacture and considering costs at retail, inmates develop lay plans – finding the most economical use of materials – and are introduced to ideas

2013), accessed February 24, 2018, <http://www.artsevidence.org.uk/evaluations/rel/>.

22 “Evaluations,” *Arts Alliance Evidence Library*, accessed February 24, 2018, <http://www.artsevidence.org.uk/evaluations>.

23 Nina Burrowes et. al., “Intermediate Outcomes of Arts Projects: A Rapid Evidence Assessment” (report, National Offender Management Service, 2013), accessed February 24, 2018, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/254450/Intermediate-outcomes-of-arts-projects.pdf.

24 Geoffrey Crossick and Patrycja Kaszynska, “Understanding the Value of Arts and Culture: The AHRC Cultural Value Project” (Arts and Humanities Research Council, 2016), 47–51, accessed February 24, 2017, <http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/documents/publications/cultural-value-project-final-report/>.

25 Peter Bazalgette, *The Empathy Instinct: How to Create a More Civil Society* (London: John Murray, 2017), 146–82.

26 Dame S. Coates, “Unlocking Potential: A Review of Education in Prison” (UK Ministry of Justice, May 2016), accessed February 24, 2018, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/524013/education-review-report.pdf.

27 Kirstin Anderson, Sarah Colvin, Fergus McNeill, Mike Nellis, Katie Overy, Richard Sparks, and Lyn Tett, “Inspiring Change: Final Project Report of the Evaluation Team” (report, February 2011), accessed March 19, 2018, <http://www.artsevidence.org.uk/media/uploads/evaluation-downloads/mc-inspiring-change-april-2011.pdf>.

28 Shadd Maruna, *Making Good: How Ex-convicts Reform and Rebuild Their Lives* (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association Books, 2001), 10.

29 *Ibid.*, 164.

30 Some argue that prisoners (like certain alcoholics) do better when they start to redefine themselves and engage with redemption narratives. William Dunlop and Jessica Tracey suggest “newly sober alcoholics whose narratives included self-redemption were substantially more likely to maintain sobriety in

the following months, compared to newly sober alcoholics who produced no redemptive narratives; 83% of the redemptive group maintained sobriety between assessments, compared to 44% of no redemptive participants.” William L. Dunlop and Jessica L. Tracey, “Sobering Stories: Narratives of Self-Redemption Predict Behavioural Change and Improved Health among Recovering Alcoholics,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 104, no. 3 (2013): 576–90, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031185>.

31 Action research is 1) future oriented, 2) collaborative, 3) agonistic, and 4) situational; it also 5) implies system development, and 6) generates theory grounded in action. See Gerald I. Susman and Roger D. Evered, “An Assessment of the Scientific Merits of Action Research,” *Administrative Science Quarterly* 23, no. 4 (1978): 590, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2392581>.

32 Lorraine Gamman and Adam Thorpe, “Editorial,” *CoDesign* 7, no. 3-4, (2011): 139–41, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15710882.2011.630561>.

33 Lorraine Gamman, Adam Thorpe, Matt Malpass, and Eva Liparova, “Hey Babe—Take a Walk on the Wild Side! Why Role-Playing and Visualisation of User and Abuser ‘Scripts’ Offer Useful Tools to Effectively ‘Think Thief’ and Build Empathy to Design Against Crime,” *Design and Culture: The Journal of the Design Studies Forum* 4, no. 2 (2012): 171–93, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2752/175470812X13281948975495>.

34 Saras D. Sarasvathy, *Effectuation: Elements of Entrepreneurial Expertise* (Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 2008), 65–95.

35 Tim Brown, *Change by Design: How Design Thinking Transforms Organizations and Inspires Innovation* (New York: Harper Business, 2009).

36 Lorraine Gamman and Adam Thorpe, “Criminality and Creativity: What’s at Stake in Designing Against Crime?,” in *Design Anthropology*, ed. Alison Clarke (New York/Vienna: Springer, 2011), 56–71, available at https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-7091-0234-3_5.

regarding margins, mark-ups, pricing, and profit to ensure their products are appropriate for sale for a good cause. At first glance, the focus of the co-design activity appears to be aimed at helping inmates develop and deliver a bag designed to protect its user against crime. However, we also designed the process to familiarize participants with design processes and approaches we felt would be useful in other areas of their life. In short, we reflected that engagement with collaborative design processes within a prison industry setting could contribute to developing inmates’ entrepreneurial abilities in the same way that employment in prison industry workshops contributes to their future employability. By developing inmates’ design thinking and skills, tasking them with creating a product with the user in mind, and facilitating exercises aimed at developing empathic understandings about others – including our diverse group of student volunteers – Makeright aimed to build positive social understandings useful for life outside prison as well as entrepreneurial skills.

