

PPI payments and excluded groups



Written by Peter Bates, peter.bates96@outlook.com

Contents

Summary	1
Asylum seekers	1
Prisoners	2
Motivation and ethics	5
Conclusion.....	6
How this paper is being written.....	6
Appendix 1: Money and UK prisoners	6
Where do prisoners get money from?.....	6
How do prisoners store their money?	7
How do prisoners access their money?	7
How do prisoners use their money?	8
Appendix 2: Countries that have undertaken relevant research.	8

Summary

Health research should be coproduced with people who have lived experience and nonsalaried Public Contributors should be offered a payment in recognition of their contribution¹. The offer of funds is known as a Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) payment². This paper investigates whether PPI payments can reach two groups of citizens who are at risk of being excluded from the process – asylum seekers and prisoners. Further groups may be added as this exploration continues.

There are many other issues that arise in conducting research with these two groups of citizens, who may have difficulties in accessing the usual advertising³, live in such straitened circumstances that their ability to give free and informed consent may be doubted, and who may find staff acting as gatekeepers while opposing the principles of coproduction and payment. This paper focuses narrowly on the practice of making payments for coproducing research.

Asylum seekers

UK government guidance on what is included in the ‘no recourse to public funds’ list does not mention research⁴, so there appears to be no justification here for refusing to offer PPI payments to

people in the immigration system. However, in the absence of a clear statement granting permission, asylum seekers will be too afraid of jeopardising their asylum claim to participate.

Prisoners

Coproducing prison research

While prisoners have few opportunities to contribute to decision-making⁵, several user-led organisations are promoting the democratisation of decision-making in prisons⁶ and consulting with people in custody⁷, so Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) is sometimes considered in UK prison research⁸. Most of this is done with ex-prisoners, so UK examples of PPI with serving prisoners are vanishingly rare⁹, due to several factors, including the following:

- There has been a perceived decline in the overall amount of prison-based research as staff reductions in the early 2010s combined with rising demand to make it an increasingly challenging environment for researchers¹⁰.
- Dually qualified researchers (i.e. fully qualified and employed academics who are also ex-prisoners) can be locked out of the prison estate by the background checking process applied to all prison visitors¹¹.
- Involvement of ex-prisoners in research, consultations and other service improvement activities is often carried out by an independent, user-led organisation contracted for the role. The ex-prisoners are therefore recruited, managed and remunerated by the independent organisation rather than by the prison or directly by the research institution.
- National policy has shut down opportunities for making PPI payments to people in custody – of which more below.

Neighbouring practices

Participatory Action Research (PAR) provides a wider framework for considering how prisoners may get involved in coproducing research in collaboration with academics. UK examples of the use of PAR in a prison include Hill et al (2008)¹², Ward & Bailey (2013)¹³ and Haarmans et al (2021)¹⁴, while PAR has been used in prisons¹⁵ and forensic mental health services¹⁶ elsewhere in the world.

Another neighbouring field is that of payments for research participation, as opposed to research coproduction, and such payments will be discussed further below.

Official guidance

While the national policy prior to 2024 is unknown, a recent policy statement may have closed the door to future payments for prisoners who get involved in research. Applications for permission to conduct research in UK prisons are dealt with via a process¹⁷ managed by HM Prison and Probation Service National

Question #1

Was there a policy prior to 2024 and where can it be found?

Research Committee (NRC) and support is provided by the Health and Justice Research Network¹⁸. NRC Guidance issued in 2024¹⁹ is shown in the box below and The Ministry of Justice has explained that their use of the term ‘participation’ in this guidance covers both research participation and coproduction²⁰. This means that future payments for Public Contributors will be confined to, as yet undefined, ‘very exceptional circumstances’. No exceptions have been found²¹.

Published guidance on payments to prisoners

Participation should not automatically lead to any financial benefits or losses for participants, nor should they feel that they will incur social benefits or losses due to their participation or non-participation. For example, timing of prison-based interviews may result in a loss of earnings from spending time in an interview when participants would normally be in work or education. Researchers should address this issue in their research application. Offering incentives to supervised individuals for participation in research will only be considered in very exceptional circumstances where there is strong evidence that response rates have become problematic. Separate approval via the NRC must be sought prior to any payments.

