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The Good Lives Model (GLM) is a strengths based approach to offender rehabilitation which aims to promote an individual’s aspirations and plans for a more meaningful and personally fulfilling life (Ward, 2010). The GLM and the traditional Risk Need Responsivity (RNR) approach to offender rehabilitation are not mutually exclusive. Risks and needs can be reduced or managed within the GLM framework, which delivers a more holistic, client-centred, and engaging framework within which to do this (Ward and Fortune, 2013).

According to the GLM, all individuals have needs and aspirations and seek ‘primary human goods’ which are likely to lead to psychological well-being if achieved. Eleven primary goods have been defined: life, knowledge, excellence in play, excellence in work, excellence in agency, inner peace, friendship/relatedness, community, spirituality, pleasure and creativity. Secondary goods are activities that individuals engage in, in order to achieve primary goods e.g. running may serve as the secondary means by which to meet the need for excellence in play. The desire to achieve primary goods is normal, however, the way in which some individuals try to meet these needs is maladaptive and they harm others in the process. This is often due to a lack of internal or external resources to meet their needs in a more pro-social manner (Willis, Yates, Gannon and Ward, 2012). For example, harmful sexual behaviour can sometimes be the secondary means by which to meet the need for inner peace or friendship/relatedness.

In order to reduce reoffending and help individuals achieve a satisfying life without harming others, the GLM views intervention as an activity that should build capabilities, strengths, opportunities and resources in individuals. The starting point in helping individuals to achieve their primary goods in pro-social ways is to help them understand their conceptualisation of what constitutes a good life. This is achieved through 1) asking questions about the individual’s core commitments in life and their valued day-to-day activities and experiences, and 2) identifying the goals and values underlying their offending. The next stage is to collaboratively formulate a good lives plan with the individual to identify secondary goods that can satisfy their primary goods in socially acceptable ways. Individualised intervention then focuses on building internal capacity and skills, and building external resources and supports to successfully implement the good lives plan and address any dynamic risk factors that might block fulfilment of the plan. (Purvis, Ward, and Willis, 2011).

The GLM was developed as a framework for use in interventions with adults who had engaged in sexual offending behaviour. However, G-MAP, a UK based service, has adapted the GLM for use with children and young people who have displayed harmful sexual behaviour, and refer to it as the GLM-A. The terminology and concepts have been changed so that they are more meaningful for children e.g. they refer to ‘Primary goods’ as ‘My
needs’ and ‘Secondary goods’ as ‘How I meet my needs’. Another adaptation that has been made is reducing the 11 GLM primary goods into eight GLM-A primary needs: having fun, achieving, being my own person, having people in my life, having purpose and making a difference, emotional health, sexual health and physical health. The GLM-A is a framework to help understand the needs that drive a young person’s behaviour and inform the interventions that should be implemented and prioritised to help them meet those needs more appropriately. Formulation and intervention should be undertaken within a systemic perspective, which includes collaboration with the young person and their family or carers (Fortune, Ward and Print, 2014).

Willis, Yates, Gannon and Ward (2012) have provided helpful guidelines as to how the GLM can be integrated into practice. They are clear that practitioners can exercise flexibility and creativity in integrating the GLM into their practice as long as the core constructs are embedded throughout the intervention and that the approach taken is consistent with the guidelines provided. In addition, G-MAP have produced a guide, ‘Intervention and planning using the Good Lives Model’, to assist professionals to construct individual programmes of work that are specific to the needs of children and young people and their unique circumstances. More recently they have published a book ‘The Good Lives Model for Adolescents Who Sexually Harm’ which provides comprehensive therapeutic guidelines and case illustrations to demonstrate how the GLM-A can be used in practice (Print, 2013). The G-MAP model of intervention, known as the Safer Lives Programme in Scotland, was introduced in Scotland in 2008 and a number of individuals in Scotland have been trained as trainers in the Safer Lives Programme.

Initial evaluation findings on the value of the GLM-A has indicated that practitioners found it to be a helpful framework to aid the understanding of professionals, children and carers of the needs being met by the harmful sexual behaviour, as well as an excellent framework for engaging and motivating children and carers in therapeutic work. The initial evaluation findings from children highlighted that they were able to understand the GLM-A, it helped them to understand their own harmful sexual behaviour and what needed to change, it was motivational, and it provided them with hope that things could get better (Leeson and Adshead, 2013). Additionally, a survey considering the impact of implementing ‘Safer Lives’ in Scotland concluded that practitioners viewed it as having a positive impact on their practice, most often by adding to their available ‘tool kit’, but at times in a more transformative way. Almost all of the practitioners viewed the approach as an excellent fit with their own professional values and liked the return to a more positive and person centred approach rather than dominated by a risk management perspective (Simpson and Vaswani, 2015).

Whilst the strength-focused approach of the GLM is welcomed, it has been considered to be too focused on the individual level of analysis. Given the evidence about the significance of social capital in desistance, it has been argued that there is also a need for more focus on interventions around the familial and social contexts of offending and that legitimate opportunities to develop social capital be improved (McNeill and Weaver, 2010). To date the GLM has largely been applied to individuals engaging in harmful sexual behaviour. However, the principles are equally applicable to other types of offending and there is potential for the GLM-A to provide a framework for children involved in all types of offending behaviour.
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