Creativity and Criminality: Why Design Thinking for Prison Industries Might Be a Good Fit

In 2014, when we launched our Makeright project (having secured funding from the Arts and Humanities Research Council (AHRC)) we were aware that design thinking³⁵ had not been taught in prison before – neither within prison education, nor within prison industries – and we wanted to see what effect the design processes we introduced might have on inmates.³⁶ Even though our team was not convinced that many inmates would possess so-called “outsider ingenuity,” positively described by those who give accounts of the “misfit economy,”³⁷ we were aware that many criminal scams apply human-centered and behavioral insights using an understanding of human psychology that many designers would benefit from emulating. Additionally, we were intrigued by similarities in behavioral and cognitive traits within the populations of prisons and art schools. Both have a greater propensity than the wider population to be opportunistic and risk embracing, as well as dyslexic, as we have written about elsewhere.³⁸ We wondered if design education might serve to channel and develop the inmates’ natural capacities in ways that traditional education had not achieved, given the latter had already failed so many of those behind bars. We wanted to reimagine the textile workshop within prison industries as a space within the prison that could accommodate different learning styles, and provide a creative hub where design and entrepreneurship could have a role in the restoration and rehabilitation of inmates who engaged with collaborative designing and making.

Our rationale, that everyone has the potential to be creative, resonates with Leon Cruickshank’s observation that “rethinking the role of the designer and not seeing them as the primary source of creativity in projects impacts on the very bedrock of what it is to be a designer.”³⁹ Our strategy for the prison inmates was linked to applying co-design approaches to democratize innovation, and the belief that thinking through doing – which is part of studio practice – could work for inmate learners within prison systems. While we never imagined such skills would enable inmates to become professional designers, we did hope that designing prototypes using the techniques we teach and learn in design school – from role and game playing to ideation and prototyping – could help the inmates build their social competence and resilience. We thought that exposure to creative learning experiences such as these might enhance their emotional and empathic understandings, as Grit Hein describes.⁴⁰ Also, we wanted to help the inmates develop new, transferable, creative thinking skills that might support their ambitions for future self-employment in other contexts, given that seventy-nine percent of prisoners say that when they leave prison they are interested in starting a business – compared to around forty percent of the UK population as a whole.⁴¹

Makeright: Course and Program Design and Delivery

Table 3 lists the twenty-six creative exercises through which we delivered the Makeright design teaching. The table locates the exercises within stages of the Design Council's Double Diamond Design Process⁴² and indicates some of the learning outcomes that are experienced by participants.

Although the exercises can be delivered in any order, through iterative development and delivery of the program and resources, and in dialogue with numerous colleagues – including designers Emma Jonsson, Joe Hunter, and Marcus Willcocks – we found that the program structure we share in Table 3 most effectively supports learners' ability to grasp the complex concepts and information required to design for specific user requirements and against specific vulnerabilities and threats.

In the prison, the action research was supported by two of our former design students, Pras Gunasekera and Erika Renedo, who were employed by HMP Thameside to run Makeright within the textiles workshop (between 2015–17). Keith Jarvis, the Enterprise Manager there, and Makeright champion made these appointments happen. His understanding of prison constraints – no internet access, restricted use of tools, etc. – also helped us finalize a course that could run inside.⁴³ The first iteration of the Makeright course at HMP Thameside, delivered between October and December 2016, was a potent learning experience for everyone – the entire team, the inmates, and the prison staff. We asked the inmate learners to conceptualize and design for someone whose possessions they would want to keep safe and secure. It is not always easy to work out what someone else might want and need, so we showed the learners the methods designers use to do this. We taught them how to develop and use

- personas – fictional characters created from the attitudes, behaviors and experiences of real people;
- lifestyle mapping – visuals depicting the world that the personas inhabit, what they might wear, where they might go, what they might do in their everyday lives, etc.;
- journey maps – visuals that illustrate the progression of the personas' daily activities;
- story boards – illustrated scenarios that the personas might encounter; and
- marketing rationales – explanations as to why the persona they had developed would want to own the bag they were designing for them.

This process seemed to work. We were encouraged by how well the inmates engaged with the exercises and how the design resources worked to support their engagement. In particular, the empathic "things"⁴⁴ we used, such as films, social games about loss and theft, and role playing perpetrator techniques really unlocked the learners' creativity. These activities asked the inmate learners to think through what people carry, what things get lost most regularly, which 'hot products'⁴⁵ get stolen most often, which bag features make the bag vulnerable to theft, and how design features can deter theft.