A request for clarification yielded the following from the NRC²²:

Offering incentives to defendants in criminal cases, people in prison, or people under probation supervision for participating in research is a particularly sensitive issue and has the potential to undermine public trust in government research more generally. Current MoJ policy is that financial incentives should not be offered to people while they are in custody. However, a prisoner should not lose pay by participating in research during working time. This should be agreed beforehand with prison staff and an assurance should be given to that effect.

The MoJ will consider the use of incentives on a case-by-case basis and incentives may in some circumstances be offered to people who are under supervision of the CJS, or to defendants^a. This option should only be considered when a research study is at risk of not being able to answer the research question of interest due to lack of participants for example. Clear and compelling reasons will have to be provided on the benefits of using incentives in this particular context.

In relation to the use of incentives or payment to lived experienced researchers who are no longer under the supervision of HMPPS – they would be outside of the remit of MoJ policy and therefore NRC approval for their use would not be required.

The MoJ policy on the use of incentives in research is currently under review. Whilst there is no publication date yet, we hope to know the outcome of the review early in 2026.

Historic precedents

A systematic review of peer-reviewed literature published by Treacy and colleagues in 2021²³ found only two examples²⁴ where PPI payments appeared to have been made, and closer examination revealed that neither offered payments to people in custody:

- Awenat and colleagues studied suicidal thoughts and behaviour in prisoners in the north of England. A Service User Reference Group (SURG) advised the academic team, comprising

^a Author’s note: The phrase ‘under the supervision of the CJS or defendants’ excludes anyone in custody, as they are denied payments by the policy mentioned in the previous paragraph.

four ex-prisoners who had been suicidal during their own imprisonment. All members of the SURG were then interviewed individually about their experiences in the group and the results analysed²⁵. This study, therefore, made payments to ex-prisoners rather than people currently in custody.

- MacInnes and colleagues conducted research in forensic mental health settings, rather than prisons. Whilst there will be many similarities between a locked forensic psychiatric unit, the differences mean that this cannot be considered a precedent for making PPI payments to people in prison.

Payments for research participation

PPI payments for research coproduction are separate from but adjacent to payments for research participation. In research participation, the prisoner provides the data which is analysed and reported by the research team while in coproduction, the prisoner is part of the team and so helps to design the research, collect and analyse the data, and publish the results.

Mambro's team found 426 prisoner studies across 53 countries that were published in English or French²⁶ and published before 30/09/2022. Two thirds of them (68%) were from just four countries - the United States, Australia, the United Kingdom and Canada. Almost a third of them (131 out of 426 studies or 31%) paid prisoners for research participation, although only 14 of them explicitly stated the reason for making a payment. In the UK, 34 studies were conducted, of which three²⁷ made a payment to the prisoners. Internationally, whilst only a third of studies offered payment, the practice was more common in 2013-2022 than in the previous decade (see Appendix 2).

The three UK studies that did compensate prisoners for research participation comprised:

- Sheard et al (2009)²⁸ added credit worth £5 to prisoner's phones for participation in a drug trial that gathered data from medical records and a urine sample from each prisoner.
- In the study by Hayes et al published in 2013, prisoners were not directly compensated for participation in research but rather carried out the participation in the time they would otherwise be in the classroom and were compensated as if they had engaged in the lesson²⁹. A similar approach was taken in a Canadian study, except that research participation was completed in the prisoner's usual work time and so compensation was provided as if the prisoner had been at their usual workplace³⁰. This depends upon research activity being of sufficient duration, as one-step consultations would not easily fit into the working regime. Hayes published well before the launch of the UK policy guidance noted above, through which there must be no financial incentive or penalty for participating in, or declining to participate in the research. Practice elsewhere such as the USA³¹ and Canada³² contrasts with the UK's parsimonious approach.
- Young et al (2019)³³ paid Scottish prisoners £20, but we note that policy and practice in Scotland differs from that in England.

So, none of these three studies added money directly to the account accessed by English prisoners.

Treacy and colleagues (2019) hoped to arrange payments to prisoners for coproduction activities but were obliged to scale back their ambitions due to the administrative delays in obtaining

permission³⁴, so, instead of paying individual prisoners, they made a donation to the prison library. The delay they experienced may be similar in some ways to the delays facing nonsalaried Public Contributors who seek permission to collect research data from NHS patients³⁵, although it is not known whether the delay was caused by restrictive policies or ignorance of a permissive policy, uncertainty about the best way to respond, diffused responsibility for decision-making or distraction by other priorities.

Motivation and ethics

Contributing to research may be recorded as a positive case-note, thus impacting parole reports, but it is unclear whether the NRC Policy statement quoted above would consider such advantages a prohibited 'social benefit. Within the prison, a visibly fair incentives system can contribute to the belief in procedural justice, thereby promoting a pro-social attitude toward authority and internalisation of good behaviour.

Dilemmas around payment for prisoners have been explored by Ward & Bailey³⁶ and Callaghan and colleagues are working on the related issue of payments for people living in secure psychiatric settings³⁷. The following concerns may have influenced the Ministry of Justice when the decision was taken to deny payments to prisoners for engagement in research:

- Many prisoners have mental health challenges or intellectual disabilities, making it more difficult to ensure that consent is meaningful.
- Constraints upon prisoner autonomy may invalidate informed consent³⁸.
- The low level of payments for work inside the prison (see Appendix 1) amplifies the power of payments which are made. PPI payment rates could match those offered in the community or match prison rates of pay for other activities³⁹. Mambro and colleagues advocate for payments to be made for research participation within the prison and show that such payments are not coercive, while steps should be taken to minimise the risk of exploitation and undue influence.
- Excessive payments to one prisoner could trigger intimidation from others inside the prison
- Within the prison, denying prisoners a payment is viewed as part of the punishment.
- Beyond the prison gates, making a payment may be perceived as making prison more pleasant or enabling offenders to profit from their crimes.
- It may be reminiscent of unethical research where prisoners were used as disposable subjects to test dangerous interventions⁴⁰
- Responding to an individual application to conduct research in the light of unfamiliar and complex policy guidance is too demanding for Governors, so it is less burdensome to simply reject all requests.
- Creating and utilising procedures for authorising and administering payments is disproportionately burdensome for the prison.

- Researchers themselves may have varying opinion about the ethics or practicality of making payments.

The case for offering payments includes the following:

- Justice requires equitable access to healthcare, whether one is incarcerated or not. To treat prisoners less well than other citizens is discriminatory, especially when other vulnerable groups are offered payment, including drug misusers.
- Payment can raise the level of engagement, commitment and truth-telling by the recipient who will take the task more seriously as part of the informal transaction in exchange for the payment. This improves the quality of the research.
- It is exploitative to take the knowledge and labour of prisoners without compensating them.

Conclusion

In practice, making payment to these two groups of citizens appears problematic. There appears to be few pioneers willing to discuss the inequalities between these groups and the general public.

How this paper is being written

The investigation that generated this paper is driven by simple curiosity. The work is unfunded and is conducted as a piece of citizen science rather than under the control of any organisation. Accountability is achieved by following the *Writing in Public* framework⁴¹. Many people have been approached for advice⁴², and I am grateful to the people⁴³ who have contributed to this evolving resource⁴⁴. Please send me your suggestions for further improvements.

Appendix 1: Money and UK prisoners

Where do prisoners get money from?

The following arrangements may apply to England only as other nations within the UK may have their own rules.

Friends, relatives, government departments and agencies, local authorities and charities may all send money to a prisoner's account⁴⁵. There are particular arrangements to regulate the publication of writing or art created by prisoners⁴⁶.

Convicted prisoners may not conduct business transactions, apply for loans or gamble for financial gain. Some prisoners are eligible for a Release on Temporary Licence (ROTL)⁴⁷, enabling them to carry out activities outside the prison. ROTL provisions permitted an average of just over 1,000 prisoners to work in the community in the year to March 2025⁴⁸.

Payments to prisoners sit within Rule 8 of the Prison Rules 1999 and are regulated by PSO4460 Prisoner's Pay⁴⁹. Unconvicted prisoners are not obliged to take part in paid activities.

Prisoners are eligible for standard rate of pay (£4 per week) if they complete the full working week and demonstrate the required level of performance and effort required. The full working week in prison is normally ten morning, afternoon, or evening sessions, or five night shifts⁵⁰. Activities that attract pay in the prison include some which, beyond the prison gates, would be called education, volunteering, leisure and therapy. Guidance is provided on the provision of education⁵¹. The Governor may authorise financial bonuses for productivity, achievement or progress by prisoners, while poor behaviour may result in deductions. Prisoners found guilty of disciplinary offences may be punished by losing up to 84 days full pay (less the cost of phone calls or postage, so that the prisoner may maintain family contact)⁵².