Some inmates had literacy issues, so we designed the learning exercises to afford access to experiential and reflective learning via more inclusive forms of interaction and documentation. These methods included specially designed card games, quizzes, role play, and collage, in addition to peer presentation and feedback. Inmate learners brought a unique perspective to the design process applying their own experiences and expertise – including their personal knowledge about crime – as design assets. There were some difficult moments. For example, the group discussions broached many sensitive topics, which sometimes elicited deep feelings including empathy with victims that such restorative practices foster, as described by Piers Worth et al.⁴⁶

37 Alexa Clay and Kyra M. Phillips, *The Misfit Economy: Lessons in Creativity from Pirates, Hackers, Gangsters, and Other Informal Entrepreneurs* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2016), 3–48.

38 Ibid.

39 Leon Cruikshank, *Open Design and Innovation: Facilitating Creativity in Everyone* (Dorchester: Dorset Press, 2014), 11.

40 Grit Hein, "Empathy and Resilience in a Connected World," in *The Resilience Handbook: Approaches to Stress and Trauma*, ed. Martha Kent, Mary C. Davis, and John W. Reich (New York: Routledge, 2014), 145–55.

41 Center for Entrepreneurs, "From Inmates to Entrepreneurs: How to Break the Cycle of Reoffending" (Center for Entrepreneurs, May 2016), 6, available at <https://centreforentrepreneurs.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Prison-Entrepreneurs-Report-WEB-1.pdf>.

42 For more information, see <https://www.designcouncil.org.uk/news-opinion/design-process-what-double-diamond>.

43 "Makeright Teaching Materials," *Makeright*, accessed February 24, 2018, <https://makeright.org.wordpress.com/teaching-materials-4/>.

44 "A fundamental challenge for designers and the design community is to move from designing 'things' (objects) to designing things (socio-material assemblies)," Erling Bjögvinsson, Pelle Ehn, and Per-Anders Hillgren, "Design Things and Design Thinking: Contemporary Participatory Design Challenges," *Design Issues* 28, no. 3 (2012): 102, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/DESI_a_00165.

45 Ronald V. Clarke, *Hot Products: Understanding, Anticipating and Reducing Demand for Stolen Goods*, ed. Barry Webb (London: Home Office, Policing and Reducing Crime Unit, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, 1999), available at <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.424.3416&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.

46 Piers Worth, Theo Gavrielides, Matthew D. Smith, Andriana Ntziadima, and Ioanna Gouseti, "The Psychology of Restorative Justice: Creating the Inner and Outer Space for Change—An Observation of Restorative Justice Meetings," in *The Psychology of Restorative Justice: Managing the Power Within*, ed. Theo

Table 3. Makeright course design.

	Discover	Define	Develop	Deliver
Double diamond Top level process				
Process stage	... understand people and their needs	... challenges, causes, and opportunities	... ideas & potential solutions	... what works
What participants gain	Understand Think critically Empathize with others, particularly victims of crime	Insight Communicate, cooperate & collaborate with colleagues	Synthesize Learning through practice that here is no one right answer. Embracing criticism and iteration lead to as useful feedback improvement	Communicate Owning decisions about what happens next through completion
How makeright delivers this stage	Observe 5. The lost thing Personal experience observation	Frame 11. Role-play Acting out to empathize with user	Distil 18. Refine your design brief Refine brief using bag components	Implement 20. Design prototyping Testing ideas in toile
	1. Constant Gaze portraits Looking and interpreting	7. Character cards Persona building blocks	15. Frankenstein bag collage Identifying design components	Presentation preparation Collate all learning's and outcomes
	2. When have you designed before? Identifying transferable skills	8. "Mood board" Developing the context of persona	16. Defend your bag role play Critique design in real world use	21. Pattern development Refining manufacture process
	3. Most lost and stolen quiz Game about the common bag theft techniques and items	9. Where do bags come from? Interactive session on bag history and typologies	17. Bag typologies game What components does a bag need?	Final presentation Communicate learning's and outcomes for critique
	4. Who uses the bag? Identifying a user	10. Developing a persona Who is the user and what do they carry	14. Understanding the design brief Who are you designing for and what do they need?	Portfolio creation Create tools to seek further education and work

The first iteration went well; by Christmas 2015, our first group of learners had presented their thinking and prototypes (Figures 2–7) to prison staff and our research team. The inmates had co-created a plausible range of anti-theft bag designs that they had developed using offcuts donated to the prison textile workshop by local businesses.

This first cohort also provided critical reflection and feedback on their

Gavrielides (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015), 216.



Figure 2 The Arm-Lock Bag has an inner, lined, hidden zip pocket that sits against the body to keep valuables safe. Copyright © 2016 Design Against Crime Research Centre.



Figure 3 The Decoy Messenger Bag has a pocket for valuables hidden in the flap which, if unjustly accessed, forces the hand back out through the main zip opening. Copyright © 2016 Design Against Crime Research Centre.



Figure 4 The Holster/Pit Pocket Bag sits under an outer jacket and is held close to the body to prevent pickpocketing. Copyright © 2016 Design Against Crime Research Centre.