Whilst such opportunities may be theoretically available, the UK prison population has grown, whilst behaviour has deteriorated and the workforce has shrunk in both numbers and experience, leading to nearly half of male prisoners spending less than two hours out of their cells during weekdays. The number of starts on education programmes has plummeted⁵³.

Question #2

How are contradictory messages reconciled – most prisoners receive pay for their involvement in work or education, but most are in their cells?

How do prisoners store their money?

Prisoners may hold three accounts inside the prison, as well as holding one or more bank accounts in the community. The accounts within the prison are called private, spend and save. Money earned within the prison is credited to the prisoner's individual spend account⁵⁴.

The combined value for a prisoner is not permitted to rise beyond £900 – insufficient for the downpayment on rented accommodation in some parts of England.

Question #3

How does the spend account work? The save account? What money goes in and out of these two accounts? Has the combined value threshold been increased over time? Why is it so much lower than the cost of setting up a home after release?

How do prisoners access their money?

The Incentives Policy Framework⁵⁵ regulates how prisoners can access their money and it offers four incentive levels, called Basic, Standard, Enhanced Initial and Enhanced Extended⁵⁶. In the year to March 2024, prisoners typically started on Standard (45% of the prison population) and those who did well progressed to Enhanced Initial (49%). Poor behaviour led to 5% being downgraded to Basic whilst fewer than 1% of prisoners rose to the highest level, called Enhanced Extended. The Enhanced Extended level is available at the discretion of the Prison Governor⁵⁷.

A prisoner's assigned incentive level is unaffected by conviction or by transfer from one prison to another⁵⁸. Access to private cash is governed by a policy⁵⁹ that sets spending limits which are revised each year, with 2025 figures shown in the table below. Unconvicted prisoners are not obliged to take part in paid activities and their spending limits are higher.

The incentives system includes access to money but also includes a range of other privileges, ranging from permission to wear one's own clothes to time out of one's cell and access to the gym. Detailed

and local implementation arrangements are reviewed by an Incentives Forum made up of staff and prisoners⁶⁰.

Weekly spending limits in 2025

Level	Unconvicted prisoners	Convicted prisoners
Basic	£30.25	£6.00
Standard	£66.50	£21.75
Enhanced (both initial and enhanced)	£72.50	£36.25

How do prisoners use their money?

Prisoners may buy food and toiletries from the Prison Shop or other items via approved mail order businesses as well as add credit to their phone. They may send their money to family members or others, but there are defined limits to these transactions⁶¹. Funds may be saved in preparation for release from prison.

Question #4

Do staffing or discipline problems result in some prisoners being denied access to the shop?

Where prisoners gain permission to work for an ordinary employer outside the prison under the ROTL rules, the prison service insists that the employer matches or exceeds the national minimum wage levels⁶². The prisoner is provided with a payslip, but the money is sent to the prison. The employee's net earnings are then significantly reduced by a levy⁶³ in compliance with the Prisoners Earnings Act 1996 and those funds are transferred to a voluntary organisation that provides victim support. The balance is placed into the prisoner's account.

Rumours suggest that some Governors have permitted payments to be made into a prisoner's account which cannot be accessed until they leave, thus avoiding any interference with the prison culture whilst helping with resettlement.

Question #5

Is there any truth in these rumours?

Appendix 2: Countries that have undertaken relevant research.

Mambro et al (2024) reviewed 426 prison research studies, looking for information about payments being made to research participants.