Figure 5 The arm handles of the Festival Bag are anti-theft zip pockets that seal the bag. Copyright © 2016 Design Against Crime Research Centre.



Figure 6 The Tote Canvas Bag features a folding flap that is sealed using Velcro; when the bag is worn over the shoulder, the user's arm secures the flap. Copyright © 2016 Design Against Crime Research Centre.

Figure 7 Laptop Case to be used with anti-theft Tote or Arm-Lock bags. Copyright © 2016 Design Against Crime Research Centre.



experiences that helped us understand how to improve our teaching materials and methods. Reflective discussion helped the team recognize that inmate learners needed close and continuous facilitation and support to stay on task and achieve results. It was apparent that the project would not be deliverable without a higher ratio of facilitators to learners than we could sustainably provide. In response, we decided to explore the possibility of bringing in volunteers with art and design experience – many of whom were recent art and design graduates from London colleges – to mentor inmates during the future iterations of the Makeright course. We subsequently recognized that volunteer engagement with inmates was one of the most important aspects of Makeright’s approach to teaching and learning. We trained our volunteers in facilitation techniques, which enabled them to actively listen to the inmates and use inclusive and empowering approaches that would support the inmates’ attempts at prototyping. In brief, the volunteers demonstrated Makeright’s collaborative and cooperative ethos by the way they interacted with inmate learners. We believe an active listening and mentoring approach is central to any successful rehabilitative initiative, and that respect and equality for all citizens demonstrated via non-hierarchical reciprocal relations is achievable within the prison environment and system.

To understand whether our teaching materials worked across cultural contexts, the Design Against Crime Research Centre (DACRC) team also agreed to test the Makeright course and teaching resources in India, working with Praveen Nahar from Ahmedabad’s National Institute of Design (NID) who was a Co-investigator on the AHRC project. Praveen worked with a group of students he had selected to translate our materials into culturally appropriate words and images for their local context. NID staff and students then delivered a version of the Makeright course to twenty-five inmates in Sabarmati Central Jail, Ahmedabad, with Lorraine Gamman and Pras Gunasekera from DACRC attending some teaching events in Ahmedabad. The positive results confirmed the efficacy of our teaching materials in the Indian context. Makeright in India delivered four credible anti-theft bag design prototypes (Figures 8–11) and much positive inmate feedback about the value of the course. In March 2016, these designs were presented to an invited audience at Sabamarti Central Jail, and, thanks to the efforts of Sunil Joshi, Superintendent of the Prison, we ended up making the front page of *The Times of India*.⁴⁷

In both countries, the Makeright course program integrated some uniquely restorative elements. The focus on designing bags that would thwart criminals and prevent crimes meant the inmates used their ideas to improve the situations of others vulnerable to crime. Additionally, it was agreed with inmates in the UK that any profits from the sales of the anti-theft bags would go to the national healthcare charity Sue Ryder, which also provides opportunities for inmates to work on day release in their charity shops (the Release on Temporary License Scheme). The UK inmates who signed up for Makeright knew they were agreeing to (a) receive a small fee (pocket money) for the work completed during the sessions, as is usual in UK prison industries; (b) share their intellectual property to support a good cause by granting a free license to Makeright to manufacture and distribute their designs to raise money for charity; (c) their designs being available in Sue Ryder charity shops and online; and (d) they would retain some intellectual property rights over the designs they co-produced. At a later stage we agreed with the inmates that if they wished to do so, they could make and sell the design concepts they had co-created outside of the Makeright project if they wanted to. But most UK inmates, with one or two exceptions, said that even though they *did* want to contribute to charity (and relieve boredom by being so occupied in the co-design process), they did not see themselves exploiting their collaboratively produced designs in the future. We found that the inclusion of a third party beneficiary – in this case, the Sue Ryder charity – was

47 “Convicts Help Design Theft-Proof Bags,” *The Times of India*, last modified March 22, 2016, <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/ahmedabad/Convicts-help-design-theft-proof-bags/articleshow/51506424.cms>.

Figure 8 To foil bag snatchers, the outer layer of the Snatch-Proof Tote detaches while the inner bag containing the wearer's belongings remains. Copyright © 2016 Ishaan Dixit & Manish Minz for NID India.



Figure 9 A hidden pocket for money and other valuables is located within the bottle compartment of the Bottle Bag. The bottle acts as a decoy. Copyright © 2016 Ishaan Dixit & Manish Minz for NID India.





Figure 10 Its thick leather base makes slashing the Travel Bag difficult in crowded areas, and its rucksack-like opening prevents access to the main compartment. Copyright © 2016 Sahil Thappa for NID India.



Figure 11 Praveen Nahar (NID) and Pras Gunasekera (UAL/ HMP Thameside) with Makeright bags at HMP Thameside. Copyright © 2016 Design Against Crime Research Centre.