Country	No. of studies that included payments for participation	No. of studies that did not pay for participation	Total
United States	84	116	200
Australia	19	17	36
United Kingdom	3	31	34
Canada	4	17	21
Spain	2	15	17
Brazil		8	8
Italy		6	6

Country	No. of studies that included payments for participation	No. of studies that did not pay for participation	Total
Switzerland		5	5
Ethiopia		4	4
France		4	4
Iran		4	4
Norway		4	4
Taiwan		4	4
Germany	3		3
Greece		3	3
Nigeria		3	3
Portugal		3	3
Sweden		3	3
2-nation studies in the countries named in the footnote		2 ^b	2
4-nation study covering the countries named in the footnote	1 ^c		1
One study in each of the countries named in the footnote	11 ^d	20 ^e	31
Two studies in each of the countries named in the footnote	4 ^f	26 ^g	30
Total	131	295	426

¹ [Payment guidance for researchers and professionals | NIHR](#)

² See [Payment-guidance-for-members-of-the-public-considering-involvement-in-research.pdf](#). Also https://peterbates.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/how_to_make_sense_of_our_payments_offer.pdf

³ [Home - People in Research](#). For an evaluation of the adverts found on this site, see <https://peterbates.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/12/Going-cheap-on-expenses.pdf>.

^b One study was in Denmark & Estonia; the other study was in Italy & Brazil

^c Belgium and France, Germany and Portugal.

^d China, Ethiopia, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Philippines, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan.

^e Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, China, Cyprus, Fiji, French Guiana, Georgia, Ghana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Israel, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Pakistan, Philippines, Russia, Singapore, Togo.

^f Indonesia, Netherlands.

^g Chile, Colombia, Germany, Ireland, Malaysia, Malawi, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Peru, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Tajikistan.

⁴ [Public funds](#)

⁵ Prisoners are one of the groups identified as routinely excluded from opportunities to contribute to research about them. See Beresford P (2020) PPI or user involvement: taking stock from a service user perspective in the twenty first century. *Research Involvement and Engagement*. Jun 26;6(1):36.

⁶ Lived-experience, or user-led groups, including [User Voice](#), [Lived Expert](#) and the [Prisoner Policy Network](#) were named by McNaull G, Johnson M, Maruna S, Daniel H & Scully H (2024) Collaborative Research in a Pandemic: Co-producing solutions to a crisis. *Prison Service Journal* 272.

⁷ See, for example, User Voice (2025) *Transforming justice services through lived experience: Our work in prisons*. Downloaded from [Prison Council & Consultations 2025](#) 15/09/2025.

⁸ Treacy and colleagues asked 30 prisoners from one prison for advice about their research plans and a further 16 prisoners from a second prison. Treacy S, Haggith A, Wickramasinghe ND, *et al* (2019) Dementia-friendly prisons: a mixed-methods evaluation of the application of dementia-friendly community principles to two prisons in England *BMJ Open*; 9:e030087. DOI:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030087.

⁹ Rutherford R, Bowes N, Cornwell R, Heggs D & Pashley S (2024). A systematic scoping review exploring how people with lived experience have been involved in prison and forensic mental health research. *Criminal Behaviour & Mental Health*, 34(1), 94–114. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.2324>. Also Rutherford R, Pashley S, Bowes N, Heggs D & Cornwell R (2025), Rapid Review of Literature Reporting the Experience of Patient and Public Involvement in Prison and Forensic Mental Health Research. *Int J Mental Health Nurs*, 34: e13483. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.13483>.

¹⁰ More people are being sent to prison and stay there for longer sentences, while more of them have recognised additional needs. Staffing levels have been cut and staff turnover has increased, replacing seasoned and experienced staff with younger and less experienced employees. Overcrowded cells and more frequent prison transfers have disrupted relationships with staff and so behaviour has deteriorated. Vacancy levels in the workforce have risen. As a result, obtaining approval for research may be delayed, prisoners are more likely to be unable to leave their cell, staff may not be available to escort prisoners to meetings and prisoners may be less amenable to help anyone in authority.

¹¹ Honeywell D (2023) A Critical Reflection on Being a Lived Experience Researcher. *Irish Probation Journal*. Oct 1;20.

¹² Sullivan E, Hassal P & Rowlands (2008) Breaking the Chain: A prison-based participatory action research project *The British Journal of Forensic Practice*, 10(3), 13–19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14636646200800015>.

¹³ Ward, J., & Bailey, D. (2013). A participatory action research methodology in the management of self-harm in prison. *Journal of Mental Health*, 22(4), 306–316. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09638237.2012.734645>.

¹⁴ Haarmans, M., PAR Team., Perkins, E., and Jellicoe-Jones, L. (2021) “It’s Us Doing It!” The Power of Participatory Action Research in Prison: A Contradiction in Terms? – Phase 1. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 20(3), pp.238-252.