48 Kent A. Kiehl and Morris B. Hoffman, "The Criminal Psychopath: History, Neuroscience, Treatment, and Economics," *Jurimetrics* 51, no. 4 (2011): 355–97, available at <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41307135>.

49 Jon Ronson, *The Psychopath Test: A Journey through the Madness Industry* (London: Riverhead Books, 2011), 250–56.

important to the success of the project as it contributed to motivating inmate engagement. Several inmates commented that on occasions, when they "could not be bothered" with the course, they remembered that they were contributing something to those less fortunate than themselves and this motivated them to continue.

Although the inmates self-selected to attend the course (to meet ethical requirements) the posters advertising Makeright were only shown to UK Category B and C offenders and not offered by the prison to Category A offenders, who are usually regarded as likely to be more violent (Table 4).

Table 4. Different prisoner security categories in England and Wales.

Category	Description
A	Category A prisoners are those that would pose the most threat to the public, the police or national security should they escape. Security conditions in category A prisons are designed to make escape impossible for these prisoners
B	Category B prisoners do not need to be held in the highest security conditions but, for category B prisoners, the potential for escape should be made very difficult.
C	Category C prisoners cannot be trusted in open conditions but are considered to be prisoners who are unlikely to make a determined escape attempt
D	Category D prisoners can be trusted in open conditions.
U	Un-sentenced prisoners, or prisoners on remand awaiting trial, are generally housed in category B accommodation unless they have been provisionally classified as category A.

Source: Offenders' Families Helpline, accessed March 15, 2018, <http://www.offendersfamilieshelpline.org/index.php/prisoner-category/>.

The prison was very clear about what security measures were needed to ensure the safety of our staff and volunteers. When HMP Thameside agreed to let us deliver the course, they insisted on training our staff and volunteers (for a minimum of one morning session) in how to avoid manipulation by inmates and promote best practice for safety and security. Research indicates that sixteen percent of adult males in prison, or on parole or probation are likely to be psychopathic (compared to one percent of the general population).⁴⁸ As well as excluding Category A prisoners from Makeright, HMP Thameside insisted on showing us videos of recreated scenarios showing how staff have been manipulated in the past. Over the two years Makeright has run, there have been no security issues or incidents that have raised concern. When working with inmates, our staff and volunteers were not worried for their own safety. Many did often express concern for the inmates after being touched by the stories they told when we were designing and making together. During Makeright classes, many inmates spoke of adverse life experiences where poverty, grief, trauma, addiction, homelessness, and lack of work were significant. For the most part, our team and volunteers did not choose to review or worry about the offences that brought inmates into the jail. Nor were we concerned about potential psychopathic tendencies listed in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, because we were never alone with inmates or at risk. Instead, we took inmates at face value and developed our own understandings of them as individuals. Choosing not to experience people through the lens of labels linked to their offences or psychological profile goes along with Jon Ronson's warning that such labeling tools are dangerous weapons.⁴⁹ Hearing the inmates' stories helped us understand how important listening to people is, and recognize that substance abuse issues, homelessness, unemployment, and trauma issues have such a massive influence on offending.

In order to address the inmates' concerns about future employment prospects, we set up a certification process for them that recognized their learning and contribution to the program. As well as receiving a course completion certificate from our center, the Makeright learners could additionally opt to submit their portfolio of work developed through the course to the HMP Thameside education department for an NCFE Level 1 in Art and Design (accredited through Novus). We also started to explore how design and designers might engage with the wider prison system and created an exhibition *Make It Right* to show the rest of the prison what the men in the Makeright classes had been up to and what design thinking could contribute to prison life. The exhibition was delivered at HMP Thameside in November 2016 and had a positive impact on the self esteem of all involved. The team got permission to invite all the prison inmates who expressed interest in seeing the exhibition, and families of the Makeright learners still inside at the time of the exhibition were invited. Also invited were our volunteers, external guests, and members of the press so all could see what the men and volunteers had been working on and also meet some of them. For this event, inmates of another Serco prison (HMP Kilmarnock) manufactured the Makeright bags out of recycled lorry (truck) tarpaulin (provided by the farm-to-front-door organic food delivery company Abel & Cole). The bags were manufactured at HMP Kilmarnock because many inmates from the Makeright course at HMP Thameside had been released and those remaining did not have the strong sewing machine skills that the longer term prisoners working within the textiles workshop at HMP Kilmarnock could offer.

In November 2016, we launched the designs constructed from the reclaimed Abel & Cole lorry tarp (Figures 15–17).

We are continuing to develop the Makeright (designed in prison) brand. Although we have many new designs in our solutions pool, in 2018 we are concentrating on refining the first five UK designs (see Figures 12–16) for retail markets. Abel & Cole's parent company – the William Jackson Food Group – have provided some sponsorship so we can test our bags with Abel & Cole customers using their existing online channels to find out what this group of users think of the bag designs and what sort of improvements we ought to make, if any, before marketing the bags more widely in Summer 2018 via their website and distribution network.

Figure 12 (Left) Tazul—Unisex Tote Bag. Copyright © 2016 Tom Willcocks for Design Against Crime Research Centre.

Figure 13 (Middle) King—Unisex Decoy Messenger Bag. Copyright © 2016 Tom Willcocks for Design Against Crime Research Centre.

Figure 14 (Right) Sean—Unisex Holster/ Pit Pocket Bag. Copyright © 2016 Tom Willcocks for Design Against Crime Research Centre.



Figure 15 Steve—Women's Arm-Lock Day Bag. Copyright © 2016 Marcus Willcocks for Design Against Crime Research Centre.



Figure 16 Lee—Unisex Laptop Case. Copyright © 2016 Marcus Willcocks for Design Against Crime Research Centre.



Figure 17 Group shot of assorted bag designs. Copyright © 2016 Tom Willcocks for Design Against Crime Research Centre.



Lessons from the Makeright Course—Supporting Inmate Learners “Through the Gate”

We have explored many ways to evaluate the Makeright course. Originally we applied a before/after survey method, drawing upon the Intermediate Outcomes Measurement Instrument (IOMI) toolkit produced by RAND Europe for the UK National Offender Management Service.⁵⁰ But the inmate learners said they found this survey too general and complained that it duplicated other survey data (for example on substance abuse) that they had previously contributed to; and they felt the information requested was irrelevant to the Makeright project. In subsequent iterations of the course we tried the Empathy Quotient Survey⁵¹ instead, but inmates who started to engage with it also complained about the number of questions (sixty) it contained and said they did not want to complete it, so we abandoned this measure too. Eventually, we decided the most appropriate method of evaluation available to us was to interview inmates who gave their consent using a list of semi-structured interview questions the team developed, and Erika Renedo got permission to undertake the interviews.⁵² Participating inmates were also invited to make short films of their learning journeys. This process involved the men learning some basic digital skills to create digital presentations that used images and a voice-over to communicate their experiences of the Makeright course. In the end, only four inmates took up this offer and actually went on to complete the work on their films.⁵³ Digital literacy training was independently delivered by Stretch, a social enterprise that focuses on developing the digital skills of inmates by supporting them to tell their stories via digital narratives.⁵⁴ In addition to these very personal anecdotal accounts, it was primarily the interview testimonies gathered by Renedo between 2016 and 2017 that informed what we know about the strengths and weaknesses of the course and its impact on participants.

At the most basic level of information gathering, we found levels of attendance on the Makeright course – when compared to other programs – to be excellent. Prison staff noted some changes in participants’ behavior, including refraining from conflict and greater compliance with the resettlement agenda. Craig Thomson, the Prison Governor, wrote a letter of support for the project, formally recognizing these results.⁵⁵ Despite these observations being subjective, prison is a very structured environment – inmates’ experiences are, for the most part, controlled and commonly observed. Prison staff said they saw improvements in participating inmates’ behaviors when compared to the wider population of inmates with whom they had contact; this wider prison population represents a control group of sorts. The learners’ qualitative testimony also suggested that the design studio experience is quite valuable to them. As one inmate commented, “What did I learn from it – well, as I said, I learned how to design and sew an anti-theft bag without smashing some people’s heads in. That’s the main one – to be calm and collected and get on with your work and let everyone else do the same.”⁵⁶ Many inmates also commented on how much they enjoyed the opportunity to build skills and engage in reflection. Whether some of the observed behavioral changes we have mentioned will continue when inmates leave prison, or can help reduce reoffending, we do not know – the UK justice system requires large data sets to effectively measure reoffending. We need to run the course several more times – and follow the outcomes for at least one hundred participants – to achieve appropriate volumes of data. Other challenges to gathering robust quantitative evidence of the impact of the course on reoffending include the variance in learners’ prison sentences (some prisoners who did the course have been released, some not) and there are a proportion of foreign prisoners who emigrate upon release making outcomes relating to recidivism difficult to follow. It is certainly our intention to engage with robust evaluative mechanisms if we can attract realistic funding, and our team is hopeful

50 The Intermediate Outcomes Measurement Instrument (IOMI) toolkit was developed in 2014 by a research team led by RAND Europe, in partnership with ARCS (UK) and the University of South Wales.

51 The Empathy Quotient Survey was developed by Simon Baron-Cohen of Cambridge University. For a sample survey, visit <https://psychology-tools.com/empathy-quotient/>. We obtained permission to use it from Baron-Cohen via email on July 19, 2016.