¹⁵ PAR has been used in prisons in the USA. See Crabtree JL, Wall JM & Ohm D (2016). Critical reflections on participatory action research in a prison setting: Toward occupational justice. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*, 36(4), 244–252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1539449216669132>. Also Fine, M., & Torre, M. E. (2006). Intimate details: Participatory action research in prison. *Action Research*, 4(3), 253–269. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750306066801>.

¹⁶ For an example from Canada, see Livingston JD, Nijdam-Jones A, Team P.E.E.R. (2013) Perceptions of Treatment Planning in a Forensic Mental Health Hospital: A Qualitative, Participatory Action Research Study. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*. 12(1):42-52. doi:[10.1080/14999013.2013.763390](https://doi.org/10.1080/14999013.2013.763390).

¹⁷ See [Prison research - Health Research Authority](#) and [Research at HMPPS - HM Prison and Probation Service - GOV.UK](#).

¹⁸ [Health and Justice Research Network | The University of Manchester](#)

¹⁹ Ministry of Justice (2024) National Research Committee: Applicant Guidance [What makes a good research application:](#)

²⁰ “I can confirm that the guidance on incentives applies to all research activity with prisoners/people under supervision, whether that is participation or coproduction.” Personal correspondence from Katie Hughes, Research Officer at the Ministry of Justice 10 Sept 2025.

²¹ One researcher commented, “In projects I have worked on previously we have suggested thanking serving prisoners for the time in research with phone credits or even a library voucher, but our suggestions were rejected by NRC as they state no prisoner should be incentivised to take part in research.” Personal communication, 19 September 2025.

²² Personal communication from Karen Morgan, Senior Social Researcher, NRC, 17 Sept 2025.

²³ Treacy S, Martin S, Samarutlake N. *et al.* (2021) Patient and public involvement (PPI) in prisons: the involvement of people living in prison in the research process – a systematic scoping review. *Health Justice* 9, 30. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-021-00154-6>.

²⁴ Also MacInnes D, Beer D, Keeble P, Rees D & Reid L (2011) Service-user involvement in forensic mental health care research: areas to consider when developing a collaborative study. *J Ment Health* 20 (5): 464–472. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09638231003728109>.

²⁵ Awenat YF, Moore C, Gooding PA, Ulph F, Mirza A & Pratt D (2018) Improving the quality of prison research: a qualitative study of ex-offender service user involvement in prison suicide prevention research. *Health Expect* 21 (1): 100–109. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.12590>. Also Awenat Y. Forensic Patient and Public Involvement: The Development and Maintenance of an Ex-offender Service User Reference Group. In Pratt D, ed. (2015) *The Prevention of Suicide in Prison: Cognitive Behavioural Approaches*. London, UK: Routledge.

²⁶ Mambro A, Afshar A, Leone F, Dussault C, Stoové M, Savulescu J, Rich JD, Rowan DH, Sheehan J, Kronfli N (2024) Reimbursing incarcerated individuals for participation in research: A scoping review. *International Journal of Drug Policy*. Jan 1;123:104283.

²⁷ Hayes AJ, Burns A, Turnbull P & Shaw JJ (2013) **Social and custodial needs of older adults in prison**. *Age and Ageing*, 42(5), 589–593. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/aft066>.

²⁸ Sheard, L, Wright, NM, El-Sayeh, HG, Adams, CE, Li, R, & Tompkins, CN. (2009). The Leeds Evaluation of Efficacy of Detoxification Study (LEEDS) prisons project: a randomised controlled trial comparing dihydrocodeine and buprenorphine for opiate detoxification. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy*, 4, 1. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1747-597X-4-1>

²⁹ Hayes AJ, Burns A, Turnbull P & Shaw JJ (2013) **Social and custodial needs of older adults in prison**. *Age and Ageing*, 42(5), 589–593. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ageing/aft066>.

³⁰ Kronfli N, Lafferty L, Leone F, Stoové M, Hajarizadeh B, Lloyd AR, Altice FL (2024) Using nominal group technique to identify perceived barriers and facilitators to improving uptake of the Prison Needle Exchange Program in Canadian federal prisons by correctional officers and healthcare workers. *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 2024 Aug 1;130:104540.

³¹ “All incarcerated researchers received refreshment – for example, juice, granola bars, cheese, and crackers – and \$20 on their jail account (books) for their participation in project workshops (for a maximum payment of \$80 for four workshops.” Fields J, González I, Hentz K, Rhee M & White C (2008) Learning from and with incarcerated women: Emerging lessons from a participatory action study of sexuality education. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 5(2), 71–84. <https://doi.org/10.1525/srsp.2008.5.2.71>

³² The following papers report on different aspects of the same study: Martin RE, Adamson S, Korchinski M, Granger-Brown A, Ramsden VR, Buxton JA... Hislop TG (2013) Incarcerated women develop a nutrition and fitness program: Participatory research. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, 9(3), 142–150. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPH-03-2013-0015>. The same work is also reported in Martin RE, Korchinski M, Fels L, & Leggo C (2017). Arresting hope: Women taking action in prison health inside out. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 4(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2017.1352156>. Also in Martin RE, Murphy K, Hanson D, Hemingway C, Ramsden V, Buxton J... Hislop TG (2009) **The development of participatory health research among incarcerated women in a Canadian prison**. *International Journal of Prisoner Health*, 5(2), 95–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449200902884021>. Also Ramsden V, Martin R, McMillan J, Granger-Brown A & Tole B (2015) Participatory health research within a prison setting: A qualitative analysis of 'Paragraphs of Passion'. *Global Health Promotion*, 22(4), 48–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1757975914547922>.

³³ Young S, González RA, Fridman M, Hodgkins P, Kim K, & Gudjonsson GH (2018) **The economic consequences of attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder in the Scottish prison system**. *BMC Psychiatry [Electronic Resource]*, 18(1), 210. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1792-x>. Jun 25.

³⁴ Personal communication with Sam Treacy, September 2025.

³⁵ As prisoners are counted as NHS patients, barriers may have been erected by the NHS Trust and/or the Prison Governor. For details of the challenges of coproducing Focus Groups in the NHS context, see Bowness B, Bates P, Chauhan A, Osman Y, Shlovogt T & Lawrence V (2025) Public co-researchers in research: approved in principle, undermined in practice? *Research Involvement and Engagement* 11, 63. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40900-025-00708-0>. Also <https://peterbates.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/01/How-to-get-approval-for-Public-Contributors-to-interview-NHS-patients.pdf>.

³⁶ Ward J & Bailey D (2012) **Consent, confidentiality and the ethics of PAR in the context of prison research**. *Studies in Qualitative Methodology*, 12, 149–169. [https://doi.org/10.1108/S1042-3192\(2012\)0000012011](https://doi.org/10.1108/S1042-3192(2012)0000012011).

³⁷ A paper is due out from Ian Callaghan and colleagues later in 2025.

³⁸ Charles A, Rid A, Davies H, Draper H (2016) **Prisoners as research participants: current practice and attitudes in the UK**. *Journal of medical ethics*. Apr 1;42(4):246-52.

³⁹ On 18 Sept 2025, an inquiry was sent to NIHR's international team to find out how they address this dilemma when engaging Public Contributors in Low and Middle Income Countries.

⁴⁰ Joseph Mengele conducted experiments on prisoners at Auschwitz II-Birkenau from 1942-1945. From 1932 to 1972, African-American prisoners at Tuskegee, Alabama were denied access to treatment for syphilis so that researchers could track the natural progress of the disease. Philip Zimbardo subjected students to his now discredited 'Prison Experiment' in 1971. In the USA in 1972, over 90% of new drugs were first tested on prisoners. See London AJ (2012) A non-paternalistic model of research ethics and oversight: Assessing the benefits of prospective review. *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*. 40(4):930-44.

⁴¹ Bates P (2024) [How-to-write-in-public.pdf \(peterbates.org.uk\)](https://peterbates.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2025/09/PPI-payments-and-excluded-groups.pdf).