52 To view the interview questions, please visit <https://makerightorg.wordpress.com/interviews/>.

53 Films by Sam, John, James, and Jim available at <https://makerightorg.wordpress.com/images-and-videos/>.

54 Stretch digital storytelling techniques and the films mentioned here are listed on <http://stretch-charity.org>.

55 Craig Thomson, letter to the Queen’s Award Prize Panel, May 31, 2017.

56 “Interview no. 12,” *Makeright*, accessed March 29, 2018, <https://makerightorg.wordpress.com/interviews/>.

57 “Living Lab,” European Network of Living Labs, accessed February 24, 2018, <http://openlivinglabs.eu/livinglabs>.

58 The Men’s Shed Movement appears to have emerged in Australia in the early 1990s, following a health conference dedicated to men. The idea of community sheds is based on a backyard scenario where a man would go to his shed and carry out tasks, such as restoring furniture or fixing lawn mowers, but often after retirement downsizing means this space is lost to many individuals; so its reframed as a “community shed” place that could accommodate small groups and ease isolation.... Evidently, the first Men’s Shed (by that name) was opened in Tongala, Victoria, Australia on July 26, 1998, as identified by Barry Golding, *The Men’s Shed Movement: The Company of Men* (Champaign, Illinois: Common Ground Publishing LLC, 2015), 114.

59 “Public Collaboration Lab,” accessed February 24, 2018, <http://www.publiccollaboration-lab.com>.

60 “What is a fab lab?,” Fab Foundation, accessed February 25, 2018, <http://www.fabfoundation.org/index.php/what-is-a-fab-lab/index.html>.

61 Dale Dougherty, “The Maker Movement,” *Innovations: Technology, Governance, Globalization* 7, no. 3 (2012): 11–14, DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/INOV_a_00135.

that course impacts will also be demonstrated through comparison of outcomes of future inmate cohorts in other prisons. To this end, we have been offered the opportunity to run the course in HMP Doncaster, HMP Kilmarnock, and HMP Wandsworth, and will explore this in 2018/19.

A community of practice is emerging with Makeright at HMP Thameside – hopefully this will spread to other participating prisons. Inmate feedback is positive but learners anticipate harsh problems on release. Once inmates’ time is served, they are required to leave the prison and return to the outside world, usually with only a bin-liner containing their possessions, forty-seven pounds in cash and, for some, no place to go home to. Some prisoners are banned not just from returning to prison sites where they were incarcerated but also from the locations where their original crimes were committed – even though this may be where their families live and their support networks exist. For some inmates, going home on release means they will be in breach of the terms of their license and risk being returned to prison as recidivists.

At the same time, the Ministry of Justice (MOJ) rules about security and inmate confidentiality also mean that it is not easy to keep in touch with released Makeright learners without going through the probation service, which means significant time delays in establishing contact with course participants on release. So our attempts to find out what happens to Makeright learners on release, or to support them through the prison gates as returning citizens, have not borne much fruit. For example, a few inmates who were released from Makeright were not allowed back to the prison to see the exhibition of their own work because of MOJ rules, although some have found us and visited Central Saint Martins at King’s Cross to meet with the team. Their offers to mentor new Makeright inmates, and give something back while maintaining contact with the people and practices they found useful to them, cannot be taken forward in the present system. This security emphasis – although understandable – is disappointing in terms of community building and relational engagement.

Learning from the Maker Movements

We feel Makeright needs to make connections with offenders outside as well as inside the prison to be of lasting value for participants and help them to identify alternative pathways to desistance for those that experience the isolation and alienation that can ultimately lead to recidivism. Dedicated community spaces near the prison could provide places for returning citizens to build their skills, relationships, and resilience as they reintegrate with the world beyond bars. The European Living Lab Network,⁵⁷ the Men’s Shed Movement,⁵⁸ the Public Collaboration Lab we have developed with Camden Council,⁵⁹ and Fab Labs⁶⁰ and Makerspaces,⁶¹ among other approaches, may be of inspiration as we seek to create infrastructure or recreate elements of the Makeright studio’s community in place outside the prison for citizens after their release. Community Makerspaces, for example, built near to prison sites would allow returning citizens to access the creative collaboration and experiential learning that Makeright provides alongside resettlement guidance and support. Here, returning citizens could access additional services and educational opportunities made available to them and other members of the local community that would help them build skills and competencies, relational networks, and ultimately the resilience to survive and thrive. Through offering a different cultural approach, primarily working class men could access sewing machines, computers, and other tools and services that they could share. Maker culture is known for its focus on collaboration, on sharing knowledge through group activities, and peer support and learning. The Fab Lab ethos of “make, learn, share” or “learn, make,

share” is an open, inclusive, collaborative approach to innovation that places emphasis on self-sufficiency and enterprise. It has a lot to offer returning citizens in the scenarios we describe, as do local design schools who have student capacity and could put students to work on social innovation strategies, working with inmates in the context of challenge based education programs.⁶² However, neither of these cultures explicitly includes the specialist skills and experience necessary to support the complex needs of returning citizens, nor do their current models offer a cultural environment former inmates would likely feel comfortable in. Therefore, any design of a creative hub that welcomes and appeals to returning citizens would need to draw upon the resources and competencies of inmates and prison professionals in its conception and delivery.