⁴² Inquiries have been sent to the following people – posted to LinkedIn 22/08/2025, also to 11:11 Prison Support, Gareth Addidle, Amy Allard-Dunbar, Rob Allen, Caragh Arthur, Rebecca Askew, Yvonne Awenat, Neil Baker, Tine van Bortel, Gill Buck, Laura Bowden, Centre for Mental Health, Jon Collins, Emily Cooper, Tasha Cowperthwaite, Paul Crawshaw, Sacha Darke, Camilla De Camargo, Dani Darley, Heather Draper, Manuel Eisner, [EPIC](#), Jessica Fields, Abbie Gardner, Kathy Hampson, Nicholas Hardwick, Paula Harriot, Ruth Hatcher, Paul Hogan, Dave Honeywell, Rob Knight, Nicholas Lord, Ralph Lubkowski, Shadd Maruna, John McDaniel, Douglas McInnes, Emma Murray, Francis Pakes, Samantha Pariser, Emma Palmer, Jonathan Parker, Ricky Piper, Katie Price, Revolving Doors, Grace Sheward, SNAP, Paul Taylor, Criag Thomson, Lindsay Thurston, Samantha Treacy, John Tully and User Voice.

⁴³ Comments and advice have been gratefully received from Sandra Beeton, Jamie Bennett, Alex Bradley, Ian Callaghan, Rod Earle, Morag Farquhar, Carole Gardener, Poppy Lyons, Mark Monaghan, Charlotte O'Brien, Sean Ormerod, Rosie Rutherford, Rachael Timoney and Dominic Willmott..

⁴⁴ All errors and omissions are the sole responsibility of the author. The information is provided in good faith, and so readers engage with the contents at their own risk and undertake not to hold the author liable for any injury, loss, or damage arising through reading or acting on its contents.

⁴⁵ [\[Insert title of document\]](#) para 5.36

⁴⁶ "Prisoners are prohibited from publishing material about their own crime or past offences, or those of others, except where it consists of serious representations about their conviction or serious comment about crime, the criminal justice process or the penal system." [PSI 37/2010 Prisoners' Access to the Media \(Para 2.2\)](#) and paragraph 11.3(j) (i) of [PSI 49/2011 Prisoner Communications Services](#).

⁴⁷ Prison Rule 9 (Prison Rules 1999) and Prison Service Order 6300 set out how Release on Temporary Licence works and who is eligible. The Prisons and Probation Policy Framework (May 2019) also provides for Resettlement Day Release. See also [ROTL-Self-Help-Toolkit.pdf](#).

⁴⁸ [HMPPS Annual Digest 2024 to 2025 - GOV.UK](#)

⁴⁹ [pso-4460-prisoners-pay](#)

⁵⁰ [pso-4460-prisoners-pay](#) paras 2.4 and Annex B.

⁵¹ <https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/67eaa0f7f0edd954a99fe97a/prison-education-library-services-pf.pdf>

⁵² In accordance with Prison Rule 55 (1)(d).

⁵³ [Prisons](#)

⁵⁴ [PRISONERS EARNINGS ACT 1996](#)

⁵⁵ The current Incentives Policy Framework is at [\[Insert title of document\]](#). Formerly the Incentives and Earned Privileges Scheme. See also [HMPPS Annual Digest 2023 to 2024 - GOV.UK](#)

⁵⁶ A fifth level, Entry, was introduced in 2013 and abolished in 2019.

⁵⁷ [\[Insert title of document\]](#) paragraph 5.4.

⁵⁸ [\[Insert title of document\]](#) para 5.6.

⁵⁹ [PRISONERS EARNINGS ACT 1996](#)

⁶⁰ [\[Insert title of document\]](#) Annex B.

⁶¹ [\[Insert title of document\]](#) para 5.36

⁶² PSO 4460 Prisoners' Pay, Paragraph 2.7.3 and 2.7.4 indicates that prisoners are not formally included in the National Minimum Wage Act 1998. However, the prison service is unwilling to give businesses which employ prisoners a commercial advantage, so insists on equal pay and conditions for prisoners and other employees.

⁶³ When a prisoner has permission to work for an ordinary employer outside the prison, their net pay consists of earnings after removing tax, national insurance contributions, court-ordered deductions and child support payments. The employer provides the employee with a payslip but must transfer the net pay to the prison service. The prison service takes a levy and transfers it to an approved victim support charity before transferring the balance into the prisoner's private bank account held in the community. Prisoners receive the first £20 of their net pay along with 60% or more of their net earnings above this figure. Governors are required to set the usual levy rate at 40%, but may, in exceptional circumstances, reduce it to any figure between 0% and 40%. See [PRISONERS' EARNINGS ACT 1996](#).