Designers who have worked with inmates, inmates who have had some training in design, and established maker cultures within prison could be introduced to maker hubs as a boundary space on day release from prison so inmates’ reintegration to outside communities and places could be a gradual one. The experience inmates gained would have more chance of helping them become stable than the usual practice of addressing barriers linked to empowerment and cultural difference. With such maker organizations and spaces, the UK could open up the prison and create facilities that would operate as community anchors for vulnerable citizens on the outside as well as returning citizens from the inside – a space of restoration as well as a place for building cultures of resilience that could follow the sort of social enterprise models Rachel O’Brien eloquently outlines in her RSA Transitions paper.⁶³ We notice that a form of cooperative ethos has been developed in different ways across the world connected to prison industry activity: in the USA by companies such as Homeboy Industries;⁶⁴ in Italy by social enterprises such as Socially Made in Italy, where they pay working inmates a living wage when in prison and as create jobs in cooperatives on the outside;⁶⁵ and in Canada, as described by Ralph Gutkin’s *Peterborough Dialogues*⁶⁶ to name but a few. Our proposal for Maker-spaces nearby prisons to support the Makeright community of practice is still on the table at HMP Thameside, and we hope the initiative will emerge at other UK prisons. More importantly our proposal could help develop not just co-production understandings and a cooperative ethos, but also strong relational engagement with local communities and the outside world.

Conclusion

By engaging with prison industries via an action research project, Makeright successfully created a space to introduce design practice to inmates. We were able to open the prison door and allowed to run the experiment because our design against crime focus was considered uniquely restorative. This rehabilitative experiment was successful inasmuch as inmates (a) co-created a range of anti-theft bags; and (b) provided meaningful feedback about the value and impact of the course on their behavior, information that (c) prison authorities concurred with. Further evaluation is needed about Makeright’s impact. It is obvious that a one-off course like this could never be enough on its own to address the challenges inmates face with resettlement after prison. As Weaver & Weaver observe “if correctional practice is to support desistance, it must extend far beyond its traditional concerns (i.e. with professionally led interventions focused on changing individuals) and into a deeper engagement with means and processes that enable the (re) connection of the individual to the kinds of assets and reflexive relational networks that can facilitate not just desistance but social integration. This implies re-establishing ‘the circuit of social reciprocity’ ... and in so doing, learning from the experiential expertise of those engaged in that struggle. Such an approach is in alignment with the aspirations of co-production.”⁶⁷

62 Geoff Mulgan, Oscar Townsley, and Adam Price, “The Challenge-Driven University: How Real-Life Problems Can Fuel Learning” (Nesta, 2016), available at https://www.nesta.org.uk/sites/default/files/the_challenge-driven_university.pdf.

63 “Pay prisoners to work in social enterprises while in custody. This would continue through the gate in a Transition Park with the aim of normalizing work, addressing resettlement needs and securing employment in the community.... Salaries would make a contribution towards reparation to victims, individual savings towards resettlement and, potentially, running costs.” Rachel O’Brien, “RSA Transitions: A Social Enterprise Approach to Prison and Rehabilitation,” RSA, last modified November 1, 2011, 4, available at <https://www.thersa.org/discover/publications-and-articles/reports/rsa-transitions-a-social-enterprise-approach-to-prison-and-rehabilitation>.

64 For more information, see <http://www.homeboyindustries.org/why-we-do-it/>.

65 For more information, see <http://www.sociallymadeinitaly.com>.

66 For more information, see <http://peterboroughdialogues.media>. Also, see <http://peterboroughdialogues.media/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/Exploring-a-Community-based-Response-to-our-Criminality-Crisis.pdf>.

67 Beth Weaver and Allan Weaver, “An Unfinished Alternative: Towards a Relational Paradigm,” in *Beyond the Risk Paradigm in Criminal Justice*, ed. Chris Trotter, Gill McIvor, and Fergus McNeill (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 221–38.

Acknowledgments

With thanks to the AHRC for funding (i) the 2014–16 “Design Thinking for Prison Industries” project (including 2017–18 Follow on Funding), (ii) the 2014–16 “Extending Empathy” Research Network (<http://extendingempathy.com/eventsarchive>), and (iii) the 2014–16 “Public Collaboration Lab” activities. All three projects have informed this paper. Also with thanks to Ezio Manzini and Jeremy Till at the University of the Arts, London, who invited us to participate and contribute to the “Cultures of Resilience” seminars, where early versions of this paper were delivered.